

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So much for the general question of the policy of the two parties. Now, let me point out to you for a moment what has really been the operation connected with the sale of timber limits with this Government. It is quite true that there were a large number of applications. The regulations fixed the terms upon which applications could be made, and under which grants could be given. The law fixed the lines which had been considered by hon. gentlemen opposite the proper lines on which people could obtain limits; and surely it was not an offence for anyone to make an application for a timber limit under regulations open to the world, known to everybody, and under which everybody had the opportunity of making an application. If the hon. gentleman could point out a case in which a Liberal applied for a timber limit, and a Conservative applied for the same timber limit, and the Liberal's application was set aside, and the timber limit was given to the Conservative without competition, then he would have a case; but in that speech of his—which exceeded somewhat his own limits of what should be a proper speech, for, I believe, he enjoined the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) to give him a gentle reminder when he went beyond an hour and six minutes—in that speech, he never ventured to make a suggestion, among all the charges he had to make, that the Government had in any one case given a Conservative a timber limit without competition for which a Liberal had applied or was applying; but, on the contrary, wherever there were two applications, the limit was given to the highest bidder, and where there was only one applicant, it was given to him on condition of his fulfilling the conditions required, whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative. Let the hon. gentleman put his hand upon a single case of a Liberal having been, because of his politics, refused a timber limit by this Government. Now, Sir, what has been the practical result? There were no less than 2,029 applications for licenses; the time of boom brought numerous applications. But, Sir, an application was not of any value; it gave no one anything except the privilege of making it, and the trouble to the Department of filing it; there was no money in the application, that is quite certain. I am speaking now of the applications up to the 1st of May of this year; and out of the 2,029 applications there were 568 Orders in Council authorising licenses to issue. But, Sir, the Order in Council did nothing; it did not authorise anyone except under permit to cut timber. In four cases in all, I believe persons have been permitted to cut timber under Order in Council. A license was required before anyone could cut timber; and, Sir, we find that, before the licenses were issued, after the mere passage of the Orders in Council, the result has been no profit to the people who applied, but this remarkable fact, that for ground rents alone, which did not give anyone a right to cut one stick of timber, the country received \$24,062.27. Did that look like favoritism to anyone? Now, let us see what the country received for bonuses under this system under which we are told the Government gave away these timber limits in order to provide for their friends. In these cases, recollect, where no licenses were ever issued, the country received \$21,226.25 from persons who were competing for the right to obtain licenses; and for royalties, in the four cases to which I have referred, in which timber was permitted to be cut, we received \$8,587.92, so that for these cases where Orders in Council were passed, but no licenses were issued, the country received \$34,176.44; and only in relation to \$8,500 of that was there a right, on the part of a single person paying the money, to cut a single stick of timber. Yet that was the kind of favoritism and corruption bestowed on our friends—the corruption of letting them apply for licenses and giving them Orders in Council compelling them to pay the ground rent; and if they did not go further, if they did not make a survey, if they did not put up a mill and get out a

license, they got nothing else and the country got the money. Now the total number of yearly licenses issued altogether was 96 and the total number of twenty-one years leases, and of these more than one-half, I believe, were got after public competition, was eleven. So that of leases of every kind, the total number issued, of yearly licenses and twenty-one years leases, was 107. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that Orders in Council were passed in favor of certain members of Parliament who applied for limits. Let me say that the question as to whether a gentleman, who is a member of Parliament, may apply to the Department for that which is open to the world to apply for, which is embodied in public regulations, which everyone can take advantage of, is one, perhaps, open to discussion, but certainly not open to the denunciation in which the hon. gentleman indulged. Then, he tells us, there were 17 altogether, members of the Senate and House of Commons, in whose behalf Orders in Council were passed. I presume that the \$250, the first year's rental, was paid in every one of these cases, but I know, as a matter of fact, there were only three persons to whom leases were actually granted, and who, therefore, in virtue of those leases, were in a position to cut timber. These were, Mr. M. K. Dickinson, who is a lumberman, and whose business is to cut timber. Are we to be told that a lumber merchant, because he is in this Parliament, is to be deprived of the privilege of applying to Parliament to get that which any man can get? If it be shown that advantages were given to him which were not given to others, there might be some question as to his treatment, but in Ontario nobody ever objects to members of the Local Legislature getting timber limits from the Province of Ontario.

Mr. COOK. Does that apply to other lumbermen besides Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Does what apply?

Mr. COOK. That he is a lumberman and has a right to get timber limits?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about. Mr. Dickinson was one, the other was Mr. Rykert, not acting for himself at all but as a trustee for Mr. John Adam; and the third was Mr. Hugh Sutherland, who is certainly, as I said on a former occasion, not a friend of this Government, who is certainly a member of the party opposite, but who took the same advantage everybody could take by applying for a timber berth and operating it in the way required by the regulations. There was, undoubtedly, a large number of permits issued, and a good deal has been made of their issue. No less than 6,837 permits were issued, but when I tell you that 4,581 of those were free permits, issued to settlers under the regulations of settlement, to enable them to obtain cordwood, it will be said that, at any rate, was not an act of corruption on the part of the Government. I say 4,581 were issued to settlers free of charge. Then the number of permits issued to cut timber for railway construction purposes, by promoters and others, amounted to 25. Then to cut cordwood upon berths along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, east of Monmouth Station, 30 miles east of Winnipeg, about 33 permits were issued, and everyone was obtained after public competition. Then there were permits for the cutting of logs and manufacturing them into lumber, under a policy which enabled the person to get a permit instead of a license. There were 43 of these permits, out of which the holders of only about 13 cut a large quantity. Of the remainder of those 6,837 permits, 2,000 were given to settlers and others to cut cordwood, house logs, &c., when they required more than they could obtain under the ordinary free permits given to homesteaders. That is the whole history of these timber limits, these licenses and permits; and I will ask hon. gentle-