

*By Hon. Mr. Stevens:*

Q. You had an unfavourable impression?—A. Yes.

Q. Let us look at this evidence. This is such a notorious case. Everybody knows it, so let us get this story out right. This case was tried on the 13th day of February 1925, the case of Rex vs. J. F. Simons et al, and the examination is that of Joseph Alfred Edgar Bisailon by Mr. Cannon, who at the time was Prosecuting Attorney.

Mr. DONAGHY: What was Simons charged with?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: If you will excuse me, I will give you that information after a moment. This is an examination regarding certain deposits made by Mr. Bisailon in his own account.

Mr. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to object to this question being put, unless the members of the committee, or myself, representing Mr. Bisailon, have a copy of the document upon which Mr. Farrow is being examined?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: The client of Mr. Gagnon is not under examination; I am examining Mr. Farrow, and this document is one which is available to anyone and unquestionably the solicitor for Mr. Bisailon has at his disposal the document, if he chooses to get it.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Chairman, there is only one way of getting a proper understanding of the proceedings in a Court. My friend Mr. Stevens is taking the wrong way. The only way to do it is to have the record of the Court produced here and an exemplified copy of the charge; the names of the parties and the evidence taken, and the pronouncement or judgment of the Court upon that evidence. There is no use in putting up a piece of evidence here—

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: I am taking the evidence of Mr. Farrow.

Mr. DONAGHY: —highly coloured. We know in all these matters there is disputed evidence; we should have it all here. That is why I ask the courtesy of my hon. friend to give to us shortly an outline of what this case is which he is cross-examining on. I do not know a thing about it.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I think the objection raised by Mr. Donaghy is not one which should receive your support. I am examining Mr. Farrow, who is the chief of the Customs Department, on information which he has already admitted he knows of; he has read this evidence; he has had in his possession the evidence and he has said that that evidence did not impress him favourably. Why can I not follow that now with some other questions? If the committee desire the particulars, I have asked for these particulars and they have not yet been brought down. I am going to ask again on the floor of the House this afternoon for the privilege of moving certain motions. That privilege may not be granted, but I am going to ask for it in order to see if I cannot get before this committee all the information I know to be available.

Hon. Mr. BENNETT: A short way out of that, it seems to me, would be to have Mr. Farrow produce the evidence he has in his possession.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Very good.

*By Hon. Mr. Stevens:*

Q. Have you it with you?—A. Which is that?

Q. You have not this with you, Mr. Farrow? You have it in your office?—A. I think I have it in my office.

Q. Will you be good enough to produce the copy you have received?—A. I do not know as it is a court copy which I have.