

Premier had claimed that the Government had allowed the prosecution to choose their own counsel. They had done so, but he could imagine what an outcry would have been made if any Conservative Government had claimed credit for such a statement. These same men had also appointed their own tribunal, and they would also endorse the deliverance of these commissioners, and thus seek to make themselves clear. Now, in the language of condescension, we heard that the prosecution had been allowed to choose their own counsel. We heard a great deal of Liberalism, indeed, and of this being a democratic country. It had been said that if you scratched a Russian you would find under the skin a Tartar, but if you scratched some of the hon. gentlemen opposite you would find a mixture of demagogue and tyrant such as Russia could not supply.

The Patronage Given to Gamey.

The Premier had denied that the hon. member for Manitoulin had got any of the patronage. He knew of no man in public life who needed so careful watching as the Premier when he was making arguments in favor of a party position.

Mr. Ross explained that he had said that the member for Manitoulin got no patronage from the Provincial Secretary's department. He had admitted the appointment of Mr. Flesher and of the returning officer.

Mr. Whitney—Then he had received some of the consideration he was promised for supporting the Government.

Mr. Hammond's Evidence.

It had occurred to him that the Premier, having made up his mind that he himself would be in some danger if he appeared as a witness before the commission, would also fight very shy of the attempt at subornation of perjury on the part of the Provincial Secretary in regard to Mr. Hammond. He did not do so, however. He said that there was no harm in Hammond's evidence. Who had said that there was? The point was the conduct of the Provincial Secretary in endeavoring to induce Mr. Hammond to forget some of the things he knew. Suppose the hon. member for Manitoulin had done that. He could imagine the supreme indignation of the public. It was quite impossible to frame a more dishonest comment on this question than the comment of the commissioners themselves. They did not refer to the alleged offence—not that Mr. Hammond differed from the Provincial Secretary, because he did not differ very much on anything important—but that the Provincial Secretary had attempted to get Mr. Hammond to commit a crime.

The Premier had spoken of the support given to the Provincial Secretary by the others of his party. He believed that there were men sitting on the floor of this House just as guilty as the Provincial Secretary might be. But the Premier talked about the loyal support. If the Premier had not said that, it would not have been necessary for him (Mr. Whitney) to say what he was going to say. How did it come that from one end of the Province of Ontario to another, and even within the House, statements were made by Liberal members of the Liberal party that, no matter what else should happen, they would get rid of Stratton.

The Letter to the Premier.

The Premier had said that he wished to rule with clean hands. That was a proper wish; but if he were so anxious to have the public believe so, why did he not go into the witness box? He had a letter from the member for Manitoulin offering his support to the Government, and yet he would not go into the box. The Premier had said in the morning that what had been said to Mr. Gamey was that if he did not sign the letter he would not receive the patronage. He was at the time simply paraphrasing the language of the report. The commissioners,

however, made no use of this language, and so it must have been the Premier's own. The language of the Premier represented more and more that of a man who was occasionally engaged in thinking aloud. If the member for Manitoulin received any patronage at all it amounted to this, that the Government made a bargain with him, which, according to the Premier's language, they endeavored to get out of.

Judges Merely Individuals.

The Judges who heard the evidence were just individuals, like any who might be picked out from the street anywhere, and appointed commissioners to do certain specific and well-defined work, and take down the evidence and report to the House, and so anyone who dealt with them as Judges was doing himself and the public a wrong, and much harm might come of it. The commissioners, herefore, could have no reason to complain when their conduct was criticized. Hon. George Brown had criticized Judges on a previous occasion when they were acting as Judges in the matter of an election petition, and he was summoned for contempt of court, but was held to be justified in his remarks. It was much more reasonable that men who were not sitting as Judges, but as commissioners, servants of the House, should not be free from criticism upon their acts. The conduct of the Government in calling to their assistance members of the judiciary could not help but bring the judiciary considerably into disrepute. But these considerations were trifles light as air in the minds of the Government. We had a judiciary of which the whole world might well be proud, but they were not held how in the same high regard that they were two years ago.

Sir John Boyd's Family.

Fancy Sir Oliver Mowat doing as the two Judges had done in the present case. We had this gentleman with three sons in the employ of the Government, which must stand or fall according to his decision, and Sir John Boyd himself, for the last eight or ten years, had received from the Government of Ontario remuneration for his employment by that Government outside of his fees as a Judge. He was sorry, upon his honor as a public man and as a private individual, to say it, but it was indecent—(Opposition applause)—and the fact that all these things were being done from day to day, without promoting even a smile on the faces of the partisans, in this country was another evidence of the low state of morality in this Province among certain people from whom higher and better things should be expected.

