

dealing with the subject, and I think that the House would like to have whatever documents relating to this subject that may be in the possession of the government laid upon the Table previous to the discussion. Perhaps it would be well to add to the motion all papers not already laid before the House.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I may say that we have not copies of the tenders, but only a reference to them, giving the figures and the firms, nor have we a copy of the contract. I think it has not been sent out.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I was under the impression, in reading the reports of the other House, that the contract, or the conditions contained in the contract, were laid upon the Table. That is my recollection.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman may be right. My hon. colleague informs me that he thinks the Postmaster General has received it. I have not seen it.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I think he has received it and sent it to me for an opinion.

INDEPENDENCE OF SENATE—THE COOK CASE.

MOTION POSTPONED.

The Order of the Day being called,

By the Honourable Sir Mackenzie Bowell,
K.C.M.G.:—

That he will call the attention of the Senate to certain telegrams, letters and an affidavit which appeared in a number of newspapers published in Canada during the month of October, 1900, as follows:—

From the Montreal Gazette of October 13, 1900.

Owen Sound, Ont., October 12.—At the opening meeting of the Liberal campaign in North Grey, Dr. E. H. Horsey, the Liberal candidate, spoke at Annan, when he was opposed by Mr. H. G. Tucker.

During Mr. Tucker's address reference was made to the manifesto of Mr. H. H. Cook, and in reply Dr. Horsey claimed that Mr. Cook had left his party because he had been refused a senatorship.

Mr. Tucker afterwards telephoned Mr. Cook and learned from him that the reason he had left his party was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other members of the cabinet, through an agent who was sent specially to Toronto to interview Mr. Cook, offered Mr. Cook a senatorship, and stated that, owing to his long and useful career in the Liberal party, he would receive it upon payment of \$10,000.

Mr. Cook refused the position under the circumstances, and stated that he would do all in his power to oust those who were guilty of such barefaced acts of corruption.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Dr. Horsey also stated that he had been approached by Mr. Cook and requested to use his influence in getting Mr. Cook a senatorship.

Mr. Cook telegraphed Mr. Tucker, in reply to a telephone message, the following words:—

'Re your question I never asked Dr. Horsey to assist me in getting a senatorship. I have no confidence in the man and knew he had no influence. I was an applicant for a senatorship, but when it was offered to me the price was too high.

H. H. COOK.'

Last night at North Keppel Dr. Horsey denied that Mr. Cook had never named any members of the cabinet, and as a result of a conversation over the phone to-day, Mr. Cook telegraphed Mr. Tucker in the following words:—

'Price demanded from me for a senatorship was \$10,000.

H. H. COOK.'

From the Montreal Herald of October 15, 1900.

The Gazette this morning publishes the following letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier:—

To the Editor of the Gazette:

Sir,—In the Gazette of this morning there appears a telegraphic report of a meeting held at Owen Sound, Ontario, in which the following statement occurs:

'During Mr. Tucker's address reference was made to the manifesto of Mr. H. H. Cook, and in reply Dr. Horsey claimed that Mr. Cook had left his party because he had been refused a senatorship.

'Mr. Tucker afterwards telephoned Mr. Cook, and learned from him that the reason he had left his party was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other members of the cabinet, through an agent who was sent specially to Toronto to interview Mr. Cook, offered Mr. Cook a senatorship, and stated that, owing to his long and useful career in the Liberal party, he would receive it upon payment of \$10,000.'

Commenting upon the above, you say editorially

'Mr. Cook was an old, prominent and hard-working Liberal, and was to get his seat at a bargain, for \$10,000. What did the unknowns pay? Who was to get Mr. Cook's \$10,000, and what was to be done with it? These are questions that Sir Wilfrid Laurier must answer personally. He is the head of the government that named the senators. He personally advised the Governor General when senators were appointed. He cannot go to the country on polling day with this charge unanswered, and with the senatorial toll taker unexposed and unpunished.'

I am not prepared to admit that a man in public life should be answerable for charges of this character, unless they are supported by some kind of evidence which would give them colour at first sight. I, however, waive the right of ignoring such an accusation, and I here and now make the statement for myself and my colleagues, that there is not a shadow of foundation in the charge of Mr. Cook; that I never, directly or indirectly, through an agent or otherwise, made any demand upon him for any sum of money, big or small, or for anything else.

I give the whole charge the most unqualified and emphatic denial, and I challenge the proof of the same.

WILFRID LAURIER.

Montreal, October 13.