



General Business

50 YEARS

For the last 50 years... never left the front rank...

ARMSTRONG & CO. PROPRIETORS

M. S. N. COY EXCURSIONS

Excursions to points down river, during June, July & August.

WANTED

Wanted, male or female to begin work next week...

FURNACES, FURNACES, WOOD OR COAL

REASONABLE PRICES

STOVES

COOKING, HALL AND PARLOR STOVES

PUMPS, PUMPS

A. O. McLean Chatham

FURNACE LINE

WANTED

Wanted, male or female to begin work next week...

JUST ARRIVED AT APOTHECARIES HALL

PERFUMES AND SACRETS

CHOICE TOOTH POWDERS AND TOOTH WASHES

TOILET SOAP AND TOILET POWDERS

TOILET BATH AND WAGON POWDERS

SPONGE BATH, SPONGE POWDERS

HAIR TONIC AND HAIR BRUSH

SHAMPOO AND WHISKY

CHARBONATED LEMON

AND GINGER WINE

DEER BEER

CENTURY CREAM

WIND'S MONEY AND ALMOND CREAM

Apocariers Hall

O. HICKEY, PROP.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION

1895, SEPT. 24 TO OCT. 4

ST. JOHN, N. B.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1895

Farm and Dairy Products

LIVE STOCK, AGRICULTURAL

Horticultural Departments

Special rates will be arranged with railways...

CHAS. A. STREET, Managing Director

Miramichi Advance

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Investigation of Charges against Police Magistrate McCullay

Continued from 1st page.

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Court re-assembled pursuant to adjournment.

The first witness called and sworn was

SAUL THOMPSON, M. D., Q. C.,

Newcastle, Clerk of the Peace, secretary-treasurer of Northumberland county, said:

"I have the accounts and returns filed by police magistrate McCullay, of Chatham for 1892-3 and 4. They include Scott Act accounts and returns, and those of ordinary business of his court."

Mr. Lawlor offered said accounts and returns in evidence, viz.:

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1892

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1893

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1894

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1895

Witness—I have no other returns or accounts of police magistrate McCullay, I have the Scott Act inspector's accounts and returns for 1892-3 and 4.

Accounts and returns produced, offered in evidence and objected to by Mr. Murray, who says they are offered only as a fishing device against Mr. Menzies; being merely certified by Mr. McCullay to enable Mr. Menzies to get his expenses.

Returns of Inspector Menzies were admitted, subject to objection.

It is not required by the Summary Convictions Act for convicting magistrates to make quarterly returns to the Clerk of the Peace?

Witness—I have a slight recollection of that, but can't say; if can't say who did Mr. Lawlor here asked the question in which the money was paid to me, for I pass it over. My books are the jail record. I cannot, from memory, name any persons who paid fines and costs to my wife.

Can you recall any other case where Cassidy and Thomas Murphy?

Witness—I was present when Thomas Murphy was released—when Mr. Menzies took the money; I am not clear or any other case, my book does not show the names of prisoners; can't give any other instances without the books.

You have heard Murphy's testimony about the notes. Is that correct?

Witness—I presume that was the case. How did Mr. McCullay treat you in that case?

Fairly and respectfully, as he always did, and I treated him in the same way. I was dissatisfied, however, with his judgment.

Was there only one witness out of six or seven in that case who gave evidence, which, in your opinion, would sustain the judgment?

I can't say without looking at the evidence. [Looks at the testimony.] I was not a lawyer that question. I was not the judge.

Did you not, immediately after the judgment was delivered, say it was an outrageous one?

I did not say that, so far as I remember; I said it was a right judgment. I had been judge I would have given it the other way.

Cross-examined by Mr. Murray.

All these returns put in evidence were put before the Municipal Council and passed. I don't recollect having any other case than the one named before police magistrate McCullay. I cannot say whether he is prejudiced in his magisterial conduct or no; I think he has the courage of his conviction. When he makes up his mind to do a thing he will do it, without fear, favor, affection or reward. I don't say whether his judgments are right or wrong; the Supreme Court decides that, and sometimes the Legislature.

Re-examined by Mr. Lawlor.

Your knowledge of Mr. McCullay's conduct would be gained in that case you refer to?

I think that was the only case. I was dissatisfied with his judgment in it and have changed my opinion since. It was advising him in the Barry case. In the other case I was counsel for Cassidy and was not prejudiced in favor of my client. I did not appeal, because I felt I would not gain, as the Supreme Court assumes that the magistrate is sole judge of the facts. Had I been in Mr. McCullay's place I would have given judgment the other way. Looking at it without prejudice, now, I am of the same opinion, for I think the preponderance of evidence was in my favor.

THOMAS MURPHY, laborer, Chatham, sworn—I have been before the Chatham police magistrate on several occasions for violation of the Scott Act, convicted, and sent to jail once. I pleaded guilty; was sent to jail for selling liquor to an Indian; I think it was fall before last. I served out the full time—4 months. I was, at the expiration of the 4 months, put back for six days for violation of the Scott Act. I put in fourteen or fifteen days of that time.

How did you get out, then?

I made an agreement with Mr. Menzies.

Objected to by Mr. Murray.

Allowed, as the discharge could not be made, save on order of Mr. McCullay. Where was this agreement made?

In the jail, or by the door of it. I was in the cell. I had sent for Mr. Menzies a day or two before.

Tell us what passed between you.

He let me out by my giving my notes of hand (4 of them) and promising to pay them. The notes were for the whole sum, or \$14 each. Mr. Wm. Irving witnessed them. I got out of jail immediately after I signed the notes. Menzies did not make any allowance for the time I served in jail.

