

Denounces Another Untruth.

"The option referred to in the minute is the option referred to in (4) and the 'examiners' then upon the property were McCormick and Irwin, who were sent out and their expenses paid by the Trust Company."

I say that is absolutely untrue, and there is absolutely no evidence to support it. Here is another statement on page 148 of the report:

"On January 26, 1904, Mr. Fowler again saw Mr. Ryan."

I had seen Mr. Ryan several times before. The 26th of January, 1904, was the day on which we finally closed the agreement of sale and signed it.

"—and negotiations were resumed, the object being to close with Ryan upon a basis which would be satisfactory to the Union Trust Company, which was then expected to finance the transaction."

Allusion to Lying Report.

The satisfaction of the Union Trust Company had absolutely nothing to do with this transaction. If the Union Trust Company had declined to take the matter up I proposed still to carry out the contract with Mr. Ryan. I was bound to do it. I had to do it. I was liable to him for the purchase price of that property, and I would have to pay it. And yet, this commission, in a matter with which it should have had nothing to do, made this absolutely lying report in order to try and injure me in some way. (loud cheers.) The report further says:

"Mr. Fowler does not pretend that he ever disclosed to the Trust Company either the real option on the larger property at \$200,000, nor the real bargain on the smaller property at \$170,000."

Foresters Made Big Profit.

I never told them, they never asked me, if they had asked me I would have told them. If the trust company did not see fit to take up the matter then they need not have done so. I wish they never had, because I certainly would have made very much more money out of it. There is one other point I want to refer to. The Minister of Justice had to admit, because the facts show it, that in every one of these transactions there was a very large profit accruing to the Foresters.

Scores Minister of Justice.

But, said the Minister of Justice, what if it had been the other way? And what was the comparison he made? A comparison, sir, which a man occupying the position which the Minister of Justice occupies should not have made—I had almost used an unparliamentary word, but I am so careful on that point that I certainly will not use the word I intended to use. I will not borrow from the vocabulary of the Globe or the Montreal Star. I will use parliamentary language. I say, I was surprised at a gentleman occupying that high position, for it is a high position, it ought to be the fountain of justice, but how can we expect in this country to have a pure and limpid stream of undiluted justice flowing from such a source? Sir, it is absolutely impossible. And the Minister of Justice made that comparison, comparing the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), a man the latchet of whose shoe the Minister of Justice is not worthy to tie; a man whose name will shine in the annals of this country with honor when the name of the Minister of Justice will be forgotten. The Minister of Justice dared to illustrate his point by using the name of a man who has recently been convicted, Mr. McGill, for misuse of the funds of a bank. (Shame.)