

you for regretting his expulsion from office on those grounds?

SIR RICHARD. You open up a question which involves many issues. The honour of its public men is, or ought to be, a matter of the utmost moment to any nation. In Sir John's case, the scandal and exposure of a man in his position and of one who had become a sort of fetish in the eyes of a large number of his countrymen, has had a doubly demoralising effect. Had the Conservative party, when he confessed his guilt, repudiated him and deposed him from the leadership, then the result which Lord Dufferin hoped for might have been attained. But when they re-elected him as their leader, they made public proclamation to the people of Canada and to all the world that so far as one great party in Canada was concerned it was prepared to condone the grossest malversation, backed by the grossest falsehoods, on the part of their chosen chiefs, and that in their eyes truth and honesty were no longer requisite qualities for Canadian public men. The effect of their action was twofold. Many men became utterly disgusted with politics and political life altogether, and held from that time, as an article of belief, that there was no such thing as honesty in politics. Others took the line that it was all part of the game, and condoned or defended Sir John's crime as a sort of political necessity.

REPORTER. Had the Conservatives any choice when they re-elected him?

SIR RICHARD. They certainly had no man of equal ability to put in Sir John's place. But they owed it to themselves, and much more to their country, to dis sever the connection for the time being, if only to mark their disapproval of his proceedings. Later on they might have re-instated him when lapse of time might be supposed to have in some degree purged his delinquencies. As it was, they and their supporters became as it were accessories after the fact to the grossest political crime known to Canadian history. Up to that time the Conservative party might have pleaded that they were ignor-