

valuable. Now, here arises a point to which I call your especial attention. Here is a great public question,—because the deviation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south was a matter of great public comment. In what position was the hon. member for Lincoln to give an impartial vote on that subject? It might well have come to pass that the decision of Parliament would have hung on the vote for the member for Lincoln and one or two more—and I ask what position had the member for Lincoln taken himself in to give an impartial vote on the question of the deviation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south, when, by his own showing, it would probably put \$100,000 at least into the pockets of himself and his associates? Sir, the third defence of the hon. gentleman, the third and innermost line of his entrenchments, is one that deserves a little more than a passing notice. The hon. gentleman admits the fact, he cannot deny the fact, but the hon. gentleman pleads, and with some show of truth, that he is not alone, that others were as bad. Well, I do not know that in the abstract I would dispute that proposition; but I have this to say: If all that was true, if he could show that others were as bad, it would be no defence whatever for the hon. member for Lincoln; but it would be a just ground of censure on others who had committed like improprieties with himself, whether Governments or private individuals, though it would be no sort of defence for him, if it were true. But the hon. gentleman goes on into particulars, and he designates as the offenders who were as bad as he, my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) who presided over the Administration at a previous period, and by way of awful example, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Cook). Now, I remember perfectly well what the Mackenzie Government did; I remember the grounds on which we did it, and I am prepared to take my full share of responsibility for all we did in that matter. Sir, what that Government did was this: In 1874, looking at the position of the North-West, finding that we were daily and hourly assailed with petitions from settlers to induce, almost to compel, in some way, lumbermen to go into that territory, to reduce the price of lumber, the excessive cost of which was a great obstacle to the settlement, my hon. friend beside me passed a permissive Bill by which, under certain restrictions and conditions, he asked power, in view of the then exceptional circumstances, to grant licenses without tender. That, so far, is perfectly correct. But the Bill is purely a permissive Bill, and I think, unless I am gravely mistaken, that all that Bill did was to give my hon. friend and his Administration the right to do by an Act of Parliament what his predecessors, in their Administration, had done without any such formality. I think that is the case, and there are proofs of it; but that part of it I will leave to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is more conversant with those matters than I am. Now, I have this to say: What we did, I declare, was done by us wholly and entirely in the interest of the settler, and not of any private individual whatever. Lumber in the North-West was selling, to my certain knowledge, at \$60, \$70, \$80, \$90, and in some cases \$100, per thousand. We were assailed by petitions—and my hon. friend is here to testify to them—time and again by settlers in those distant regions, to bring in lumbermen and

cause them to manufacture in competition; and it will be found that my hon. friend has the proof here that when he granted those limits, as the correspondence shows, we took excellent good care that a limit was placed to the price of lumber which was to be manufactured. Sir, I note one further thing: I note that while the Prime Minister took away licenses from the hon. member for North Simcoe, he appears shortly after to have granted these identical limits, or as nearly as possible those limits, to other parties on far less stringent conditions than the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had attached to them. Now, I say that the conditions had greatly altered between 1878 and 1882. In 1882 the country was swarming, as we all know, with parties who were seeking for limits; and I say it was the duty of the Government to have recognised that fact, and when they had a number of applications for those limits, to have put them up at once at public auction, with due restrictions and conditions, and made the most they could of the property of the people. But another thing. Not only was that the duty of the Government, Mr. Speaker, but I find, on reference to *Hansard* of 1882, that the attention of the Government was called in the strongest possible manner to those facts, and to the extreme danger of such transactions as those in which the hon. member for Lincoln was engaged. On March 27, 1882, twenty days before the passage of this Order in Council, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) moved, and it is on record, that the condition of the case had altered, and that it was imperatively necessary in the public interest that those limits should be put up to public auction, and my hon. friend showed there were 150 applications for timber limits pending before the Government at the time. To put the case briefly, I say that in 1882 it was the duty of the Government in power, no matter what Government it might have been, to have caused the permissive Bill to cease, and to have had recourse to the principle of selling by tender. Had my hon. friend remained in power, I should say he would have deserved severe censure if he had not done so, and I only apply to the hon. gentleman the same rule which he would, beyond all question, have applied to us under the same circumstances. There is but one other excuse made by the hon. gentleman, or rather made by one of his friends, that may deserve a little notice. I observe that the Statute of Limitations is pleaded, and it is said that, as six years have elapsed, the hon. gentleman should go free. It is a legal maxim, which, I think, will not be denied by legal gentlemen in this House, that the Statute of Limitations cannot apply to cases of breach of trust; but, apart from that point, the hon. gentleman has put himself entirely out of court, for the simple reason that when the attention of the House was called to those matters, the hon. gentleman, as I have stated, rose in his place and solemnly repudiated all complicity in this transaction, solemnly denied all the charges made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and on the fact of that denial the House made no further movement in the direction of an enquiry. And now let us consider where we stand. We have got the facts admitted; they are not denied, and cannot be denied. We have the defence of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I say no man in his position was a free agent, or could be a free agent; that a man who