

to be appended to a report which on its very face carries its own condemnation, it is not to be wondered at that those outside of parliament should have their minds prejudiced against the supposed offender against the laws of parliament. The public will naturally look at the result without enquiring as to the means by which it was brought about, when they have before them the verdict and judgment of men who are entrusted with the high and responsible duty of protecting the public interests. It is because of this that I propose dealing with the report of the Minister of Justice which he, after a week's incubation, presented to the committee for its adoption, the report which you proposed in amendment thereto, and the compromise report of no less than thirty-two closely printed pages, which under ordinary circumstances would take not less than two hours to read, without even suggesting any amendments or alterations, but which was passed by the sub-committee within the space of twenty-five minutes or less and adopted by a non-quorum of the general committee without being read at length or even the eliminations from your report being read over or considered. I do not propose to find any fault with the less than one half of the members of parliament present when the report was adopted, because I know it has been the invariable, although

PERNICIOUS PRACTICE

of that deliberative assembly to adopt reports when unanimously concurred in by the leading members of both sides. I might with justice, if I felt disposed to do so, accuse four-fifths of those present when the report was adopted, with entire ignorance of the facts upon which that report was based and with not having informed themselves of the evidence in support thereof. In fact, I could go further and give the names of at least fifty out of the seventy-five members present when the report was adopted, who have told me that they had not read the evidence or report when action was taken by the House thereon.

It will be no reflection upon the action of parliament to say, that through your connivance, cunning and vindictiveness and through the desire of the Minister of Justice to prevent the government being

censured (as I shall hereafter prove) an unjust and illegal condemnation was passed upon one, who according to your very high authority, had offended against no law, and who had not by any act of his rendered himself amenable to its jurisdiction. If the evidence and report could be submitted to any court in the land for its adjudication, I am satisfied that the judgment would not only entirely exonerate me from the censure passed upon me, but would convince the public that I had been made the victim of a compromise. It is rather amusing to see the cordiality with which the whole Grit press joins hands with you and the Minister of Justice in my condemnation, but it is very singular that in their anxiety to convict the government of wrong doing, they condemn me for something from which the committee entirely exonerated me in obtaining the limit illegally and by corrupt means.

If the verdict rendered, viz: that the only corrupt act of which I was found guilty was the payment to one Muckle of \$5,000 to bribe his employers, the C. P. R., and the evidence in respect to this matter had been published, I would have no cause for complaint, for the very publication would have been my vindication. If you had a particle of generosity or honesty about you, you would admit that Mr. Muckle was correct when in his letter published in the Globe of May last, he characterized the report which you manipulated as an *unwarranted, gratuitous and infamous lie* from beginning to end, and the report lacking his evidence a farcical insult to the people of the Dominion, and Lincoln in particular.

THE FIRST REPORT.

I now propose to deal with the conclusions arrived at in the several reports to which I have above referred. First, that of the Minister of Justice declares:

(1) The committee find that at no time was the government or any of its members, or the department or any of its officers, influenced by any undue or improper means with regard to any of the transactions relating to the said timber limits, and that no attempt was made by Mr. Rykert or any other person to obtain the said limits or any concession in relation thereto by any undue or improper means or influence.