

voted. But my confidence in some of the members of the U. F. O. was somewhat shattered on the vote taken today."

"I am not condoning the making of reckless statements, particularly against this House, when public men are not ready to back up such statements," said W. H. Casselman, U.F.O. member for Dundas. "I want to protest against the making of reckless statements by public men."

#### Mr. Hall Starts Something.

R. R. Hall, Parry Sound, took a fling at the Attorney-General, and said that he should have taken some action, when Mr. Burnaby told him, as he is said to have done, the day before he made his bribery speech, that he was going to make it, to find out who the person was who offered the bribe. He agreed with Col. Lennox, also, regarding the stand of the U.F.O. members in voting against the Chairman's ruling. "If I had been in Mr. Burnaby's place the U.F.O. members would not have let me slide out." Mr. Hall then started something by saying that the U.F.O. members stood together whether they were right or wrong.

Mr. Casselman demanded a retraction. There was a good deal of disorder and noise, and Mr. Casselman repeated his demand.

"There are two members of the U.F.O. I exempt from that statement," said Mr. Hall, but that did not satisfy Mr. Casselman, who said the statement was a reflection on his side of the House. Mr. Casselman appealed to the Speaker, and the Speaker ordered that the statement be retracted.

The Premier rose. "Members are supposed to accord to each other, whether they believe in it or not, the attributes of sincerity and decency. Ordinary House decency demands retraction."

#### Cheers and Jeers.

"In consideration of the fact that I seemed to have hit and hurt somebody, I withdraw that statement," said Mr. Hall, amid cheers and jeers from the members, and the Speaker called for order.

John O'Neill supported the views of those who held that the House should take some action, and objected to persons going around the country talking without due sense of responsibility.

J. M. Webster said he believed that the lid should have come off at the committee, and that the kettle should have been allowed to boil over. J. W. Curry said that he opposed the Chairman's ruling at the committee because he thought he was wrong in law; that neither the committee nor the House had the right to make Mr. Burnaby answer the question.

#### Mr. Curry is Angered.

Some member interjected a remark that roused Mr. Curry's anger.

"Anyone that wants to ask a question should do so, and I will sit down while he is doing so. I will go to the other side of the House when I feel inclined, and I won't have any obligations from any members on this side of the House if I do."

Karl Homuth, South Waterloo, said they were all proud of the way the Premier had voted in committee. The name should have been given. The House should go on record, he held, as being surprised that a man in Mr. Burnaby's position should say such a thing.

Mr. Brackin explained that Mr. Burnaby, though at first he had maintained that the committee had no authority to question him, had voluntarily waived his objection and had, therefore, accepted the jurisdiction of the committee. Mr. Brackin also said a word of praise for the Attorney-General, who, he said, had himself voted in favor of the committee calling the Attorney-General to the stand to give evidence.

Mr. Drury made a last appeal. The effect of the amendment, he said, would be to make the House ridi-

culous. Let public opinion deal with the charge if it was not substantiated.

Mr. Ferguson wanted the report of the evidence before the commission printed, and, after a short discussion, Mr. Dewart added in his amendment that the committee should have power to sit during the recess.

Before the vote was taken Mr. Casselman made an explanation. "I want it clearly understood," he said, "that I do not condone the making of the kind of reckless statements that Mr. Burnaby was guilty of making, but at the same time I don't think we should press this matter to the extent of haling him before the bar of the House."

## Mr. Burnaby Before Legislature Committee

By a vote of 12 to 9 the Legislature Committee on Privileges and Elections declined yesterday to sustain the ruling of Chairman R. L. Brackin to the effect that R. W. E. Burnaby, President of the United Farmers of Ontario, must divulge to the committee the name of the individual who called on him in his office some months ago and offered him \$1,000 a year if he would assist him in landing the job of Purchasing Agent for the Ontario Government.

The U. F. O. President stated that The Globe's report of his utterances at Kettleby, in which he announced the offer of a bribe, was substantially correct, except that portion of it which might be interpreted to reflect on past Governments. When the individual in question had made the offer to him in his office, Mr. Burnaby said he had told him that he would use his influence to see that he did not get the job. When the man walked out, somewhat nettled at the point-black refusal, J. J. Morrison, U. F. O. Secretary, had asked what was the matter with him, and then, Mr. Burnaby said yesterday, he had related the details of the proffered bribe to Mr. Morrison.

#### Tells Initials Only.

Mr. Burnaby first questioned the jurisdiction of the committee to interrogate him on the point at issue, inasmuch, he said, as it did not affect the honor or integrity of any member in the Legislature. It was a personal offer to himself, he pointed out, and he had refused it and taken steps to see that the individual never got the job. He had gone so far as to communicate the initials of the man and the last letter of his name to the Attorney-General, but had never told anyone, not even Mr. Morrison, the whole name. The initials and last letter, he said, were J. S. F—y.

Mr. Burnaby stated his grounds for refusing to divulge the name. Besides taking issue with the committee as to its jurisdiction in the matter, he said that, as there were only himself and the unnamed individual in the room when the offer was made, he had no other evidence to substantiate what was said. Any statement he might make, he feared, might be made the grounds for a libel action against himself.

#### Premier Supports Chairman.

In spite, however, of Chairman Brackin's explanation that a statement made on oath could not be made the basis for a libel action, Mr. Burnaby steadfastly refused to divulge the name. The Chairman ruled that he must, and his ruling was upset on two votes, the first one on a show of hands by 9 to 7, and the second one on Mr. T. H. Lennox's demand for the ayes and nays by a vote of 12 to 9. The Premier voted to sustain the Chair, and a minority of Farmer members on the committee voted likewise.

Correspondence between the Premier and Mr. Burnaby was produced in which Mr. Burnaby had divulged the initials of the individual with a view to stopping him from getting the position. It came out in evidence that on the day before he made the statement at the picnic