

Public Accounts Committee.

Q. Then what?—A. Then the consequence easily follows that usually follows from men starting out on the wrong line; it led to the web being somewhat tangled.

Q. Use the word then, say the word?—A. Well, the jury, I am satisfied, did not believe all the witnesses that swore that way.

Q. And you say they perjured themselves; swore to what was untrue?—A. I think they went farther than they intended. The jury seemed to think so. Many of them in their evidence were confused; many of them wavered upon the question of how they had voted; they wavered very much.

Q. Now, Mr. Howell says another thing: "I could not shut my eyes to the fact that certain classes of jurymen associated in one place, and certain other classes associated in another place," and on the next page, 114, he goes on to explain that there was a regular Liberal camp and a Conservative camp in the lives of the jurymen while the trial was going on; that the Liberals congregated there and the Conservatives there and therefore there was this marked line of politics on the jury; are you able to corroborate that statement?—A. I saw no sign of it, I did not become aware of it.

Q. On page 114 Mr. Howell says: "I know this, that the jurymen were divided into two camps," and again, "the Conservative jurymen went in one pack, and the Liberal jurymen in the other pack." Now, if that has been the case, is it possible that you would not have noticed it?—A. I think I would have become aware of it, but I never learned that or supposed it was so.

Q. Had it become a matter of comment or notoriety?—A. I heard no remark upon it.

Q. Never heard it remarked upon?—A. No.

Q. From your experience in these cases, acting for the defence, would you be surprised to learn that on the 17th of July, 1896, as appears in Mr. Sifton's letter to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that he had in his possession on that day "conclusive evidence of an organized system of tampering with ballots"; on the 17th of July, 1896, would you be surprised to learn that Mr. Sifton so wrote?

The Solicitor General objected.

Q. I ask him from his experience in regard to matters that came out in these trials that on the 17th of July, 1896, Mr. Sifton had in his possession "conclusive evidence of an organized system of tampering with ballots."

The CHAIRMAN.—If it is only a question as to the checking of this witness I must allow it. If it is a question of opinion this man is not an expert.

The question was read over.

The CHAIRMAN.—Clearly that question is objectionable and it is ruled out.

By the Solicitor General:

Q. These trials were presided over by Chief Justice Taylor, were they not?—
A. Yes.

Q. Is he looked upon in Manitoba as a competent judge?—A. Yes.

Q. Having some knowledge as to the way in which criminal trials should be conducted?—A. Oh, certainly.

Q. Did he ever make any complaint as to the manner in which Mr. Howell behaved himself?—A. Oh, I think occasionally we had the usual questions raised as to the conduct of the case and sometimes may be there were rulings against Mr. Howell, but no general complaint of misconduct.

Q. No suggestion of professional misconduct?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Nothing of that kind?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Nor do you offer any against Mr. Howell?—A. Of professional misconduct? Certainly not.

Q. You spoke of Freeborn, didn't you?—A. I was asked about the matter.

Q. You do know that Chief Justice Taylor charged in every instance?—A. In each case he charged.