

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Who says "nothing of the kind?"

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do.

Mr. FARROW. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. COOK. What do you know about it?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I will show it is so. I will prove it. I have the documents, and I will prove it before I sit down.

Mr. FARROW. Prove it now. Your tongue goes too fast.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In some of the cases the Orders in Council authorised the issue of licenses; in others permits were granted without Orders in Council; but, so far as the public are concerned, or so far as the public interest is concerned, it makes no kind of difference whether the right to cut timber is obtained by an Order in Council, a license or a permit; the country suffers all the same. I, with extreme moderation, only placed the number at 67. The Minister of the Interior puts both classes at 174. Does he still adhere to the statement he made which I quoted from—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The statement he made at St. Thomas that, in the great majority of cases cited by Mr. Cameron, there is not a word of truth?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He does adhere to it, does he? Then, if he does, I desire to quote the Minister of the Interior in the House against the Hon. Mr. White out of the House, and I shall do so in a few minutes. But, in case the people of this country—I do not mean this House; I do not know that any arguments any man could use in the House would affect members in this House; it is not in the nature of things that you could expect that hon. gentlemen who have been sharing in these spoils are in a position to give an independent opinion—as the hon. the Minister of the Interior out of Parliament and in Parliament may not be considered a very reliable witness, even when he gives evidence in support of an Administration of which he is so distinguished a member, I intend not to take the words of the Minister of the Interior, but to refer to the returns brought down to Parliament and the blue-books submitted to Parliament. I will take the Sessional Papers of 1882, No. 30.

Mr. COOK. Yell now, why don't you?

Mr. FARROW. Two hundred square miles.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You will find in this Sessional Paper a return submitted on the 8th March, 1882. In that Sessional Paper you will find the name of Turner & Co., of Germain & Co., of J. Bergin & Co.—perhaps the hon. member for Cornwall knows something of that—who received each a yearly license to cut timber in the disputed territory. You will also find in the same return the name of Joseph Whitehead, of W. J. Macaulay, of Stephen H. Fowler, of R. Fuller & Co., of Macaulay, Ginty & Sprague, each of whom obtained a license to cut timber for twenty-one years in the disputed territory. You will find in the Sessional Papers for 1883, No. 118, another return submitted to Parliament, and this return is entitled as follows:—

"Permits granted on lands within the territory now in dispute with Ontario from August, 1878, to March, 1883."

In that return there are the names of thirty-five individuals, each of whom obtained permits to cut timber in this disputed territory. The list embraces the following names:—  
R. J. Short, who was a partner of the Hon. John Costigan, now Minister of Inland Revenue. R. J. Short obtained a second and third permit. Costigan & Short, the Minister of Inland Revenue and his Conservative partner, also  
Mr. CAMERON (Huron.)

obtained a permit to cut timber in the disputed territory. So did John Lewis, a friend of the Minister of Inland Revenue—as you will find in the correspondence here in my hand, letters from John Costigan, addressed to the Department begging the Department to give his friend Lewis a permit to cut timber. You will find H. Bulmer, a partner of the nephew of the Minister of Railways, got a permit, and John Lewis got a second permit.

An hon. MEMBER. Why not?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. Minister deny it? He stated at St. Thomas that the statements made by me were not true. I am within the mark when I say that I did not give one-third of the names of parties who had permits from this Administration to cut timber in the disputed territory. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company that rules this Government, had a permit. Patrick Macdonald had a permit, and so on through the list of 35 individuals, and I venture to state that in the whole list there are not four individuals who ever pretended to be Liberals. In the first list I read there are the names of seven who obtained permits to cut timber, and in the next list there were 35 persons who obtained permits to cut timber after the boundary award was executed by the arbitrators. I hold in my hands a statement the original of which was prepared in the Department of the Interior, and I challenge the hon. gentleman as to its correctness. It is a statement of the permits granted by this Administration to their political friends after the boundary award was made. That statement is entitled:

Schedule showing the names of persons who cut timber under permits in that part of the Dominion of Canada declared by an Order of the Queen's Council to be within the Province of Ontario.

That list of names is as follows:—

"R. J. Short, Jno. Lewis, J. W. Macdonald, R. J. Short, Costigan & Short, H. H. Bailey, H. Bulmer, jr., John Lewis, H. R. McDonald, R. J. Short, Clifford Lewis, W. L. Baker, Frank Gardner, Mrs. J. Genaghty, P. Macdonald, D. Carmichael, A. D. Macdonald, Jas. Baston, N. D. Coates, John Culbert, Jno. Short, Geo. Munroe, Geo. Myers, Wm. McKinnon, E. A. Sharpe, C. Kobold, A. Mulligan, J. Hennessy, Jno. Ward, E. M. Bidout, Jno. O. Miller, E. H. Bunting, R. J. Short, Angus Macdonald, Jacob Rose, Dick, Banning & Co., Jno. McLeod, C. W. Chadwick, Mrs. McKeena, Ste. Catharines Lumber Co. Rainy Lake Lumber Co., W. Cameron, T. W. Dobbie, Jacob Smith, Jno W. Colclough, Robt. Bunting, C. S. Hoare, Frank Gardner, Julius Colombe, Geo. Gagnon, Pat. Fitzgerald, Thompson & Palmer J. W. P. Witten, Chas. Ward, Frank Ward, Jos. McCracken, Wm. Zippell, Jno. Ward, A. E. Mulligan, John Thompson, M. Ritchie."

Most of these names are perfectly familiar to hon. gentlemen in this House, especially familiar to members of the Administration. Now, Sir, the Minister of the Interior, at St. Thomas, told the electors there a farther story to which I wish to refer. He said permits were given to parties to cut firewood and railway ties, and the impression he left upon the audience, the impression he intended to leave upon the audience, was that the Government gave permits in the disputed territory for no other purposes, except to cut firewood and railway ties. I say that is not correct. A reference to the returns I have referred to, shows that in eight different cases, the Government gave permits to cut poles, ties, lumber and square timber. The Minister went further, and in undertaking to answer the charges that had been made against this Administration, said that permits to cut timber were issued during Mr. Mackenzie's *regime*—and bear in mind he was then discussing the timber limits in the disputed territory, and that only. He was attempting to answer the charge I had made in December last against the Administration. I say it is not true that Mr. Mackenzie, during his *regime*, granted permits to cut timber in the disputed territory. No permits appear during that period in the returns submitted to Parliament; no permits appear in the blue-book during that period; no permit existed anywhere, except in the fertile brain of the Minister of the Interior; and I will prove that out of his