

about a whole week endeavoring to impress the Government, and to the credit of the Conservative party and the Government they refused and cancelled the order, although these two gentlemen would have received large advantages from this hon. gentleman, who proposed to erect a mill and give them a liberal interest in it. So much for the hon. member for Simcoe in connection with this matter. I do not wish to take up the time of the House with any further reference to these matters. There is much that could be said with reference to the hon. member for West Huron, who has made his attacks on hon. members on this side and upon their characters. I think it comes with a very bad grace from that gentleman, above all others on that side, that he should attack the reputation of hon. gentlemen on this side, who stand as well here and as well before the electorate of Canada as the hon. gentleman himself does. It is well known that the hon. gentleman found his way into this House by ways that are dark and ways that are devious.

Mr. COOK. I am going to remain here. I have been here a long time.

Mr. HESSON. I was referring to the hon. member for West Huron, although it seems that the boot fits the foot of the hon. member for Simcoe. Now, I would just say that I am not in the slightest degree influenced in my support of the Government by any favors that I have ever received by the Government party. If it should come to that, that my constituents required me to support the policy of the Opposition at any time, I will resign my seat not only in this House, but in the country itself, because I could not follow or work with such a party having such a policy, if they have a policy at all. Now, I wish to illustrate the position the hon. gentleman places some of his own friends in by the course he is pursuing to-night. The *Halifax Chronicle*, a strong supporter of the party opposite, contains this despatch, sent by some person in Ottawa:

"OTTAWA, Ont., 26th April. Col. Ray and Messrs. Forbes, Kirk, Robertson and McIntyre, members of the House of Commons, have addressed a petition to the Minister of Railways asking that a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile, granted two years ago by the Dominion Parliament, towards the completion of the railway from Annapolis to Digby be renewed and increased to \$6,400 per mile. Col. Ray had an interview with the Minister on the matter a few days ago, and it is probable that the prayer of the petition will be complied with."

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have friends who have been hawking around this petition—I myself had some knowledge of it—requesting the Government to grant this subsidy. We are not going to say that this is going to influence the action of these gentlemen; that it is going to purchase or bribe them; it may be too small a sum to purchase their support permanently for the Government; but their signatures to that petition will secure their votes for aid to this railway, so that on that question at all events their votes will be influenced. Now, what is the difference between receiving such aid from the Government as a cash subsidy and having an interest in some timber limit or some cattle or grazing lands, on the conditions which are open to everybody. Are these gentlemen who support the grant to this railway going to be forever damaged in their reputations on that account? I leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite to say; I do not say that hon. gentlemen opposite will be influenced in that direction; but as the hon. member for West Huron has pointed out in two cases of gentlemen who had formerly been strong Reformers becoming supporters of this Government, it simply shows that when the amount is large enough you could buy the whole of the hon. gentlemen on the same terms.

Mr. LISTER. I shall ask the indulgence of the House for a very few moments. I intended to speak earlier, but hon. gentlemen seem desirous of putting themselves right before the House and the country, and I have no desire to interfere with their efforts in that respect. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took considerable time o-

show that the hon. member for West Huron had become a purchaser of certain lands in the Province of Manitoba. Now, I do not know that any person ever thought it was a crime in a member of this House or anybody else to buy lands from the Government in the usual course, or to buy them from third parties. So far as I was able to make out, the list the hon. gentleman read proved, if it proved anything, that the lands mentioned in that list were purchased from some third parties. Be that as it may, there is no law in this country to prevent him from buying from the Government or from anyone else and paying his money, and there can be no wrong doing about it. The complaint made by the hon. member for West Huron is that the members of this House have used their positions as supporters of the Government to get for their friends and associates advantages from the Government that the outside public have not been able to get. It is a remarkable fact that in the instances given by the Minister of the Interior, he could only point out three Reformers among all the hundreds who applied for colonisation lands. It is extraordinary that in the election of 1882, in almost every county of Ontario, leading supporters of the Government gave it to be understood that they had some unusually rich thing on hand; and it is remarkable that in my own county, and in some other counties I know of, leading Reformers were seduced by some of these colonisation companies into a partial desertion of the party with which they had been allied before. But I say that that is not the effect. The charge is that members of this House have used their influence with the Government to advance their own interests; and I care not whether they were successful or not in making money out of those lands, the crime, if it be a crime, was the same. When they applied for those lands, they did so with the expectation that they were going to make enormous fortunes; and if their expectations have not been fulfilled, it is the fault of fortune and not theirs. A great deal has been said to my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Cook) by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of the Interior did not think it beneath the dignity of his position to attack the hon. member who has not spoken in this debate, in an unmanly, cowardly way about some transaction that occurred in the past—something about a timber limit granted to him by Mr. Mackenzie previous to his going out of office. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always ready to have their nick at my hon. friend; they are always ready to charge him with having been peculiarly favored in being allowed to select timber limits where he thought proper, in quantities of not less than 20 miles; but I can tell the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that the hon. gentleman whom he now follows with such ostentatious zeal granted, previous to going out of office in 1873, licenses to people to cut timber in the North-West Territories, allowing them to select their grants in areas as small as three square miles; and Mr. Mackenzie, in granting to my hon. friend the limit spoken of, only did what the hon. gentleman who had preceded him had done, and what hon. gentlemen opposite now claim Mr. Mackenzie was wrong in doing. I am not here to justify my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) or his Government, but I must say, in simple justice to my hon. friend and his Administration, that hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to make such a charge. Under the Administration of these hon. gentlemen, in 1882, lawyers, doctors, shoemakers, tailors, every other thing but lumber merchants, were found applying to the Government for timber limits. How was it lumbermen became so numerous in this House and throughout the country? Not one per cent. of the applicants for limits knew anything about saw logs or lumber, with the exception, perhaps, of occasionally purchasing a little for their own use. Why were these men so anxious to get timber limits? Why are hon. gentlemen opposite so anxious to secure limits