Mr. Whitney declared that his opinions in this regard were backed up by that of many of the independent papers of the Province. Quoting from The Toronto News, he read a reference to a meeting in the Queen's Park to decorate the veterans' monuments, when the mention of the judiciary was received with jeers.

Mr. Ross—The jeers were heard at a Conservative gathering.

Mr. Whitney—The meeting was one of the Veterans' Association of Ontario, and it did lean closely to Conservative principles. The Premier himself took good care not to be present at that meeting, being convinced that he had done enough for them by giving them 160 acres of land somewhere.

The Finding Too Extreme.

Mr. Whitney quoted also from The Hamilton Herald and The Ottawa Journal to substantiate his own opinion that the position taken by the Judges in the commission was one which had lowered them in the public estimation. Nor was this opinion shared alone by the people outside of the House. The hon. members opposite, by their actions, had shown, when the report was laid upon the table, that they were dissatisfied. Their faces on that occasion showed no sign of triumph, because they felt that the commissioners had gone too far. In every quarter of Ontario to-day the opinion was expressed openly that this deliverance was too extreme and had gone altogether too far. The counsel engaged had been altogether ig-

nored. They never dreamed that such a deliverance would have been given. The argument of Mr. Blake was not even touched upon by the commissioners. Their finding was simply a compilation of the evidence in favor of the Provincial Secretary, accompanied by a very skillful minimizing of anything that could count at all against him. The simple fact was this, that the member for Manitoulin had been on trial, and the language used by witness after witness corroborating the evidence of the member for Manitoulin was not quoted, and not even mentioned, in the report, with the result that the supporters of the Government would have to draw in their horns and submit to the Provincial Secretary a little while longer.

Charges Were True.

He declared that the opinion to which he was forced was that the charges made by the member for Manitoulin were true, that they were mainly true, and the commissioners themselves believed that he received money, and, as he (Mr. Whitney) took it, for the purposes he had said that he received it.

The attempt to get Mr. Hammond to forget some of the things he knew was not only not disproved, but the Provincial Secretary had not cared to say a word about it in the witness box. These facts rendered it impossible for him (Mr. Whitney) to say that he did not believe the statements of the member for Manitoulin. The Premier had spoken of the presentation of evidence on every material point to the commission, but in one or two instances, when evidence of a very distinct, positive and serious character was brought there, it was not allowed to be given before the tribunal. When evidence of men who were prepared to contradict and prove the utter falsity of the evidence of Frank Sullivan was offered, it was at once turned down by the distinguished Judges. The evidence of Mr. Passmore, saying that the \$900 came from the same place as the \$3,000, had not been referred to by the Judges, although it was very material to the verdict.

Mr. Ross—Mr. Gamey said that the \$900 came from Manitoulin.

Mr. Whitney said that perhaps Mr. Passmore had said so, but he was trying to point out that the commissioners had believed everything said by Frank Sullivan and had discredited Mr. Gamey's evidence, because he had said that he had nothing but the best interests of his constituency at heart. Simply because he did not say that his motives were bad, and that there was no money consideration offered, they discredited him.

Credibility of Witnesses.

Again, the Judges had asked, "Are the Ministers' statements to be read in the light of a corrupt bargain, or as indicating a policy of conciliation?" He could imagine that the Ministers would thank the commissioners for that expression.

They might call the member for Manitoulin whatever they pleased, but when a man whose evidence is worthy of credence agreed with one whose evidence was not worthy of credence, they must count two. In the present case, the evidence of the member for Manitoulin was corroborated in one very important regard by the men who heard him talking to Frank Sullivan in the Crossin Piano Factory. The Judges said this evidence "may affect" the credibility of Frank Sullivan. Most people would say it did affect it. They gave as their reason for brushing aside the evidence of these three witnesses that they did not all tell the same story exactly alike. That was, in their favor, and it was an established principle of evidence that exact resemblance of stories tended rather to discredit them. The Judges also made no mention of the evidence of Mr. Cavers.

The Letter to the Premier.

There were two important matters in regard to Mr. Hammond. He would say nothing of the attempt to get Hammond to alter a signed interview. But Hammond, he was informed, had given a signed statement to the coun-