

evidence before the Commissioners, and also that the said Hon. Geo. W. Ross and his other colleagues were not called upon to give evidence; and also this House furthermore expresses its earnest regret that practices contrary to law which were indulged in by members of the Government, and which practices, if persisted in, are calculated to undermine and destroy the political system and degrade the dignity of public life, have been justified and defended by the same Commissioners in their report."

"Plain and Simple" Comment.

Mr. William Rickard (West Durham), who followed Mr. St. John, represented himself as "a plain and simple man," not a lawyer, and not gifted with the powers of endless talk. But a plain and simple man knows what to call one who deliberately signs another's name to a document and passes it off as his own. He also knows what name to apply to a man who exchanges bank deposit slips, and carries off the property of a bank and then denies that he has done so. I have an idea, he said, I could find a name to describe one Mr. Gamey, who did some sleight-of-hand work with those bank deposit slips. Plain and simple people would use names about that man which may not be Parliamentary. And I wonder if that Mr. Gamey is the same gentleman as the member for Manitoulin, who yesterday received a bunch of peonies with the inscription, "To one who would rather be than seem to be an honest man"? In his speech the other day the member for Manitoulin declared that the Chancellor of this Province, Sir John Boyd, should remove the star of Knighthood from his breast for having written the report of the Royal Commission. I could tell the hon. member that men who sign other people's names and tamper with other people's property and steal bank documents are not decorated with stars, as Sir John Boyd was by his Sovereign, but wear "stripes" supplied by the Government; that such men are not allowed to change those stripes at their will; that they are surrounded with four stone walls of facts, and that a watchman with a Winchester keeps guard over them by day and by night.

At 1 o'clock Mr. Rickard moved the adjournment of the debate.

Resuming his speech at 3.10 o'clock, Mr. Rickard reverted to the deposit slip subject, saying that when a man carried away, destroyed or concealed the property of another the public called it stealing. Those bank slips were regarded by the banks as valuable vouchers.

An Example For Sons.

Mr. Rickard devoted some time to a consideration of Mr. Gamey's letter on September 10 and that of October 27, which he had said were similar. Mr. Rickard pointed out the numerous instances of material changes in the latter letter. The hon. gentleman said that because a man's son was in the employ of the Government he was not to be believed on oath. The only thing that they heard about the hon. member for Manitoulin's son was that he had signed a letter in his father's name to the Premier. This was a splendid example.

Mr. Boland's evidence accounted fully for the Provincial Secretary's whereabouts on Sept. 10, and the conclusion of the Judges, made upon that evidence, was not erroneous. Another alleged mistake pointed out by the hon. members opposite was the fact that the commissioners had said that the Manitoulin protest was disposed of on October 26, which was a Sunday. This was, of course, an error, but it was not done with intent to deceive. He did not know whether it was a printer's error or what it was, but he was satisfied that it was merely an error.

The Premier's Position.

The Premier had declared in his speech that unless he could conduct the government of the country honestly he did not wish to govern it at all. That was something he liked to hear. It seemed to have the right ring about it. Anyone who had been present at

the Public Accounts Committee would be well able to imagine how such a case as the present one would be tried in a committee of the House. The only thing that came out of the Public Accounts Committee was the fact that the Government sold a timber limit to someone, and it was perhaps too cheap.

It was charged by the Opposition that Chancellor Boyd was very partisan and took advantage of every technicality against the prosecution. If that were so, why did he not take advantage of Mr. Blake's declaration that he would throw up the case when Mr. Gamey disappeared? You could talk until the crack o' doom and make a speech as long as your arm, but you had to get back to the question, is the charge true? It had been proved conclusively by sworn evidence that it was not true.

Some Comparisons.

Mr. Rickard had done a little figuring and summed up the cost of the inquiry at from \$70,000 to \$80,000, including extra indemnity and other extra expenses. This was enough to build and equip a large asylum. He thought, too, that in listening to some of the long speeches of the present debate he had earned every cent of his extra indemnity. He asked what the effect would be upon our immigration, what would the teeming millions of Europe think of Canada, to which they were looking for homes, if it were true that our Judges were corrupt? There were a few members of the Opposition who had not applauded the speech by the member for Manitoulin. They had a warm place in his (Mr. Rickard's) heart, and he wished also to congratulate the leader of the Opposition, for while he had applauded vigorously at first his vigor had subsided toward the end.

Censuring Mr. Gamey.

In conclusion, Mr. Rickard moved in amendment to the amendment "that all the words after the first word 'that' be struck out and the following words added to the original motion, 'and this House regrets that it has become its duty to place on record an expression of censure of the conduct of the member for Manitoulin in connection with the matters forming the subject of investigation.'"

