

Mr. Rykert, and of the then and of the present Deputy Minister of Interior, usually large.

(5) No grounds for, or explanations of, the change of the decision, stated to Mr. McCarthy in January, or of the action taken for the avoidance of competition, or of the unusual size of the area appeared before us.

(6) Mr. Rykert's letters claim that these results were due to Mr. Rykert's influence and persistence with the government; and we find that Mr. Rykert certainly used great persistence in pressing the claims of his client on the department and the government.

(7) There was a strong conflict of evidence as to the date at which the agreement made, or assumed to be made, as to the boundaries, namely, that Laidlaw should have the area of selection applied for by him, and that Adams should not encroach on it, was in fact made. But we are obliged to arrive at the conclusion that it was made after the 10th April, and therefore at a time when the departmental memorandum of a contrary tenor had already been prepared, and that Mr. Rykert was guilty of bad faith in this respect.

(8) Same as No. 8 in your first report.

(9) (Same as No. 9 in your first report).

(10) (Same as No. 10 in your first report).

(11) (Same as No. 11 in your first report).

(12) We think it right to state the opinion that there is some evidence to show that Mr. Lindsay Russell, the Deputy Minister of Interior, may have been at the time of these events, in consequence of his impaired mental vigor, incapable of fully apprehending the proceedings, and subject to the influence and initiative of others; and is not obnoxious to the charges of conscious wrong doing and neglect to which he would under other circumstances be liable.

(13) (Same as No. 13 in your first report).

(14) Same as No. 14 in your first report.

WHAT THE COMPROMISE WAS.

The public can now, by comparing your two reports, see what the compromise was which you and the Minister of Justice made.

Upon the only question which was submitted by parliament to you and the only one, according to your speech in parliament, with which it had anything to do, viz: Whether or not I was guilty of any corrupt act in obtaining the limit for Mr. Adams, you cordially agree. If you and the Minister of Justice had wanted to act an honorable part towards a fellow member, you would have stopped there and made your report. But no, both you and he seemed from the very outset most anxious to prolong the investigation by enquiring into a lot of irrelevant matter, against which I protested. The statement made in the report of the Minister of Justice that the boast of my influence contained in my letters was untruthful and reprehensible, is a piece of gratuitous impudence, with which neither he nor the committee had anything to do. If I did boast of having an influence with the government, what business was that of parliament? and how childish it was for a deliberate body to discuss the extent of my influence, particularly when it is known that every member of parliament, not even excepting the Minister of Justice, has frequently stated in his correspondence that he had or would use his influence with the government he was supporting. And pray, let me ask, who had a better right to suppose he had an influence with a government which for twenty-five years he had faithfully supported and defended than myself? But on the question of influence you and the minister do not agree, for you in paragraph 6 of your first report above quoted, say: "These letters claim that these results were due to Mr. Rykert's influence and persistence with the government, and we are unable to find those letters to be in that respect devoid of truth, though they are probably exaggerated." In your compromise report you very kindly drop the language I have just quoted and italicised, and say (in sec. 6), "We find Mr. Rykert certainly used great persistence in pressing the claim of his client on the department and the government." It is quite evident that the Minister having in his report accused me of untruthfulness felt that he would not like to take it all back, and consented to modify it by saying that I had used great persistence.

Dealing with the last finding of the