

Mr. Haggart.—That was my point of view. We never made any charges of corruption.

The Chairman.—I suppose you read what was said in the press.

Mr. Powell.—Candidly, I never heard anything in the House about corruption.

Mr. Haggart.—Sir Louis Davies made a statement in a speech in Toronto that there would be an inquiry into the circumstances of the Drummond County Railway, and I think he said that it would be found after investigation that some of his opponents would be up to the neck in the mire.

And so they are.

The Chairman.—Certainly the press of the country charged the Government with corruption.

Mr. Haggart.—We are not inquiring into newspaper statements; we are confined by order of the House to the inquiry referred to us.

The Chairman.—Then, that closes the evidence, and we will adjourn till Wednesday next the 25th instant, to consider our draft report.

Here we have the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), that he made no charge of corruption, and he heard no charge of corruption made in the House. He and the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), and a number of other responsible or irresponsible gentlemen on that side of the House, in a most direct fashion charged and imputed corruption to the Government in this transaction. They might be excused for doing that before the evidence was adduced before the investigating committee, but there is no excuse for them doing so after the investigation was held. They had an opportunity of coming before the committee and eliciting anything that would show corruption, but they failed to do that. For them to come on the floor of the House and repeat these insinuations after their failure to substantiate them on oath before the committee, is cowardly in the extreme. Since the investigation, the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) is absolutely estopped from making such insinuations. He could have produced his evidence upon which he founded the charge of corruption before that committee, but he did not do so. He did not have any such evidence, and he has not any such evidence now. I challenge him to stand up in this House, and to mention the name or to give to me privately the name of one individual who will undertake to swear, or who will state outside the protection of the privileges of this House, that there was corruption in connection with this transaction between Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Farwell and the Government.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) must remember the statement I made in the House and the statement I made before the committee met. I said that this transaction savors of wrong and corruption, and to-day, after the evidence has been taken, I repeat it from my place in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). When you had an opportunity you withdrew the charge.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not a charge. The words I used then were these, that the whole transaction savored of wrong and corruption, and I repeated the words to-day.

Mr. MORRISON. I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman says it. Any hon. gentleman who will stand in his place in the House, or stand up anywhere whilst he has the power of speech, knowing the facts as the hon. gentleman knows them, and make a statement of that kind, is, I will not say capable of saying anything; but I will put it in the way in which Lord Beaconsfield replied to a gentleman whose statements he wished to controvert on the floor of the British Parliament, by telling an anecdote. Circumstances arose similar to those that have arisen here; and Lord Beaconsfield stated that he did not wish to give the lie direct to the gentleman before him; but, addressing the Speaker, he told this anecdote. Sir Robert Peel, I think it was, having replenished his larder with a new wine, afterwards known as dry champagne, invited a number of kindred spirits to test it. Among them was a gentleman named Colonel Jones, a connoisseur in wines, who, after tasting the wine, was asked by Sir Robert, "What do you think of my dry champagne?" Colonel Jones, turning, replied, "Sir Robert, any man who will undertake to tell you he likes dry champagne is capable of saying anything." Turning to the Speaker, Lord Beaconsfield said, "I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of tergiversation; but, upon my soul, he is capable of telling this House that he likes dry champagne." I will not charge the ex-Minister of Railways in this instance with tergiversation, but I will say that he is capable of telling this House that he likes dry champagne. To return to the evidence of Mr. Blair, on page 20 he says:

A good deal has been stated in the public press, and something more or less hinted in Parliament, in regard to fraudulent and corrupt transactions carried on with reference to the negotiations over this Drummond County Railway.

Now, I ask the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, as an honourable man, if he can controvert, and if he can why he did not controvert, this statement of the Minister of Railways, given at an early stage of the investigation:

I want to say that I negotiated the transaction from beginning to end myself. I negotiated it with Mr. Greenshields. I know of nobody else, with the exception of a few minutes' conversation in my office, in the presence of Mr. Greenshields, with Mr. Mitchell, I think. The whole negotiations, from the beginning to the end, the conversations and the negotiations in the transaction, took place with Mr. Greenshields. I do not know of any other member of the Government having had any part in the negotiations. I had, of course, from time to time, repeatedly, in the course of these negotiations, communicated with my colleagues in the Government and con-