

who were supposed to be strongly free trade in opinion, to this effect:

The Conservatives will tell you that the policy of bounties were granted by the former government. So it was. We shall do some more business under that bounty system. I myself do not object to it. It is a good thing sometimes. We took up that bounty system and readjusted it and we intend in five or six years to wipe out the bounty system. In five or six years there will be no bounty paid to those iron and steel industries.

Now, these no doubt may be very consoling words to those who are opposed to the principle of protection, whether expressed in a customs tariff or in a policy of bounties, but they will not be very reassuring words at this juncture, when we are on the eve of the expiration of those five years, to the persons who are engaged in the business of manufacturing iron and steel, and who, in some respects, are struggling, I believe, at the present time against difficulties of an unusual character.

But, the Minister of Finance, at Montreal, referred to more than the tariff. He referred to the proceedings which had been taken against him in the courts and more particularly to the observations of the Conservative press and Conservative speakers in regard to it, charging us all with a gross exaggeration of the circumstances and facts. I do not know whether my hon. friend intended to include me in the very comprehensive remarks which he made on that occasion, but I desire to tell him that on the two or three different occasions on which I did allude to the revelations in the trial of the election petition against him I took particular care to keep myself within the record and to say not one single word which was not justified by the evidence. Indeed I took the pains to read that evidence before I uttered one word on the subject and I challenge my hon. friend, in so far as I am concerned, to point to one single word of exaggeration or unjust criticism in regard to this matter. I might retort upon my hon. friend; I might be inclined to say, and I think I might very justly say, that his representation of the facts of the case to the people who had the pleasure of listening to him at Montreal was, to say the least, not a very full one.

It was inevitable, he said, that in an election some indiscreet partisan should occasionally exceed the bounds of the law and do things which the election law did not contemplate.

My hon. friend altogether forgets the record when he puts the case in that way. In the first place my hon. friend forgot the provisions of the law himself in the elections of 1900. Upon the matter to which allusion has been made we have a plain statute, section 143 of the Election Act which declares that no man in this country, being a candidate at an election, shall make any payment in respect to that election ex-

cept through an agent duly appointed by him in writing. That is the plain provision of the law. What did my hon. friend do? My hon. friend, after his account had been presented, after his statement had been made by his agent and after it had been handed in, and when certain bills were presented to him by a man who was not his agent, by a certain gentleman by the name of Farrell, a member of the legislative assembly in the province of Nova Scotia, reluctantly, he says and upon the condition that he should never be called upon to do anything of the kind again, gave the amount of these bills, whatever it was, for the purpose of paying these bills. I have under my hand his evidence given upon the trial and examination; I have it here and I challenge contradiction of what I say. He stated that he made no inquiry as to the purpose for which this money had been expended when he handed this amount over to Farrell and it was in respect to that that the appeal was taken to the Supreme Court and it was in respect to that that the judgment of the Supreme Court was invoked. There is a penalty for doing that which my hon. friend did in this case. I have no doubt that he must have overlooked the provision of the law. I have no doubt that he did what he did inadvertently in so far as this statute is concerned. But let us not minimize this too much, let us remember that the statute law of this country provides that any man who shall make a payment otherwise than through his duly authorized agent is guilty of an indictable offence and that the statute has made provision exactly for the case which he has detailed in his evidence. If these bills were legitimate bills, if they were proper bills, if these disbursements were for proper purposes all my hon. friend had to do was to apply to a judge of the court for permission to pay them at that time. The provisions of section 145 of the statute are explicit in that regard. I will not deal further with this matter. I am prepared to deal further with it if it shall be necessary, because I have the evidence and the examination of my hon. friend under my hand.

I have spoken of this for two reasons: first, because I think the hon. gentleman has unjustly accused the Conservative party as a whole of unfair criticism in respect to that public matter, and second, because I think he did not state the case fairly and fully in his remarks at Montreal. Let me add one word further. This gentleman, Mr. Farrell, who brought these bills to the Minister of Finance is not only a member of the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia, but he is actually the Speaker of that Assembly. Some weeks before the trial came on; some weeks before he could be subpoenaed. Mr. Farrell's health suddenly failed and he sought seclusion in the neighbouring republic. By a remarkable coincidence his health was restored a day or two after