How long were the notes to run?

Each one was to be paid in 2 months—in 2, 4, 6, and 8 months.

It was on 1st December '93 I first went up to jail, served 4 mos., and 15 days, and gave the notes.

There was any understanding between Menzies and you that you were to give information about violation of the Scott Act?

No, there was no chance then; I had been too long in.

What did Menzies say to Irving after the notes were signed?

I didn't hear him say anything as I started away. The notes were signed in the office.

Since the notes were signed you have been in the employ of Mr. Menzies?

No, sir, only when he'd come after me with a paper.

Isn't it the fact that you have, either for reward or promise of reward, by or through Mr. Menzies, undertaken to get information for him?

Not for myself, and I can't say for other people.

Do you know of any arrangement between Mr. Menzies and your wife and daughter to get information in connection with the Scott Act?

Objected to by Mr. Murray and dis-

Miramichi Advance

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Investigation of Charges against Police Magistrate McCullay

Continued from 1st page.

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Court re-assembled pursuant to adjournment.

The first witness called and sworn was

SAUL THOMPSON, M. D., Q. C.,

Newcastle, Clerk of the Peace, secretary-treasurer of Northumberland county, said:

"I have the accounts and returns filed by police magistrate McCullay, of Chatham for 1892-3 and 4. They include Scott Act accounts and returns, and those of ordinary business of his court."

Mr. Lawlor offered said accounts and returns in evidence, viz.:

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1892

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1893

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1894

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1895

Witness—I have no other returns or accounts of police magistrate McCullay, I have the Scott Act inspector's accounts and returns for 1892-3 and 4.

Accounts and returns produced, offered in evidence and objected to by Mr. Murray, who says they are offered only as a fishing device against Mr. Menzies; being merely certified by Mr. McCullay to enable Mr. Menzies to get his expenses.

Returns of Inspector Menzies were admitted, subject to objection.

It is not required by the Summary Convictions Act for convicting magistrates to make quarterly returns to the Clerk of the Peace?

Witness—I have a slight recollection of that, but can't say; if can't say who did Mr. Lawlor here asked the question in which the money was paid to me, for I pass it over. My books are the jail record. I cannot, from memory, name any persons who paid fines and costs to my wife.

Can you recall any other case where Cassidy and Thomas Murphy?

Witness—I was present when Thomas Murphy was released—when Mr. Menzies took the money; I am not clear or any other case, my book does not show the names of prisoners; can't give any other instances without the books.

You have heard Murphy's testimony about the notes. Is that correct?

Witness—I presume that was the case. How did Mr. McCullay treat you in that case?

Fairly and respectfully, as he always did, and I treated him in the same way. I was dissatisfied, however, with his judgment.

Was there only one witness out of six or seven in that case who gave evidence, which, in your opinion, would sustain the judgment?

I can't say without looking at the evidence. [Looks at the testimony.] I was not a lawyer that question. I was not the judge.

Did you not, immediately after the judgment was delivered, say it was an outrageous one?

I did not say that, so far as I remember; I said it was a right judgment. I had been judge I would have given it the other way.

Cross-examined by Mr. Murray.

All these returns put in evidence were put before the Municipal Council and passed. I don't recollect having any other case than the one named before police magistrate McCullay. I cannot say whether he is prejudiced in his magisterial conduct or no; I think he has the courage of his conviction. When he makes up his mind to do a thing he will do it, without fear, favor, affection or reward. I don't say whether his judgments are right or wrong; the Supreme Court decides that, and sometimes the Legislature.

Re-examined by Mr. Lawlor.

Your knowledge of Mr. McCullay's conduct would be gained in that case you refer to?

I think that was the only case. I was dissatisfied with his judgment in it and have changed my opinion since. It was advising him in the Barry case. In the other case I was counsel for Cassidy and was not prejudiced in favor of my client. I did not appeal, because I felt I would not gain, as the Supreme Court assumes that the magistrate is sole judge of the facts. Had I been in Mr. McCullay's place I would have given judgment the other way. Looking at it without prejudice, now, I am of the same opinion, for I think the preponderance of evidence was in my favor.

THOMAS MURPHY, laborer, Chatham, sworn—I have been before the Chatham police magistrate on several occasions for violation of the Scott Act, convicted, and sent to jail once. I pleaded guilty; was sent to jail for selling liquor to an Indian; I think it was fall before last. I served out the full time—4 months. I was, at the expiration of the 4 months, put back for six days for violation of the Scott Act. I put in fourteen or fifteen days of that time.

How did you get out, then?

I made an agreement with Mr. Menzies.

Objected to by Mr. Murray.

Allowed, as the discharge could not be made, save on order of Mr. McCullay. Where was this agreement made?

In the jail, or by the door of it. I was in the cell. I had sent for Mr. Menzies a day or two before.

Tell us what passed between you.

He let me out by my giving my notes of hand (4 of them) and promising to pay them. The notes were for the whole sum, or \$14 each. Mr. Wm. Irving witnessed them. I got out of jail immediately after I signed the notes. Menzies did not make any allowance for the time I served in jail.

How long were the notes to run?

Each one was to be paid in 2 months—in 2, 4, 6, and 8 months.

It was on 1st December '93 I first went up to jail, served 4 mos., and 15 days, and gave the notes.

There was any understanding between Menzies and you that you were to give information about violation of the Scott Act?

No, there was no chance then; I had been too long in.

What did Menzies say to Irving after the notes were signed?

