

Saturday, March 10th

Col. Price said that in requesting the Magistrate to see him he wanted to determine whether the latter had lost the confidence of the community. "I asked him," he said, "if he thought he would be able to carry on, and he was rather doubtful. I told him to think it over, and let me know what he had decided to do. The department, I told him, held no animus in the matter, but merely wanted to do what was right."

#### Resignation Accepted.

Col. Price said that on July 15, while he was away on holidays, Magistrate Bradford turned in his resignation, to take effect Sept. 15, subject to the Attorney-General's approval. It was Aug. 3 before he saw it. He did not want to act hastily, so he waited until Aug. 19 before accepting the resignation.

"I had no reflection to make," said he, "on the ability of Magistrate Bradford as a lawyer. I even had in mind giving him Crown work if he desired to take it."

Then, he went on to say, friends of the Magistrate got together and started to stir up the affair all over again for purely political purposes and advantages, endeavoring to place him (Col. Price) in an untenable position, and force him to restore Bradford to office.

"I said the matter was closed," declared Col. Price, amid the plaudits of Government benches, "and it has remained closed. I didn't think it was a matter over which there should be a controversy in the press. Administration of justice since has not suffered in Lindsay. It is in good hands."

Edmond Proulx (Liberal, Prescott) thought that Bradford should have stuck to his office and forced the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to dismiss him. He thought that Col. Price, while not actually asking Magistrate Bradford for his resignation, had conveyed to him plainly enough the meaning of what was wanted of him. There were two sides to most stories, said Mr. Proulx, and he quoted from Magistrate Bradford's remarks that Mrs. Howard was only

slightly bruised; that the fracas was just a "petty squabble," and that the punishment imposed on Thomson fitted the case adequately.

William Newman (Liberal, North Victoria) declared that public opinion was behind Mr. Bradford. He argued that it would be hard now for him to make a living since he had been so long out of the practice of law. "He often sits and waits for a client," said Mr. Newman.

Frederick G. Sandy (Progressive, Victoria South) was not of the opinion that the Attorney-General had interfered

originally, but "had listened to those who had interfered." He referred to opinions expressed by two prominent citizens of the riding—William Flavelle and the recently appointed Judge O'Connor—that Magistrate Bradford had been above reproach.

When Premier Ferguson rose to conclude the debate, he explained, first, that he had no intention of opposing the motion before the House. The Government, he said, had no objection to the Leader of the Opposition seeing all the correspondence pertaining to the case. Then he declared that the

question, so far as he was concerned, was entirely devoid of political bias. "I want to put it on a higher ground," he said.

The only reference he had to the case in which Mr. Bradford had levied a fine of \$5 for common assault, was that it was unfortunate that he should have conducted the hearing in camera.

The Inspector of Legal Offices, he said, was the logical person for the department to send to look into the matter, and he argued that, following the investigation, no blame or condemnation had been placed on the Magistrate.

## KEEFER PAID \$5,617 AS 'STEAL' COUNSEL, PREMIER ANSWERS

Authority for Expenditure  
Vote 2, Item 8 of  
Estimates

### CENTRAL ONTARIO ASSETS

Premier Ferguson told the Legislature yesterday, in answering a question on the order paper, that F. H. Keefer, former Legislative Secretary for Northern Ontario, had been paid the sum of \$5,617.30 for acting as counsel for the Ontario Government in the litigation over the Chicago "water steal." The services had been rendered between December, 1926, and April, 1927, and the authority for the expenditure, he said, was Vote 2, Item 8 of the estimates.

#### Civil Expense.

Replying to another question, Mr. Ferguson said that the total expenditure for the Civil Government for the year 1923 had been \$1,961,000, and for the year 1927, estimated on the same basis, \$2,286,000. The number of civil servants in 1923 was 1,603, and in 1927, 1,880.

Hon. George S. Henry told F. G. Sandy (Progressive, South Victoria) that the revenue received by the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park Commission from water rentals for 1927 was \$741,864, that \$197,000 had been received from other sources, that there were no power companies in arrears for water rentals, and that the Commission expended \$369,000 ordinary and \$488,000 capital on the park during the year.

#### Assets Acquired.

Mr. Sandy was informed by Premier Ferguson that those assets acquired under the purchase of the General Ontario System, not used for the distribution of Hydro power, which were still owned by the Government were, the Peterboro' Gas Plant, the Oshawa Gas Plant, the Cobourg Gas Plant and Cobourg Waterworks, and the Campbellford Pulp Mill, and that all of them were being operated by the Government.

Hon. Joseph Thompson introduced two bills providing for the incorporation or re-incorporation of the St. Catharines Y.M.C.A. and the St. Catharines Y.W.C.A.