

was deceptive and illusory. In the latter you withdrew the charge against the Department and throw the blame upon myself. What magnanimity you displayed towards the Government to gratify the Minister of Justice, and how readily he acquiesced in the condemnation of one whom before he had entirely exonerated, in order to please you and save the Department!! You also very kindly eliminated from clause three, of your first report, all reference to improper conduct on the part of the Department in order to gratify the Minister. In fact, if the clauses from 1 to 9 inclusive of your first report and those of the compromise report are carefully compared and the several portions which I have italicized noted, they will afford a key to the reasons for the sudden capitulation of the Minister of Justice. The public will be able to judge of the impartiality of two such eminent judges, when they note the fact that they are both prepared to condemn Mr. Russell, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Ryley and myself as perjurers and as men unworthy of belief, if the one can screen his Government from censure and the other can gratify his spiteful revenge towards a political antagonist who for many years has been a thorn in his side. If Mr. Burgess and Mr. Ryley swore to what was untrue, as your report clearly indicates and insinuates, why did you not report them to the House and recommend their dismissal? You knew that your report was untruthful so far as it reflected upon those gentlemen, and therefore you thought it unwise to say anything more so long as you condemned me.

But the meanest insinuation of all is contained in paragraph which I have numbered 12 of your report, wherein you state Mr. Russell on account of his impaired health was incapable of fully apprehending the proceedings and was subject to the influence and initiative of others. When you penned this lying statement you knew that the report of Mr. Russell was corroborated by the evidence of Mr. Burgess, Mr. Ryley and myself, and yet try to cast a slur upon me, by insinuating that I had unduly influenced and taken advantage of him. It is no wonder that Mr. Muckle characterized your report as: "an unwarranted, gratuitous and infamous lie."

Now, then, let me examine the evi-

dence upon which you declared that "the payment of \$5,000 to Muckle was in our opinion as shown by the correspondence in evidence, substantially a bribe to induce him to betray the interests of his employers, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company." But before doing so, let me ask you what right had the Committee to examine into or pronounce upon the payment to Muckle? You know it was never referred by the order of the House for the simple reason, as pointed out by you in the House when speaking of the Sands matter. You then declared that if I had robbed Sands, Parliament had nothing to do with it, and that the only question was whether I had been guilty of a corrupt act in obtaining the limit, upon which question you found by the report that I was not guilty. The only evidence as to the payment to Muckle offered was that of myself, which will be found at page 20, and which is as follows:

2. Who was Muckle? A. "He was the timber agent for the C. P. R. Muckle was the person who claimed an interest in this limit. He claimed that he first discovered this limit and gave Adams the information. He claimed also that Adams had agreed to pay him \$5,000 for the information, provided the limit turned out satisfactorily. I will be able to show that Adams paid the \$5,000 when the limit was sold. This same Mr. Muckle was out in that neighborhood when the survey was being made, and commenced to cut down the timber with a view to making the C. P. R. buy it. He claimed he had an interest in it with Adams."

At page 16 of your report appears a letter from Mr. Adams to myself under date of July 10th, 1882, in which he states: "I had to secure Muckle his \$5,000 and he will deserve it." This letter had reference to the original agreement made between Adams and Muckle in the fall of 1881, when Muckle gave him the information which enabled him to apply for the limit. Then again, at page 23 in a letter written by me on September 5th, 1882, to Sir John Macdonald I said: "There is no harm in stating that Adams had to pay the party who originally selected this limit \$5,000, besides the subsequent cost of survey, or in all, he is out \$10,000, about as much as the limit is perhaps worth." Now, that is all the evidence in relation to