I didn't hear him say anything as I started away. The notes were signed in the office.

Since the notes were signed you have been in the employ of Mr. Menzies?

No, sir, only when he'd come after me with a paper.

Isn't it the fact that you have, either for reward or promise of reward, by or through Mr. Menzies, undertaken to get information for him?

Not for myself, and I can't say for other people.

Do you know of any arrangement between Mr. Menzies and your wife and daughter to get information in connection with the Scott Act?

Objected to by Mr. Murray and dis-

Miramichi Advance

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Investigation of Charges against Police Magistrate McCullay

Continued from 1st page.

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Court re-assembled pursuant to adjournment.

The first witness called and sworn was

SAUL THOMPSON, M. D., Q. C.,

Newcastle, Clerk of the Peace, secretary-treasurer of Northumberland county, said:

"I have the accounts and returns filed by police magistrate McCullay, of Chatham for 1892-3 and 4. They include Scott Act accounts and returns, and those of ordinary business of his court."

Mr. Lawlor offered said accounts and returns in evidence, viz.:

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1892

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1893

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1894

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1895

Witness—I have no other returns or accounts of police magistrate McCullay, I have the Scott Act inspector's accounts and returns for 1892-3 and 4.

Accounts and returns produced, offered in evidence and objected to by Mr. Murray, who says they are offered only as a fishing device against Mr. Menzies; being merely certified by Mr. McCullay to enable Mr. Menzies to get his expenses.

Returns of Inspector Menzies were admitted, subject to objection.

It is not required by the Summary Convictions Act for convicting magistrates to make quarterly returns to the Clerk of the Peace?

Witness—I have a slight recollection of that, but can't say; if can't say who did Mr. Lawlor here asked the question in which the money was paid to me, for I pass it over. My books are the jail record. I cannot, from memory, name any persons who paid fines and costs to my wife.

Can you recall any other case where Cassidy and Thomas Murphy?

Witness—I was present when Thomas Murphy was released—when Mr. Menzies took the money; I am not clear or any other case, my book does not show the names of prisoners; can't give any other instances without the books.

You have heard Murphy's testimony about the notes. Is that correct?

Witness—I presume that was the case. How did Mr. McCullay treat you in that case?

Fairly and respectfully, as he always did, and I treated him in the same way. I was dissatisfied, however, with his judgment.

Was there only one witness out of six or seven in that case who gave evidence, which, in your opinion, would sustain the judgment?

I can't say without looking at the evidence. [Looks at the testimony.] I was not a lawyer that question. I was not the judge.

Did you not, immediately after the judgment was delivered, say it was an outrageous one?

I did not say that, so far as I remember; I said it was a right judgment. I had been judge I would have given it the other way.

Cross-examined by Mr. Murray.

All these returns put in evidence were put before the Municipal Council and passed. I don't recollect having any other case than the one named before police magistrate McCullay. I cannot say whether he is prejudiced in his magisterial conduct or no; I think he has the courage of his conviction. When he makes up his mind to do a thing he will do it, without fear, favor, affection or reward. I don't say whether his judgments are right or wrong; the Supreme Court decides that, and sometimes the Legislature.

Re-examined by Mr. Lawlor.

Your knowledge of Mr. McCullay's conduct would be gained in that case you refer to?

I think that was the only case. I was dissatisfied with his judgment in it and have changed my opinion since. It was advising him in the Barry case. In the other case I was counsel for Cassidy and was not prejudiced in favor of my client. I did not appeal, because I felt I would not gain, as the Supreme Court assumes that the magistrate is sole judge of the facts. Had I been in Mr. McCullay's place I would have given judgment the other way. Looking at it without prejudice, now, I am of the same opinion, for I think the preponderance of evidence was in my favor.

THOMAS MURPHY, laborer, Chatham, sworn—I have been before the Chatham police magistrate on several occasions for violation of the Scott Act, convicted, and sent to jail once. I pleaded guilty; was sent to jail for selling liquor to an Indian; I think it was fall before last. I served out the full time—4 months. I was, at the expiration of the 4 months, put back for six days for violation of the Scott Act. I put in fourteen or fifteen days of that time.

How did you get out, then?

I made an agreement with Mr. Menzies.

Objected to by Mr. Murray.

Allowed, as the discharge could not be made, save on order of Mr. McCullay. Where was this agreement made?

In the jail, or by the door of it. I was in the cell. I had sent for Mr. Menzies a day or two before.

Tell us what passed between you.

He let me out by my giving my notes of hand (4 of them) and promising to pay them. The notes were for the whole sum, or \$14 each. Mr. Wm. Irving witnessed them. I got out of jail immediately after I signed the notes. Menzies did not make any allowance for the time I served in jail.

How long were the notes to run?

Each one was to be paid in 2 months—in 2, 4, 6, and 8 months.

It was on 1st December '93 I first went up to jail, served 4 mos., and 15 days, and gave the notes.

There was any understanding between Menzies and you that you were to give information about violation of the Scott Act?

No, there was no chance then; I had been too long in.

What did Menzies say to Irving after the notes were signed?

I didn't hear him say anything as I started away. The notes were signed in the office.

Since the notes were signed you have been in the employ of Mr. Menzies?

No, sir, only when he'd come after me with a paper.

Isn't it the fact that you have, either for reward or promise of reward, by or through Mr. Menzies, undertaken to get information for him?

Not for myself, and I can't say for other people.

Do you know of any arrangement between Mr. Menzies and your wife and daughter to get information in connection with the Scott Act?

