(2) In making this finding, supported as it is by the evidence of Mr. Rykert and of all the witnesses called at his instance, the committee are aware that such conclusion is opposed to many expressions which were used in letters of Mr. Rykert referred to the committee, and to many unavoidable implications arising therefrom, inasmuch as in some of those letters Mr. Rykert pretended to Adams that the limits had been awarded to Adams, and that the objec-. tions which arose from the interference of the two applications, and from the claims with the railway company, were overruled in consequence of the influence which he (Mr. Rykert) alleged that he had and was using with the department and the government, and in consequence of the influence of others which he was bringing to bear on the department and on the government.

Mr. Rykert has suggested that the statements of that character which appear in the correspondence may be regarded as an idle boast, but the committee consider them untruthful and

reprehensible.

(3) The committee are unable to discover that in the treatment of Shortreed and Laidlaw's application there was any intentional wrong-doing, and they find that Mr. Rykert was not implicated as to the change of description which resulted so disadvantageously to Shortreed and Laidlaw.

THE WORK OF A MASTER HAND.

Secondly, your first report which you moved in amendment to that of the Minister of Justice, and which for manipulation, deceitfulness, distortion of evidence, duplicity and cunning could not be excelled by the greatest special pleader who ever received a fee to bolster up a bad case, declared:

(1) The policy of the department, as stated to Mr. McCarthy in January was not to issue timber licenses in the locality; and to apply, in case that policy should be changed, the principle of com-

petition under the regulations.

(2) Shortly after, Mr. McPherson agreed at Mr. Rykert's instance to recommend the issue of a license to his

client, Adams.

е

r f d s

(3) A little later, when it was found that there was a conflict involving under the regulations a competition, the department promoted an arrangement for an adjustment of the boundaries so

us to do away with that competition, in the interest of the applicants, and not. as the report shows in the interest of the department, that is, of the public.

(4) The area of selection granted to Adams was as shown by the written and oral testimony, including that of Mr. Rykert, and of the then and of the present Deputy Minister of Interior, unusually large; the latter stating that he could not produce any case of a like area under like circumstances.

(5) No grounds for, or explanation of, the change of policy of the action taken for the avoidance of competition, or of the unusual size of the area appeared before us, save those appearing in

Mr. Rykert's letters.
(6) These letters claim that these results were due to Mr. Rykert's influence and persistence with the government; and we are unable to find those letters to be in that respect devoid of truth; though they are probably exaggerated.

(7) The agreement made, or assumed to be made, as to the boundaries. namely, that Laidiaw should have the area of selection applied for by him and that Adams should not encroach upon it, seems to have been made at a time when the departmental memorandum of a contrary tendor had already been prepared, and to have been deceptive and illusory.

(8) At any rate that agreement was not carried out, but the reverse. Adams was given that to which Laidlaw was entitled, which was the common object of application, and which turned out to be the only object of value; while Laidlaw was given something for which he had never asked, to which he had never agreed, and which turned out to

be prairie and not timber land.

(9) The applications of Mr. McCarthy and of Laidlaw, made when some inkling of the facts had reached them, and before any license had been recommended, for a stay, for an appointment, and for an opportunity to be heard before any such action though based upon the allegations that a mistake, and later that a gross fraud had been committed, were not merely neglected, but were treated in a way calculated to lull their apprehension that a decision might be reached without their having the opportunity they asked; and meanwhile the recommendation for Adams was pushed through and his license was issued.