Mr. Pettypiece Speaks.

No one on the Opposition side rose to speak, and Mr. H. J. Pettypiece (East Lambton) continued the debate from the Government benches, while Mr. Whitney bore visual signs of joy. He remarked that a finding by the committee would have satisfied neither the House nor the country. Mr. Gamey, instead of deserving the gratitude and esteem of the people, deserved the severest condemnation. If the Opposition had been on the right side of the case they could have rested it without indulging in insinuation and innuendo. Unless the charge of bribery was proved, the other charges fell to the ground. Instead of the Opposition confining their remarks to the main charge they had been talking for days all around the subject. (Hear, hear.) Patronage was always given to Government supporters, and he would ask the leader of the Opposition what he would do if he were in power and three or four Liberals walked over to support him. Further, he would want something to show that the members were going to support him. Mr. St. John had said that Sir Oliver Mowat would never have done these things. Mr. Pettypiece recalled that in 1883 Mr. Mowat and Mr. Meredith joined in sawing off the protests. The Opposition saw virtue only in dead Liberals. (Hear, hear.) Where did the Opposition get their money from which they sent—\$500 or \$600—to each candidate? Was it a corrupt act when the member for South Toronto (Mr. Foy) in 1898 wanted to saw off the protest against himself against that of the speaker (Mr. Pettypiece)? The latter had declined, and had fought his out. As to the exclusion of the evidence respecting Wilson's statements in Rochester, Mr. Pettypiece said if that was allowed they might as well admit the evidence of 99 out

of 100 people in Ontario to whom something had been said respecting the Gamey case.

Took Good Advice.

Mr. Stratton had been condemned for not denying the charge when it was made. Any lawyer would advise his client under such circumstances not to say a word until the proper time came. It would be as unreasonable to say that Mr. Hanna went to Buffalo to post Mr. Gamey as to say that Mr. McEvoy or Frank Sullivan "loaded" Wilson as to what evidence to give. As to Hon. S. H. Blake, he asked if to change his political coat would change him from "Soapy Sam" (the name formerly given him by Conservatives) to a paragon of virtue. (Applause.) Mr. Willison had been praised for his independent utterances in The News, whereas he was employed by Conservatives to write Conservative articles. No fault was to be found with that, except that he tacked the word independent to his title. He did not think anyone believed the Provincial Secretary actually paid \$3,000 to Gamey, through Chase or Myers, or anyone else, but the Opposition still said they believed the charges true "in the main." What did that mean? asked Mr. Pettypiece. As soon as the leaves from the cash book disappeared, the question from the Conservative press, "Where did the money come from?" ceased. If that had happened Mr. Stratton's books, the case would have closed then, for then the Liberals would not have stood by him any longer. (Applause.) But the Opposition stood by Gamey. Because of the hold he had on them, they could not let him go. The conversation in the piano factory indicated nothing. The talk about the "parcel" might have been Sullivan's washing or Gamey's, if he ever had any. The charges had been disproved, but the talk still went on as it had done; so, when was a public man safe? Yet, Gamey's conduct was not so surprising in view of the shouts of corruption which had poured continuously from the Opposition for years past. He, however, made his mistake in coming out and charging definite corruption against a definite individual. (Hear, hear.)

The Two Napoleons.

Mr. Pettypiece compared Gamey to Napoleon: each had come from their island home, the old Napoleon retiring to Elba and the young Napoleon to Buffalo. History did not tell us who went to bring the old Napoleon from Elba, but it did tell us that the member for West Lambton (Mr. Hanna) went to bring the young Napoleon back from his retreat. The old Napoleon retired finally to St. Helena, but the young Napoleon, after he had met his Waterloo, would retire to oblivion. (Applause.)

Mr. Milton Carr.

Mr. Milton Carr (Parry Sound), who followed, referred to Dr. Carman's suggestion that the Legislature be quarantined, and said it was probable that no body, religious or secular, but had its Judas Iscariot, and the member for Manitoulin was not a fit person to sit in the House. Why didn't the Opposition put Cap. Sullivan in the box when they had him here for five weeks?

Mr. Pattullo's Review.

Mr. Andrew Pattullo, the next speaker, asked why all the long arguments of the Opposition now? They had said the Government were guilty in March, when they only had the statement of the member for Manitoulin. The members of the Opposition now found themselves, much against their will, compelled to stand by the member for Manitoulin. The question of submitting such cases as the present to a royal commission instead of to a committee of the House, Mr. Pattullo said, was as important to-day as it was before the reference, but surely after the long debate on that subject it was strange that the Opposition members would still want to bring up the subject, especially in view of the recent occurrences in the Public Accounts Committee.