

"A delightful surprise awaits you in Penslar Velveton—it's the liquid face powder supreme"

It is delightfully fragrant blends perfectly with the skin surface and is practically invisible.

In a word we believe Penslar Velveton is the liquid complexion powder you will prefer

Handsomely bottled, in two tints, white or flesh—

50 cents

E. A. Foster
Central Drugstore

Professional Cards

Mayor Brown's Office Hours

Mayor Brown, office hours—10 to 11 a. m., 2 to 3 p. m. On Saturday 10 to 12 a. m. 7393-2-21-6Mtr.

MORSON & DUFFY
Barristers and Attorneys
Solicitors for Royal Bank of Canada
MONEY TO LOAN.

DR. HEATH McINTYRE
Dentist
Cameron Block, Victoria Row
Charlottetown
Office hours: 9 a. m. to 1 p. m.
2 p. m. to 5 p. m.
3683-10-25Mtr.

BABCOCK AND SONS
Patents, Trade marks, Designs,
Registered Patent Attorneys.
Established 1877
Formerly Patent Office Examiner.
Master of Patent Laws.
Representatives in all foreign countries.
Write for Book "Patent Protection."
Tells
All about and how to Obtain Patents.
99 St. James St., Montreal.
Branches Ottawa, Washington.

Miss D. Rudge
171 Great George Street
Manufacturer of all kinds of fine hair goods. Also Gentlemen's Toupees and Wigs.
Phone 314
Manicuring Hairdressing
7397-2-14MTr.

DR. CLIFT
CHRONIC DISEASES
Monthly treatment.
Hotel Victoria,
Charlottetown, P. E. Island.
Office hours 12 to 3 daily and by appointment.
756-2-14MTr.

S. S. HESSIAN
LAWYER
Montague, P. E. I.
Money to loan
7884-3-18Mtr

Carvell Charges

(Continued from Page One.)

that the letter stated that if the hon. member would go to the Committee he would get the facts.

Mr. CARVELL: I will go to the Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they do object to stating it in writing. At all events, the hon. gentleman can go and get such facts as he desires. He has just as much right to those facts as any other hon. member of this House and will have just as little difficulty in getting them. The Western Shell Committee, he says, got an order for 300,000 shells and not a shell delivered. The fact is that the Western Shell Committee has delivered 193,478 shells. I am of opinion that this Western Committee is a committee of the different factories out there who are doing the work, and while I do not wish to say positively, I have been inclined to believe that this represents other orders, and that to count those orders, he would mean to count the other two orders, of the order for 300,000 shells, 93,478 have been delivered. That concludes the hon. gentleman's allegations as regards the three Prairie Provinces. He, of course, would not give any contracts to those provinces at all. He would confine his operations to the big trusts in the East. That is the inevitable conclusion from his argument. He said so in so many words. "That is the way they have done; that is the way they have lived up to their contract!"

and in the face of that he libels them before the people of this country and before the world. The Vancouver Engineering Works, he says, got an order for 240,000 shells, of which they have delivered 39,000. They got orders for 30,000, 15,000 back in the summer and for 40,000 in October, 1915. Instead of their only having delivered 39,000 they have delivered 66,442, and the last two contracts were only made on October 8 and one on October 18. These contracts were made under the eye of the British representative. Mr. Thomas, made while he was here, and in fact directing the work of the Shell Committee. Was Mr. Thomas a party to the distribution of political patronage? Over and over again he says in his address: "Is it any wonder that the British Government sent out a representative to investigate those things?" It seems never to have occurred to his mind that the very things of which he is complaining were done after the British Government had sent out their representative.

Victoria Machinery Depot of Victoria. I think this is in the same position as the Shell Committee, that is to

TORTURED BY RHEUMATISM

Sunday School Supt. Tells How "Fruit-a-tives" Relieved

Toronto, Ont., Oct. 1st, 1915.

"I have lived in this city for more than 12 years and am well known. I suffered from Rheumatism, especially in my hands. I spent a lot of money without any good results. I have taken 'Fruit-a-tives' for 18 months now and am pleased to tell you that I am well. All the enlargement has not left my hands, and perhaps never will, but the soreness is all gone and I can do any kind of work. I have gained 85 pounds in eighteen months."

