plausibility. I admit, that the course of the Mackenzie Government gave a precedent to this Government for the course it has adopted; but the Reform party in his House and in this country took a position that left no doubt of their policy upon this question. The leader of this party, with characteristic prescience, in March, 1832, as will be found recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of 1782, page 278, introduced into this House the following resolution:—

"Moved by Mr. Blake, that in the opinion of this House the existing system of granting timber limits is liable to result in gross abuse, and in the cession of valuable interests in the public domain for inadequate consideration to favored individuals; that it is expedient to apply the just principle of public competition to the granting of timber limits."

This motion was moved on the 27th March, 1832. The time had come, in the opinion of the leader of the Opposition in this House, to define what the Reform party considered to be the true and proper policy with regard to timber limits. The Reform party took the proper ground. They took that ground whenever the evil became apparent that there was a speculative movement in timber limits. The Tory party also deliberately chose its own position. It did not accord with the principles of the Reform party, as formulated by this resolution of its leader, but it opposed this resolution, and voted it down by a strict party vote. There are clearly laid down the respective principles of the two parties: the principle of the Reform party, embodied in the resolution of its leader, and the principle of the Tory party, embodied in its action in voting down that resolution by a strict party vote. Since that action, no question can be raised as to the respective principles of these two parties. Since that resolution was moved in the House of Commons in 1882, the Reform party stands squarely and broadly on the principle that public competition should be invited in all cases where the public domain or timber limits are to be dealt with.

In parcelling out these timber limits, the Government, after the disputed territory had been awarded to the Province of Ontario, divided up and parcelled out the entire area of that disputed territory to its favorites, and the most of this plunder for you can characterise it by no other name, was granted after Mr. Blake's motion in 1882. It was the evident, and in fact the avowed design of this Government to deprive the people of Ontario of their property; not only to adopt a policy which would rob the people at large of a large portion of their property in timber, but also to rob one of the Provinces of this Dominion of its right to a property which had been awarded to it. Sir John A. Macdonald said not a stick of that timber should go to Ontario, said this after the award, after he knew that this public domain belonged to Ontario; and the design of the Government was clearly evinced and acted upon to give that property, the timber resources of Ontario, so far as they pertained to the disputed territory, to its own favorites, and rob the Province of Ontario of it.

This mad policy of squandering this portion of the public domain has continued from the day this Government took office to the present moment, and, down to the year 1885—we have no returns of a later period than February, 1885, though one was promised this Session which has not come down yet—in round numbers 25,000 square miles of the timber area of this Dominion had been granted to the favorites of this Government without competition; and this had been done in spite of and in the face of the continued remonstrance of the Reformers in this House and in this country. At every step the Government has taken in this matter, the Liberal party in this House has protested against its action and has pointed out the evil results which would flow from this betrayal of its trusts. Yet the party persists in its course. Now I suppose my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will lay stress upon the fact that there has been competition, that there has been private competition, that in cases where two or more friends of the Government applied for the same limit, the Government has permitted these applicants to have a private shake amongst themselves, to see which would give the most for the limit, in order to placate its friends and settle the question amicably. Well, that is a kind of competition that does not fill the bill. Three or four men apply for the same limit, and arrange among themselves who may have it. I find, in looking at the bonuses for limits granted under such circumstances, that they are usually insignificant, perhaps a dollar a mile, and in some case rising to $5 a mile; and the only case in which respectable bonuses have been given, so far as I have noticed, were some nine or ten limits in the Bow River district, taken by Americans. As they did not belong to the family compact, they were permitted to pay something like $110 or $120 a mile, but wherever the bidding was between friends of the Government, they were enabled to secure these limits at very little cost.

It will also be urged, I have no doubt, that the Government regulations with regard to timber limits, are much more favorable to the country than the regulations of either Quebec or Ontario; that the ground rent is higher; that while the ground rent in Ontario and Quebec is $2 per mile, the Dominion licenses are $5 per mile. It will also be urged that the Crown dues are higher, that 5 per cent. upon the value of the lumber produced is more than 75 cents or $1 per thousand specific due. Now, the question is not what the regulations are, no fault has been found with the regulations. The issue is: Ought the Government—as has been done by the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, having fixed regulations that apply to these timber limits—to have put these limits upon the market subject to these regulations, and ask competition, and for the highest bidder, for these limits? Ought it to have invited public competition, or ought it to have distributed these limits, as it has done, upon private application from its friends? I maintain that these limits ought, as in the case of Ontario, to have been put up at public auction; the regulations applied uniformly to all limits granted, whatever their location or advantages. One would probably be worth more than another; one would have a greater amount of timber than another; one would have a more favorable situation than another; one limit might fetch but a small bonus, and another might fetch a large bonus, and the Government in refusing to place these limits at competition, has deprived itself of a large revenue. Have we any proofs of that? I think we have. We have the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who obtained a limit, as he says for friends, in the Cypress Hills, for $250, and straightway sold it for $100,000. If that limit had been put up at auction the Government, in place of receiving $250 would have received $100,000. We have the case of some limits on Hunter's Island that were sold to Chicago parties for $650,000, and that cost the holders $7,500. I think we have a case in which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) is interested in some limits on Red Deer River, where one of the confederates received a power of attorney to sell these limits, four I believe in number, and did sell them, as is reported, for $100,000, and put the proceeds in his own pocket, and a suit is now pending, it is said, in the courts of Minnesota in which the members for Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) and Victoria are plaintiffs, and their confederate, a gentleman by the name of Dawes, is the respondent. Whether this is true or not, I do not know. Now, I have in my hand a return brought down this Session consisting of about 12,000 pages of foolscap, mostly correspondence in connection with the granting of timber licenses. It is rather larger than the one the hon. gentleman for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) piled on my seat last Session—about four times as large. I have gone through it carefully, and some of the results of that investigation I will give to the House later on. But with regard to the assignment of leases, with regard to the question as to whether the Government, in refusing to put these limits up at competition, has neglected the interests of the country and