Objected to by Mr. Murray and dis-

Miramichi Advance

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Investigation of Charges against Police Magistrate McCullay

Continued from 1st page.

THURSDAY, FORENOON, AUG. 29

Court re-assembled pursuant to adjournment.

The first witness called and sworn was

SAUL THOMPSON, M. D., Q. C.,

Newcastle, Clerk of the Peace, secretary-treasurer of Northumberland county, said:

"I have the accounts and returns filed by police magistrate McCullay, of Chatham for 1892-3 and 4. They include Scott Act accounts and returns, and those of ordinary business of his court."

Mr. Lawlor offered said accounts and returns in evidence, viz.:

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1892

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1893

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1894

Returns Scott Act fees, etc., 1895

Witness—I have no other returns or accounts of police magistrate McCullay, I have the Scott Act inspector's accounts and returns for 1892-3 and 4.

not have them put into his mouth with... Question allowed... Did you know of any other instances of... I have the same impression regarding... I have the same impression regarding... I have the same impression regarding...

ladies and gentlemen who took part were... Mrs. Sutherland, Miss Edith Troy, Miss... Mrs. Sutherland, Miss Edith Troy, Miss... Mrs. Sutherland, Miss Edith Troy, Miss...

was much easier for the steamer to go... around our stern than under our bow, for... around our stern than under our bow, for... around our stern than under our bow, for...

last. The fire originated from the ash... from a pipe being thrown in the spittoon... from a pipe being thrown in the spittoon... from a pipe being thrown in the spittoon...

quently the St. Helen's Battalion. With... a single exception he has shot at the... a single exception he has shot at the... a single exception he has shot at the...

Nothing less excellent. Please... The public, having perceived the superior... The public, having perceived the superior... The public, having perceived the superior...

Shipping News... [Chatham and Newcastle ship news... [Chatham and Newcastle ship news... [Chatham and Newcastle ship news...]

FINAL NOTICE SCHOOL TAX... J. F. BENSON, TYPEWRITER, & CO. NOTICE TO HOLDERS OF TIMBER LICENSES... THE BOUQUET... REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF PHOTOGRAPHS... CABINET PHOTOS... FALL OPENING OF DRESS GOODS... WOOD-GOODS! FOR SALE... SCISSORS, SHEARS AND RAZORS... GUNS I GUNS I... TABLE AND POCKET CUTLERY... DR CHASES OINTMENT... INTERNATIONAL S. S. CO. SMELT SHOOKS... GREAT ACTIVITY IN THE COTTON MARKET... NOTICE OF SALE... CHATHAM AND NEWCASTLE

Did you know of any other instances of... I have the same impression regarding... I have the same impression regarding... I have the same impression regarding...

ladies and gentlemen who took part were... Mrs. Sutherland, Miss Edith Troy, Miss... Mrs. Sutherland, Miss Edith Troy, Miss... Mrs. Sutherland, Miss Edith Troy, Miss...

was much easier for the steamer to go... around our stern than under our bow, for... around our stern than under our bow, for... around our stern than under our bow, for...

last. The fire originated from the ash... from a pipe being thrown in the spittoon... from a pipe being thrown in the spittoon... from a pipe being thrown in the spittoon...

quently the St. Helen's Battalion. With... a single exception he has shot at the... a single exception he has shot at the... a single exception he has shot at the...

Nothing less excellent. Please... The public, having perceived the superior... The public, having perceived the superior... The public, having perceived the superior...

Shipping News... [Chatham and Newcastle ship news... [Chatham and Newcastle ship news... [Chatham and Newcastle ship news...]

FINAL NOTICE SCHOOL TAX... J. F. BENSON, TYPEWRITER, & CO. NOTICE TO HOLDERS OF TIMBER LICENSES... THE BOUQUET... REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF PHOTOGRAPHS... CABINET PHOTOS... FALL OPENING OF DRESS GOODS... WOOD-GOODS! FOR SALE... SCISSORS, SHEARS AND RAZORS... GUNS I GUNS I... TABLE AND POCKET CUTLERY... DR CHASES OINTMENT... INTERNATIONAL S. S. CO. SMELT SHOOKS... GREAT ACTIVITY IN THE COTTON MARKET... NOTICE OF SALE... CHATHAM AND NEWCASTLE

Investigation of charges against Police Magistrate McCulley of Chatham.

SATURDAY FORENOON, AUGUST 31.

Court opened at 10.35 a. m. on Saturday, pursuant to adjournment.

Dr. Wm. Pugsley, Q. C. appears with Messrs. Lawlor and Winslow for petitioners.

Mr. Lawlor calls for the Police Court record in the case of the Queen on the information of John Menzies vs. James Thompson, record produced, offered in evidence and admitted.

Mr. Winslow reads the testimony to T. Coughlin given at the trial of James Thompson for violation of the Scott Act—this witness who gave testimony before this commission in reference to Inspector Menzies having him liberated from the lockup where he was imprisoned.

Mr. Winslow also reads from the record the testimony of several witnesses.

Mr. Lawlor calls for the record in case of the Queen, on informant of Anthony Forrest, vs. James Boyle, for interfering with informant in the discharge of his duty as policeman, in which Boyle stated he got liquor from Mary Murphy.

Mr. Lawlor also reads record of the case of the Queen on the information of John Menzies vs. James Thompson, on affidavit of Jas. Boyle taken in prison.

Mr. Lawlor states this information was written by Mr. McCulley in the lockup, while Boyle was a prisoner. He reads the evidence of Boyle at the trial.