R. A. WAUGH.
50c. a box, 6 for \$2.50, trial size 25c.
At all dealers or direct from Fruit-a-tives Limited, Ottawa.

am disposed to think—I may be wrong say, an organization representing that it supplies shells. They got an order, he says, for 220,000 and only about 10,000 have been delivered. There have been 12,384 delivered but the point of the thing is this, that the order for 220,000 shells was not obtained on the 18th day of October, 1915, just a little while before the Shell Committee went out of existence while the British representative himself was here, and while every contract was made under his very eye and with his approval.

The Vulcan Iron Works of New Westminster is the last of the ten. He complains because they got orders for 150,000 and only about 35,000 have been delivered. He is wrong as to that, because they did not deliver that many, but it would, of course, be consistent on the part of the hon. gentleman to be right, even were the correct figures in his favour. He seems to have made up his mind to have the facts all wrong on one side or on the other. I do not know whether that company has delivered any shells, but it is not complete in that regard—but they obtained an order for 150,000 on the 19th day of October, 1915; that is to say, they too obtained their order while the Shell Committee had the British representative amongst them, and while he himself was supervising and approved all the work and all the orders.

Mr. CARVELL: Will my hon. friend state now the number of the deliveries that have been made up to a month from the time that I was speaking because, if that will refer to page 1828 of Hansard, the first reference made to those ten companies was as follows:

I find that the Dominion Harvester Company, of Medicine Hat, were able to get an order for 10,000, and up to a month ago they had not delivered a single shell.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly what I read, as said by the hon. member for Carleton in respect of the Dominion Harvester Company, but he did not say that in respect of a single other company. But here is one point of the whole affair; the Dominion Harvester Company got its order on the 12th of January, 1916. In the name of common sense how much would my hon. friend expect them to have delivered a month ago?

Mr. CARVELL: Will my hon. friend give the information as to how many deliveries had been made up to a month ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In almost all the cases the orders were given only a few weeks before a month ago. My hon. friend does not say, except in respect of that one company that they had not delivered any shells. Why does he seek to modify his language now—but, modify it now as he will, it does not substantiate to the millionth part of a minute any single charge he has made. If they had not made any deliveries up to that time, as that hon. member stated, the Shell Committee which did not contribute 75 per cent of the orders of which he complained, and which, in regard to the other 25 per cent, distribute them under the eye and with the supervision and approval of Mr. Thomas himself? I was going to say that is a narrow hole to try to get out of, but it is not a hole at all; it is closed absolutely. If the hon. gentleman wants to comply with his contract, he has nothing left to him to do, but to apologize to the House at the first opportunity. Why, he says, nothing delivered up to a month ago? The Dominion Harvester Company got a contract on the 12th day of January, 1916—it is an awful thing that they had not delivered anything up to a month ago. The Canada Cement Company, he says, is the only company that you should have dealt

with and that could have delivered shells. My hon. friend is aware that the Canada Cement Company took a contract on the 2nd day of November, 1915, and, in respect of part of the contract has not even the plant in yet and has not delivered a shell in respect of any part of the contract?

Mr. CARVELL: Does my hon. friend want an answer to that question, because he put his remark in the form of a question? I am aware that the Canada Cement Company did not agree to furnish the forgings for the first part of their contract; they did agree to furnish the forgings of the second part.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. CARVELL: They are and have been for some three weeks ready to go on machining shells, but the parties who are responsible for producing the forgings have not done so, and that is the reason why the Canada Cement Company has not furnished shells.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All the same, why does the hon. gentleman not tell the whole of the truth? Why is he at pains to tell me that the forgings were not ready to be made for the shells in relation to which they did not have to supply the forgings stated that they expected to have the plant ready by the 15th of January, or two and a half months after the contract was let, and as a matter of fact, they got it ready to commence work in February; that is to say, it took them—I am not making any complaint against them because it is a large plant and would necessarily take some time to look over his three months to get ready one plant in relation to the one part of the contract, and in relation to the other part that they had not the plant ready yet. Nevertheless, my hon. friend complains that the Dominion Harvester Company had not delivered a month ago shells for which they got the contract on the 12th of January of this year, and he holds up the Canada Cement Company as the company that we ought to have dealt with and that would have saved the lives of the soldiers at the front.

