

person who watched your course that you were straining every nerve to show something dishonorable in the means employed in getting the limit.

If that finding were correct, then the charges of corruption made against me fell to the ground, and you, as an honest man, should have so reported. But you had your vindictive spite and malice to gratify, and in so doing you stultified your principles as enunciated in your speech, and reported adversely against me upon a matter which, even if true, Parliament, according to your own opinion, had no right to interfere with. If, as you allege, Parliament could not take cognizance of any robbery of Sands, either by Adams or myself, what on earth had it to do with the alleged bribery by me of an agent of the C. P. R. to betray his employers?

You knew when you penned that part of the Report that you had failed in sustaining any charge against me, and hoped to blindfold Parliament and the people by charging me with an offence less serious than that of robbing Mr. Sands, which you admitted you could not take any cognizance of, and you knew also that there was not one particle of evidence to justify you in reporting that I had been guilty of a corrupt act in bribing Mr. Muckle, but on the other hand, you knew the evidence was directly contrary to the Report. Your own organ in May, 1890, a few days before the Election, gave us the proof of the falsity of your Report, by the publication of a letter from the same man Muckle, who stated "*that your Report was an infamous lie, and a disgrace to the Parliament of Canada.*" Notwithstanding your organ produced this evidence of my innocence of the corrupt charge, you had not the manly candor and honesty to come forward and admit your error. Magnanimity is not one of the characteristics of your life.

Mr. Muckle uses very strong language in his letter, and perhaps stronger than an old Parliamentarian, would be justified in using, but I must admit I do not dissent therefrom, and I think I would be quite justified in using still stronger if the English language would enable me to do so. You also ignored the sworn testimony of Mr. Lindsay Russell, the former deputy minister, Mr. Burgess our present deputy, a Reformer appointed by your Government to office, and Mr. Ryley, gentlemen whose reputations stand high, and assumed that I had actually induced those gentlemen to commit a gross fraud upon Mr. McCarthy, who had applied for a portion of this same limit for Mr. Laidlaw. You knew well that you were reporting adverse to the evidence, and upon a matter which had never been referred to the Committee, and which you should have refused to investigate, but you thought you could throw a little dirt at me to gratify your malicious spite against me. In order to make good your report you very ingeniously tried to prove that Mr. Lindsay Russell was not at the time (a year before he resigned) in a fit state of mind to act, and you were base enough to insinuate that Mr. Burgess and Mr. Ryley two as honorable men as there are in the employ of the government, and who corroborated Mr. Russell's report, were guilty of perjury. There can be no other interpretation placed upon your report. These gentlemen, as you are aware, distinctly swore that the allotment of the limits to Adams and Laidlaw was made with the consent and concurrence of Mr.