Mr. Lawlor also reads record in the case of the Queen vs. Robert Armstrong on information of John Menzies, 7 April, '92 for violation of the Scott Act.

Mr. Winslow submits the 2nd case of the Queen on the information of John Menzies, vs. Robert Armstrong.

Dr. Pugsley says, having just arrived, he has not had opportunity to consult with the petitioners and counsel and thinks if an adjournment can be had until after the documents submitted and other evidence connected with the information is filed, it will facilitate its progress rather than otherwise.

Mr. Murray objects, as he thinks the inquiry has already been subjected to too much delay and should be pushed through.

After further discussion an adjournment until 2 p. m. sharp, was had.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, COURT REASSEMBLED AT 2.15.

DR. W. PUGSLEY, Q. C.

Chatham, sworn, and examined by Dr. Pugsley: Have been practicing for 24 years as a barrister; know Mr. R. A. McCulley, Police Magistrate, Chatham; have had considerable experience before the different courts—Mr. McCulley's also several times. My personal relations with Mr. McCulley have been and are friendly—extremely friendly on my part. It is I who have appointed Police Magistrate.

Without at present, going into the details of each case, how, in your opinion, has Mr. McCulley administered justice, being that opinion on what you have observed at the several cases in which you have been concerned before him?

Objected to by Mr. Murray, as the proper way is for witness to go into details—to give specific facts.

Mr. Pugsley said if he did not follow this up by questions on specific facts it would only have weight on its merits. Admitted. The Commissioner again stated that this was a different inquiry from one before the regular courts from which there would be appeal. He had admitted this kind of testimony all along, and it would only be such of it as was supported by other testimony in detail that he would consider as included in the record. He would reject all save legal testimony.

Witness: In many cases in which I have appeared as counsel before Mr. McCulley, he has erred in judgment and showed a total incapability of dealing with the matters in a judicial way. I do not say that this was done mentally; my opinion is that from his mental make-up he is not capable of dealing judicially with matters. Very often, in my experience, he reversed the principle of law which gives the benefit of doubt to the accused, and has given it to the prosecutor. In many cases he has not been governed by the preponderance or credibility of the testimony, but has given credit to witnesses who were not entitled to credit.

What do you say as to his admission or rejection of evidence? I have observed in many instances, that he would admit improper evidence that would tend to prove the case for the prosecution, and reject testimony that would tend to show the innocence of the accused.

Do you remember the case of the Queen on the information of John Menzies vs. James Thompson, in Jan. 1894, in which you appeared for the accused?

Yes. That case was tried before Mr. McCulley.

I think you asked certain questions on the cross-examination of the prosecutor, in reference to Thomas Coughlin, who was then confined in the lock-up and sentenced to imprisonment and who had stated that Mr. Menzies said he would pay his fine if he would give evidence against James Thompson. Mr. Menzies testified as follows, according to page 9 of the record:

"I did not pay his fine before he gave his evidence. He was to give evidence and I was to pay his fine. I was not going to run any risks to let him out, until he gave his testimony."

The record shows that you then asked this question—

"Who told you that Coughlin offered to pay Mr. Menzies's fine?"

Objected to by Mr. Murray and not allowed.

Was it Mr. McCulley, the police magistrate, who told you?

Not allowed. The record shows that you then asked—

"Do you remember that taking place, as stated in this record of proceedings?"

Yes, but my recollection is that there were more questions asked.

State to the commission what you were seeking to elicit by those questions.

It was because I believed that these questions, if answered, would tend to show Mr. McCulley's complicity with Mr. Menzies, in connection with the purchase of Coughlin's testimony.

I would not expect you to remember all the cases, but perhaps you can recall incidents in some others as illustrations?

There was a Conway case.

What was there in his conduct in that case to sustain what you have said of him?

In that case he evinced a desire to convict. (Objected to. Allowed.) It was the charge of selling liquor to an Indian. (Record produced.) There was only the testimony of a drunken Indian, as against that of the defendant, and other witnesses and he chose to believe the drunken Indian. Under the Indian Act one credible witness, other than the informant, must prove the case. Mr. Menzies, the nominal informant, when examined, stated that he knew nothing whatever of the offence having been committed, except from the information he derived from the Indian. I contended that a conviction could not be had, as the Indian was, to all intents and purposes, the informant in the case. Mr. McCulley adjourned several times, in order to take the opinion of the Crown officers. The attorney-general, I understand, Mr. McCulley so states in his record—said he might convict on the testimony of the Indian, he being the informant, and Mr. McCulley did convict. I am still of the opinion that the conviction was wrong. Outside of the grounds mentioned, the weight of evidence was, in my opinion, strongly against the prosecution. Record in the Conway case is here put in evidence.

In the Thompson case I think the magistrate's rulings were unfair to me. I think his conviction of James Boyle was wrong, as there was no evidence to sustain the prosecution, but the purchased testimony of Coughlin, while there were three witnesses for the defence—the defendant himself, his wife and son. No attempt was made by the prosecution to impugn the evidence of the two latter witnesses, nor do I think it could have been successfully done, for Mrs. Thompson, wife of defendant, was a very respectable woman, while her son was about 14 years old and gave his testimony in a most creditable manner.

The two Tingley cases were others in point, in this connection; one is 5th July '94 and the other 5th September '94. (Records put in evidence.)

If a magistrate commits a wrong by convicting a defendant under the Canada Temperance Act, either without evidence, or against the weight of evidence, is there any means of redress by appeal to a higher court?

Objected to by Mr. Murray, as it is a matter of law.

Commissioner says the question is one of law and everyone knows it is true. Not pressed.