Mr. CARVELL: They are making 9.2 shells, while the others are only making 18-prs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, they are not making any at all; they will be making 9.2's later, and doubtless their plant is heavier than that of the other companies. I do not know whether they are putting the plant down as fast as possible; I believe they have a careful manager; and, further than that, I know it is not a fact that, in relation to this order, the Shell Committee would have let it out very shortly before they did, and, in relation to the other, the correspondence will show that no complaint was made by them against the company at all, but complaint was made because they were not in a position to get orders of the size of the largest over the period for which the Canada Cement Company wanted orders in order to deliver the shells at the price quoted. Any one who has the slightest conception of business knows that a large contract extending over a long period of time, can undertake to deliver at a much cheaper rate than can a smaller contract, which has not so large a contract, and a small contract would be arranged with them that they would have all they could make within a year or two years, could make the prices considerably lower than they could if the absence of such an agreement. But the Shell Committee were not in a position to deal without reference to the British Government. They did deal after reference to the British Government, and they gave their contracts under their direction and every price in every instance was approved before a contract was let. Yet we are asked by the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for St. John to sit in arrogant judgment over the work of the British Government and to tell them that they know nothing about the price they ought to pay for the shells.

I had no thought of detaining the House to so late an hour. I think I have pursued the assertions made by the hon. member for Carleton from end to end of his remarks. I do not know of anything that I have omitted.

Mr. CARVELL: You have not referred to prices yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I have referred to prices, have I not?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not heard it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so, but I did not get out to say this, that I was going to add to the injury that the hon. member had done to this country by exposing to the people of the world what the British Government do not want revealed. I am going to keep my contract whether the hon. gentleman keeps his or not. I do not propose to share with him the guilt that he already has brought upon his own head.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. gentleman is not likely to talk prices.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will talk prices with the hon. gentleman at any time he wishes.

he wants to, as soon as we get the proper authority to do it.

Mr. CARVELL: Do you know, Mr. MEIGHEN: I have said where I will go and where I will stop, and the hon. gentleman shall not persuade me to go further. What does the hon. gentleman care? He is ready to sit in judgment on the British Government or any other authority so long as he can bring a little of this counterfeit glory around his own head, and rant the ruff before the House of Commons or make a pyrotechnic display before a committee of the House? These hon. gentlemen do not want a commission. The hon. member for Carleton is on record more than once as saying they do not want a judge looking into this thing, but what they want is a committee, why do they not want a commission? I will tell you—it is because they do not want a verdict. All these hon. gentlemen want is a chance to do what they are doing and have been doing for the last month, under the cover of a supposed truce—they want to take out stray portions of the evidence, leaving out the contradictions, qualifications, modifying explanations, to take stray portions of the evidence, though they may have been demonstrated to be false, and scatter them broadcast throughout the provinces, as poisoning at political garbage. That is the policy of these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. CARVELL: With the permission of the hon. gentleman I would ask one question before he leaves the point about these western companies, nor would he be justified in referring to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against

the Government, then he would give an investigation. The charges he referred to were charges involving the honour of a minister of the Crown. If charges had been made here, then it would have been my bound duty to quote that portion of his speech, because it would have modified the views expressed in relation to the point he was arguing. But no charges were made then, as no charges are made now, against the Government, of the nature he meant and he will not deny, he meant charges of that nature for if he does I can show that that is what he must have meant. Consequently, the remarks I left out had no relation to the point discussed either then or

convey a wrong impression of what he said and I did not do so. I did leave out some thing at the beginning and something at the end. I do not know of any way of making an extract except by leaving out something at the beginning and at the end. But I did not leave out anything which modified the view expressed by him in what I quoted. The view expressed was that, in regard to the motion for the production of papers bearing on transactions made by departments of the Government with the British Government, we would be justified in granting it, or would be justified in referring it to a special committee. He said he would not refer it even to the Public Accounts Committee. He went on to say that if charges were made against