

this charge? After the management passed out of the hands of the directors it went into the hands of trustees, and was there for four years, until 1870 I think. Why did he not bring the matter before them then? Why did he wait for twenty-five years until everyone who knew anything at all about it is dead? It is quite evident to everyone who has heard him to-day that he knows nothing about it. He made one of the most extraordinary and extravagant—and I was going to say—infamous charges that it was possible for a man to make and yet he did not rest that charge on the slightest foundation of evidence.

Why did he not bring this matter before the shareholders? There were meetings of shareholders, one a private meeting, at which the report of the directors was submitted; a meeting at which the shareholders attended for the purpose of determining what course they would take at the official meeting. Before that meeting was held, a deputation waited on me and asked me to preside at the meeting, which I did. Is it likely, if there had been a suspicion against me, that the shareholders would have asked me to do that? Is it likely, if there had been the slightest foundation for this slander that it would not have leaked out before a period of 25 years had elapsed? It is a charge that no responsible man would dare to make unless he was shielded by the privilege of Parliament; and it is a most unworthy thing, as every hon. gentleman in this House will admit, for a member of the Senate to abuse his privilege as the hon. gentleman from Woodstock has done to-day.

I do not think I need say anything more in denial of the gross charge which he has made. The bill for £100,000 which he has referred to was a matter of public discussion for some years. I have been unable to ascertain when it was drawn, but from the best information I can get it was drawn in 1856 or 1857. The information I have obtained points to 1856—that is three years before I became a director—but it matters little when it was drawn, as I believe all the debts of the Grand Trunk Railway have been paid. I have taken a great deal of pains to ascertain when that bill was drawn but have failed. I enquired of the solicitor of the Bank of Upper Canada, and his reply was

that the books of the bank for that period had been destroyed. They had been placed in a basement room on Church street, where the sewage came in upon them, and they became so offensive that they had to be destroyed. I wrote to the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and he was unable to give me any information. When Sir Alex. Galt was High Commissioner in 1882, I wrote to him in London, and requested him to enquire at the banking houses of Baring & Co., and Glyn, Mills & Co., to ascertain when it was, and I have a note which he sent me from an officer of that banking house, explaining why they could not give any information. Sir A. T. Galt, in enclosing the letter, writes:

“9 VICTORIA CHAMBERS, LONDON, S. W.
December 3rd, 1883.

MY DEAR MACPHERSON,

I have just received yours of the 19th ult. You will have learned by my note of Saturday that it has been found impossible to trace the bill of exchange in the books of either Glyn or Baring

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) A. T. GALT.”

“HON. D. L. MACPHERSON.”

The following is the letter from the bank, which was enclosed in that from Sir A. T. Galt:

“67 LOMBARD ST., LONDON, E. C.,
28th November, 1883.

“DEAR SIR ALEXANDER,

I regret to say that we can throw no light upon the date of the bill for \$100,000 to which you refer in your recent note. The fact is, although our ledgers are permanently preserved, they are in this case of no use, because a bill, acceptance of which was refused, would not appear in them; while the subsidiary books, in which such a bill would be recorded had been, for the period in question, destroyed. Nor can Barings, to whom I have applied, throw any light on the matter. In these circumstances I really do not see what we can do.

Believe me to be,
Faithfully yours,
(Signed) A. G. HARVEY.”

SIR A. GALT, G. C. M. G.

The hon. gentleman stated to-day, and stated it more emphatically a few days ago, that he was moved wholly by his public duty. He stated here two or three days ago, when he gave a notice, which I