It being the case, that where a magistrate does commit a wrong, by convicting a defendant under the Canada Temperance Act, either without evidence or against the weight of evidence, there is no redress by appeal to a higher court, is it, in your opinion, of the highest importance that persons in the position of Mr. McCulley should hold the scales of justice evenly and be altogether free from bias or partiality?

It is, and holding that view strongly, I have frequently expressed my opinion to impress it upon Magistrate McCulley.

Have you, in any way, directly or indirectly, initiated these proceedings?

Neither directly or indirectly have I initiated these proceedings against Mr. McCulley. I did not know they were taken until long after they were made. The first time I saw them they were filed in Fredericton. I was away from home, I believe, at the time, or might have seen something of them, as they were prepared by Mr. Bennett, my partner.

And do you say, Mr. Tweedie, that in expressing the opinion which you have expressed, that you have given us of Mr. McCulley's conduct as a magistrate, you have done so absolutely without personal feelings against Mr. McCulley?

Certainly without feeling. My feelings are all the other way. I am annoyed sometimes when he goes wrong in his decisions. I think it fair to Mr. McCulley to say, however, that I do not think he goes wrong wilfully, but he seems to approach cases from the wrong side of evidence, and he is bound to prove his innocence, instead of the prosecution being bound to prove his guilt.

Going back to the questions you put in the Thompson case, and which Mr. McCulley rejected, was or was not the arrangement which Mr. Menzies admitted that he had made with the witness, Coughlin, in your opinion, a most improper one and calculated to prevent the fair administration of justice?

Objected to by Mr. Murray, on the ground that it is in the record and

allowed. You followed it up by another question, as follows:

"Was it Mr. McCulley, the police magistrate, who told you?"

Not allowed. The record shows that you then asked—

"Do you remember that taking place, as stated in this record of proceedings?"

Yes, but my recollection is that there were more questions asked.

State to the commission what you were seeking to elicit by those questions.

It was because I believed that these questions, if answered, would tend to show Mr. McCulley's complicity with Mr. Menzies, in connection with the purchase of Coughlin's testimony.

I would not expect you to remember all the cases, but perhaps you can recall incidents in some others as illustrations?

There was a Conway case.

What was there in his conduct in that case to sustain what you have said of him?

In that case he evinced a desire to convict. (Objected to. Allowed.) It was the charge of selling liquor to an Indian. (Record produced.) There was only the testimony of a drunken Indian, as against that of the defendant, and other witnesses and he chose to believe the drunken Indian. Under the Indian Act one credible witness, other than the informant, must prove the case. Mr. Menzies, the nominal informant, when examined, stated that he knew nothing whatever of the offence having been committed, except from the information he derived from the Indian. I contended that a conviction could not be had, as the Indian was, to all intents and purposes, the informant in the case. Mr. McCulley adjourned several times, in order to take the opinion of the Crown officers. The attorney-general, I understand, Mr. McCulley so states in his record—said he might convict on the testimony of the Indian, he being the informant, and Mr. McCulley did convict. I am still of the opinion that the conviction was wrong. Outside of the grounds mentioned, the weight of evidence was, in my opinion, strongly against the prosecution. Record in the Conway case is here put in evidence.

In the Thompson case I think the magistrate's rulings were unfair to me. I think his conviction of James Boyle was wrong, as there was no evidence to sustain the prosecution, but the purchased testimony of Coughlin, while there were three witnesses for the defence—the defendant himself, his wife and son. No attempt was made by the prosecution to impugn the evidence of the two latter witnesses, nor do I think it could have been successfully done, for Mrs. Thompson, wife of defendant, was a very respectable woman, while her son was about 14 years old and gave his testimony in a most creditable manner.

The two Tingley cases were others in point, in this connection; one is 5th July '94 and the other 5th September '94. (Records put in evidence.)

If a magistrate commits a wrong by convicting a defendant under the Canada Temperance Act, either without evidence, or against the weight of evidence, is there any means of redress by appeal to a higher court?

Objected to by Mr. Murray, as it is a matter of law.

Commissioner says the question is one of law and everyone knows it is true. Not pressed.

It being the case, that where a magistrate does commit a wrong, by convicting a defendant under the Canada Temperance Act, either without evidence or against the weight of evidence, there is no redress by appeal to a higher court, is it, in your opinion, of the highest importance that persons in the position of Mr. McCulley should hold the scales of justice evenly and be altogether free from bias or partiality?

It is, and holding that view strongly, I have frequently expressed my opinion to impress it upon Magistrate McCulley.

Have you, in any way, directly or indirectly, initiated these proceedings?

Neither directly or indirectly have I initiated these proceedings against Mr. McCulley. I did not know they were taken until long after they were made. The first time I saw them they were filed in Fredericton. I was away from home, I believe, at the time, or might have seen something of them, as they were prepared by Mr. Bennett, my partner.

And do you say, Mr. Tweedie, that in expressing the opinion which you have expressed, that you have given us of Mr. McCulley's conduct as a magistrate, you have done so absolutely without personal feelings against Mr. McCulley?

Certainly without feeling. My feelings are all the other way. I am annoyed sometimes when he goes wrong in his decisions. I think it fair to Mr. McCulley to say, however, that I do not think he goes wrong wilfully, but he seems to approach cases from the wrong side of evidence, and he is bound to prove his innocence, instead of the prosecution being bound to prove his guilt.

Going back to the questions you put in the Thompson case, and which Mr. McCulley rejected, was or was not the arrangement which Mr. Menzies admitted that he had made with the witness, Coughlin, in your opinion, a most improper one and calculated to prevent the fair administration of justice?

