

rupting the country by legislative fraud and authorized corruption, and that the investigation which those judges are going to conduct is a mock trial. Well, Sir, upon that point I have only to add this: I am quite sure that whether those two gentlemen who have been selected are known to the hon. member for South Oxford or not, the people who do know them, and they are widely known in their own province, and well known, too, by members of their profession in other provinces as well, will know how to characterize as fair or baselessly false and malicious the accusation that any trial they are to conduct is a mock trial. Is it true or false that we have suppressed the charge which has been made? Is that statement not disgraceful to the man who uttered it again? Why, time and time again, I have shown to the House, unnecessarily as regards the great majority, uselessly as regards the hon. member for South Oxford, that we have not suppressed the charge, that we have refused to allow hon. members to try a large number of contested election cases, many of which had been already tried in the courts. But as regards anything to connect a member of this Parliament or a member of this Government with these electoral corruptions, the charges are there and are to be investigated if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the courage to come forward to sustain them, or if he is not simply lying when he tells this House that these charges can be proved. One or the other. The investigation has been refused, Sir, has it? The charges have been suppressed, have they? Why, Sir, there are the charges to-day as framed by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as emphasized by the hon. member for South Oxford himself (Sir Richard Cartwright) and in so far as we have changed them, we have simply changed them to conform to the violent language with which the hon. member for South Oxford sought to enforce them; and if they are not proved, the result will be to stamp him with the name upon his forehead that he deserves. Now, Mr. Speaker, in place after place in the charges we have not hesitated to put before this commission these statements that the Postmaster General is charged with a conspiracy to obtain public money for companies, to obtain that money for companies for electoral purposes and for the purpose of corrupting constituencies—although it makes not a particle of difference as far as he is concerned, for he must fall, if it be true, that he was engaged in such a conspiracy whether he used the money for the elections or not. We put that in, too, so that these hon. gentlemen might prove it if they could, and in every respect the charges are just as full and specific, so far as the Postmaster General is concerned, as they were the day they were brought by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar). One thing which we have eliminated is the general charge that other persons interested in these subsidies may have given these moneys too, and the general charge that these moneys were used in some 24 or 25 constituencies, and in some three or four elections in each of these constituencies. But, so far as the charges against the Government are concerned, and so far as the charges against the Postmaster General are concerned, they are just as clear and just as precise and just as open for investigation as the day they were made. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)

challenged me to state if they are vague now. They are not vague now, thanks to the hon. member who made them, thanks to the hon. member for Bothwell who supported them, and thanks to the hon. member for South Oxford who sought to drive them home with invective which he is sorry for now because he cannot sustain it. These charges have been made precise and they have been made specific, and if the hon. Postmaster General is not afraid to meet them, there are three men who are afraid; because they have just sought to shelter themselves on the plea of privilege against appearing before the commission at all. They are the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member for South Oxford has declared that these commissioners are the appointees of the Postmaster General himself. No statement more utterly at variance with the truth can be put upon *Hansard*, because, as a fact, they have been appointed by this House and by a vote of this House practically unanimous as regards their qualifications. The Opposition abstained from committing themselves to the principle of appointing commissioners at all, but every member of the House knows that it was perfectly consistent for the Opposition to say: that if the House should eventually appoint commissioners these men were unfit by reason of this or that disqualification, or this or that unfitness of temperament. If these commissioners were the villains whom the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) portrays as sitting on the bench of this country from one end to the other, if they were partisans, if they were party hacks, if they were men not versed in the law, if they were men not likely to be impartial, every member who sits within these walls was challenged to say so. He had an opportunity to say so; he was bound to say so, notwithstanding he thought that no commission should be appointed at all; but hon. gentlemen opposite did not dare to say so, and in spite of the repudiation of the hon. member for South Oxford, I declare that these commissioners were fully sanctioned by this House without a single dissent as to their fitness or disqualification, and after dissent had been challenged or defied, for I defied it myself standing in my place here. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has declared that the details which are published in his reptile story, in his organ in Toronto, to which organ he says we are so deeply indebted for these disclosures—as we are, of course, also to him, as I have already explained in the opening remarks I have offered to the House—the hon. member has declared that such a set of documents with regard to electoral corruption never in previous times was laid before this country. The hon. gentleman's memory is short. He forgets that about nine times what was alleged to have been expended in any one of these constituencies—saving the election of Three Rivers as to which the statement is very vague—he forgets that about nine times what was spent in the most expensive of these constituencies was spent, at the election of 1887, to secure him a supporter in a county within 100 miles from where I stand, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not so virtuous or so regretful then.