

said—and Hansard shows it—that the evidence did not support his statements, and he answered with indignation, “I have nothing to do with the evidence, nothing whatever, I rely upon this judgment of the court.” My hon. friend rather questioned that to-day.

Mr. CROTHERS: You had nothing more to do with the evidence than I had.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is what he said—(Hansard, 1909, P. 5655):

Mr. Pugsley: My hon. friend must pardon me. I say that there is nothing whatever in the evidence which would justify a statement of that kind, and the statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. Crothers: I am not here for the purpose of discussing the evidence in this case.

And it was he who was prosecuting; it was he who was making the charge that was to drive me out of the Government and out of public life, if possible. He had nothing to do with the evidence, he said. He relied upon the judgment of the court. It did not concern him whether the evidence supported that judgment or not, or whether it was false or not; he had nothing to do with it. To continue:

Mr. Pugsley: I am not surprised at that.

Mr. Crothers: I am here standing on the judgment of a court.

When I came to make my defence I relied upon such evidence as I had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You did not read any.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I did. I quoted many parts of it. I said I had only two volumes of it, and that was all I could get. I said there was more than that.

Mr. CROTHERS: You said you would not use the evidence at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said that the Government had been asked to submit the evidence to the provincial legislature so that we could get a copy of it, but that request was refused. But a friend of mine, acting as counsel for the commissioners, had had the evidence taken by a stenographer, and he sent me a typewritten copy of part of it. That I used, and with that evidence I was able to show that in upwards of twenty instances the report was absolutely contradicted by the evidence, and in a great many other cases not supported by the evidence. I am not going to refer to it particularly to-day, because I do not want to follow my hon. friend from Calgary and take up a great deal of the time of the House, but I remember that I called atten-

[Mr. Pugsley.]

tion to one statement in the report, that the evidence had been conclusive that a certain act of wrong-doing had been committed. I made the statement that it was absolutely untrue, that it showed the partisan character of these commissioners, and that so far from it being the case, the evidence was absolutely the other way. Now my hon. friend says that they wanted to try me by the evidence. Let us see for a moment. To begin with, we have the statement which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition read on the 6th of August. Then we have the statement of the present distinguished Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in a letter to Hon. Mr. Hazen, then Premier of New Brunswick, in which, referring to the matter, he said:

He will say that the report is not based on evidence and that he will, after getting a copy of the evidence, issue a statement showing this to be so. That will be his defence. We propose to get after him here before he gets a copy of the evidence.

Who was the hon. gentleman selected to get after me before I got a copy of the report? It was my hon. friend the present Minister of Labour who lent himself to that design of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They were going to try to drive me from the Government, and if possible, from public life, before I could get a copy of the evidence.

Mr. CROTHERS: You had a copy and you did not read it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But my hon. friend thought I had not. He was doing what the Minister of Trade and Commerce had written to Mr. Hazen that they would try to do; he lent himself to that design, in which, I am happy to say, he did not succeed. We have the further fact that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries knew that it was the intention to get after me before I got a copy of the evidence. That was why they refused to submit the evidence to the provincial legislature, because if they submitted it they knew I would get a copy, and they thought I had no copy of it. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, then Premier of New Brunswick, knew that that was the intention, because he had the letter from the present Minister of Trade and Commerce before he sent the report up to Ottawa to be used by my hon. friend in the improper way in which he sought to use it, and did use it. What evidence had Mr. Hazen at that time, when he knew he was sending a damnable and false report to Ottawa for the purpose of accomplishing the