Objected to by Mr. Murray, on the ground that it is in the record and

the Commissioner or government can form their own opinions of it.

The Commissioner says, though it is improper for Mr. Menzies, Mr. McCulley should be connected with it by evidence, in order for it to affect him. Many persons might think it quite proper to purchase evidence. Question allowed.

Witness: I have always held that opinion.

Was it or was it not by reason of your holding that opinion as to the propriety of that, you sought, by the questions which you put to Mr. Menzies to ascertain the extent of Mr. McCulley's connection, if any, with him in relation to the purchase of Coughlin's testimony?

Mr. Murray objects, as the question has been answered before. Admitted.

Holding the view I have already expressed, I asked those questions for the purpose of ascertaining how far the magistrate was connected with the purchase of this testimony, and I endeavored, at the time the objection was taken to my asking those questions, to impress upon the magistrate how important it was that he should allow them to be answered, so that no imputation, nor the shadow of an imputation should rest upon him as a police magistrate, in connection with such a questionable transaction. Mr. Murray said it wasn't correct to answer the question. The magistrate would not allow any question to Mr. Menzies tending to elicit that information. He gave no reasons for rejecting the testimony.

Where is Mr. McCulley's store?

Nearly opposite my office on Water street, Chatham, at that time and since, Mr. Menzies has been a frequent visitor to that store?

When I am at home I see him very often in the store, and stand- ing at the door. He is very frequently there—spends a great deal of his time there when in town.

Would it be incorrect to say he seems to make it his headquarters?

I would not say that, for I'm away so much.

Cross-examined by Mr. Murray.

I have known Mr. McCulley about 35 years; have been intimate with him during all that time; always had a high opinion of his character as a man; but not as a magistrate.

You thought he was fit to be appointed Police Magistrate of the Town?

Yes; He did not solicit it.

Did he tell you he was not well versed in the law?

He did, and I referred to the late Mr. Blair, who was a good magistrate, but not a lawyer, and told him he would pick it up after a time. I knew at the time he wasn't a lawyer, and had never studied law.

Did you expect he would never err?

I expected he would, but not that he would persistently err—against light and knowledge.

Do you, under oath, say he has persistently erred.

In my opinion, he has. I speak of my knowledge, as a lawyer, in the cases in which I have been before him.

You have spoken of his mental make-up. Is your mental make up not of such a character that you yourself, always—or nearly always—are of opinion that your clients have the right side of each particular case, or the side that should win?

I do not think so. I always try my best to win for my clients.

Can you name a case to me in which you ever thought differently?

Yes, in the case of the owners of the steam tug, Sultan, against the Providence Insurance Company. I found I had no case.

Can you name another?

Yes, the owners of the Sultan against another insurance company.

Can you name any other. How many?

Several—lots of them. I have frequently found my opinions were erroneous.

You state here that Mr. McCulley has reversed the principle which gives the benefit of doubt to the accused. Name one.

The case of Thompson is one. There was a very strong doubt there.

In that case you say three witnesses contradicted Coughlin.

Yes; there was no proof of the sale, save by Coughlin. Three witnesses contradicted him on this point. The circumstances showed there was no sale. Thompson swore he had the liquor in the house for his own use in sickness and gave some to Coughlin.

But Coughlin swore he paid ten cents for it?

He swore he put it on the table and saw Thompson pick it up. Mr. Thompson swore she was present and would have seen the ten cents put on the table if it had been put there and Thompson took it up.

Mr. Murray reads from the testimony in Mr. McCulley's record, when Mrs. Thompson swore she was not present all of the time.

Witness: But she swore to the other thing also; her evidence, in some respects, I know, contradicted that of the boy but not on that point.

Dr. Pugsley: Would not that Mr. Murray, go to strengthen her testimony for if she agreed exactly with her son, it would appear as if they were in agreement?

Mr. Murray:—Don't you know that Thompson had a bad reputation?

I can't say.

Don't you know he had the reputation of keeping a dive?

I don't know. I've heard of him striking a person one night.

Didn't you hear of the fellow he killed—nearly killed.

No, I didn't.

Mr. Murray: Well I heard him make the remark himself, but the fellow wasn't hurt. Don't you know he had the reputation of

beating his wife unmercifully sometimes?

I never heard that.

Don't you know he beat his boys and turned them out of the house?

I do not. Such things might occur and I do not know it.

Were you aware that he was driven out of Fredericton and Bathurst for his ill deeds?

I never knew he was in Fredericton. I know he left Bathurst but I don't know why. It didn't come out in evidence.

Were you aware that while in Bathurst he nearly killed Chas. Bose by striking him with a wagon shaft?

I was not. He was a man I knew little about.

Were you aware that his wife was sometimes under the influence of intoxicating liquor?

No. She was several times in my office on business and she impressed me as a woman of some refinement and education.

Previously, at the time you asked Mr. Menzies if it was not Mr. McCulley who told him to go to Coughlin, as he wanted to tell him something, had you not asked Mr. Menzies "Who told you Coughlin wanted to see you?"

I think I asked that question but I don't know whether it was before or after.

Didn't you and I have an argument on the question?

Can't say; very likely we had.

Will you cite an authority from Clark's Magistrates' Manual, showing that the right of the defendant to cross-examine the informant did not go to the extent of from whom he got his information?

I don't recollect that you did—you might leave done so, but I hardly think you would quote anything so impertinent to the subject, and I think it was wrong in rejecting the evidence.

At the time I objected to that question, do you recollect Mr. McCulley said, for his part, he was willing to have the answer?

I think he was willing to have the answer, but he sustained your objection, when he might have allowed the answer, for he had the power; my impression was and is that he was aware of the transaction between Mr. Menzies and Coughlin and it was such a one as would not commend itself to any person's judgment.

And yet you think Mr. McCulley is an honorable man?

I have a good opinion of him as a man, but as a magistrate he seems to think that any means is justifiable in order to bring a charge home to an offender; I think it possible that a person who is a magistrate, and is honorable as a man, until occasion led him to act otherwise.

Had you no knowledge that these charges were to be preferred before you saw them in Fredericton?

I was told of an intention of some parties to place charges against Mr. McCulley before the government and I advised them that unless they were sure of their ground, and could show some one case of misconduct, it was useless to prefer them.

Were you professionally consulted by any of these parties?

Never!

Were you spoken to as a member of the Government about them?

I was spoken to about them, in a casual way, but whether as a member of the government I cannot say.

Were you not spoken to about them at a gathering in Newcastle, during the Hill-Menzies trial when Robert Armstrong, John McKane, Richard Grenley, John Robinson, Jas. Robinson, or some of those, or some other, were present, and you were told that if you didn't get McCulley dismissed the party would not support you?

I was at no such gathering at Newcastle at the time mentioned.

I remember, during the Hill-Menzies trial, being in Newcastle one evening in the company of Mr. R. A. Lawlor, John McKane and Mr. Robert Armstrong. These were the only persons present, Mr. McKane, I think it was, made the remark that there was sufficient evidence elicited against Mr. McCulley in the case we were trying to justify the government in dismissing him as a magistrate. I replied that Mr. McCulley could only be dismissed for good cause shown, and that it was useless to talk to me of dismissing him, unless charges were made against him which, if proven, would justify the government in removing him.

I think someone said that a great many of my friends thought he should be dismissed for misconduct. I intimated to them pretty forcibly that he would not be dismissed for just cause, but I think, the whole of the conversation.

Did you not say if they would prefer the charges you would see that the Government would pay attention to them.

I did not. I rather took the other ground.

Did they not threaten what they would do unless McCulley was dismissed?

I'm not the man to be threatened, I think.

Didn't they say they wouldn't vote for you?

They might have said it, but I have no recollection of it.

Having stated in your examination in chief, that you endeavored to impress on the magistrate the importance of his allowing these questions to be answered, I would ask you was that not at the time the first question was asked, viz: "Who told you that Coughlin wanted to see you?"

I think not; I won't say, positively, that it was not, but if I did so when the first question was asked, I did so much more strongly when I asked if it was Mr. McCulley who had given the information to him (Menzies).

In reference to your having trouble with Mr. McCulley and finding difficulty in having him rule and decide correctly, have you not had the same experience with other magistrates as to their rulings and

decisions, in proportion to the number of times you have appeared before them as counsel?

I find that a difficult question to answer, from the way it is put. I have, at times, dealt with the decisions of other justices, and in cases where the appeal would lie, have appeared, if I felt aggrieved, but I have never found any justice persistently follow the same course as the present Stipendiary Magistrate has done.

Wouldn't you think it would be better for the administration of justice if other magistrates were to follow the same course of conduct as Mr. McCulley?

I think if magistrates generally, throughout the country, were to act as Mr. McCulley has done there would be a revolution, for citizens wouldn't stand it.

Will you swear that a large majority of the people of this county don't approve of his course?

Dr. Pugsley objects and says persons in the county generally are not in a position to form a correct opinion as they do not come before Police Magistrate McCulley, but form their opinions on prejudice and hearsay. He had been careful to confine his questions to Mr. Menzies' personal knowledge, as to avoid the hearsay and conjectural testimony which Mr. Murray now desired to elicit.

Witness, however, was allowed to answer.

I might say that a large number of the people in giving judgment upon our Saviour, but it turned out it was very wrong, although popular at the time. I can only form my opinion from my own observation and the opinion of litigants who have knowledge of Mr. McCulley's conduct, while the opinion of parties who have no knowledge in those ways would be valueless.

Witness: That's no answer. [Mr. Murray repeats question.]

Witness: I cannot say.

The Commissioner: I have no doubt that there is a class of persons in the community who think it is wrong to convict a person who sells liquor in violation of the Scott Act; and I have also, no doubt that there is another class who think that a person who sells liquor, or is accused of it, ought to be convicted without there being evidence of the fact or not. But what are such persons' opinions worth. I am sure I could never be affected in the least by them.

Mr. Murray: Don't you know that a majority of the magistrates of Chatham approve of Mr. McCulley's course and conduct?

I do not know it.

Would you say that the charge that the court over which he presides has not the respect or confidence of the community, is true?

I wouldn't give an opinion about that, for I do not know. I only know what a majority of the lawyers say, and that his court is not held in respect by a majority of the lawyers of the county.

Do you know how many of the lawyers of the county have appeared in Mr. McCulley's court?

I could mention those I have seen before me, but I think about eight.

Mr. Pugsley suggests that time is being wasted by this kind of questioning. The Com' says the examination is going far on the subject, but he will not overrule the question.

Witness:—Messrs. Lawlor, Adams, Winslow, Murray, the two Thompsons, Butler, Bennett and myself have appeared before Mr. McCulley. I wouldn't say that any lawyers but Mr. Butler and myself have entire respect for and confidence in Mr. McCulley's court.

How many of these are members and frequenters of the Chatham Social Club?