

to me which show conclusively why I wrote those answers. The hon. gentleman has, upon this occasion, as upon former occasions, endeavored to distort the facts, endeavored to make this House believe that certain things took place that did not take place, whereas I contend that the letters addressed to me and to Mr. Adams, and my replies thereto, go to show why I made the observations I did make. The hon. gentleman says I used an extraordinary influence with the Government in reference to the action to the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, I had fortified myself with the opinion of Mr. Lash, an eminent counsel, in reference to the matter, and I conveyed that opinion to the Minister of the Interior, at that time Lieutenant Governor of the North-West in reference to that transaction, and he entirely concurred in what I had done. Although I am not going into the evidence—because we have not time to do so tonight—I wish to inform the House that I have evidence to show beyond all question that I neither was a suppliant at the feet of the Government, nor tried to influence them beyond what any member of Parliament or any other person had a right to do. I say that everything I did in reference to that transaction was straightforward and honorable. I pointed out to the First Minister, and he will recollect it distinctly, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had no right to that territory, and no right to encroach on the limit; I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Sands was willing to put up money as security to indemnify the Government against the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if they would only renew that license. That is the course I took, and I will be able to show that fact when the matter is properly investigated; I can show that, instead of my being a suppliant, I put myself in a position to claim as a right what the Government also recognised was a right. It is not my duty on this occasion in making a general defence to read over the correspondence, and I do not think it would be right and fair to the House to do so. But there are facts contained in it which justify me in asking this House to hold its hand and not render judgment until I have had an opportunity of being heard before a proper Committee of this House. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the fact that there has been placed on record a statement showing that Mr. Sands had been robbed. He has placed on record a document to show that I had bribed the surveyor who was sent by Mr. Sands to explore the territory, although he must have known that a document rebutting that statement had been sent broadcast about the County of Lincoln when the hon. gentleman was there. I published during that contest an affidavit made by that surveyor, Henry S. Udell, on February 15, 1887, to the following effect:—

“That he is engaged in the business of surveying and pine land estimating, that he has been so employed for about twenty-five years on Manistee River and in other localities; that he had heard read the affidavit of Louis Sands made 3rd February, 1887, taken before Adolphus Magnon, a Notary Public at Manistee, Michigan, U.S.A., and knows the contents thereof. That the statements made therein, as far as they refer to and reflect upon him calling him by the name of Henry S. Udell, are absolutely false; that, at the request of the said Sands, he went to Cypress Hills limit and estimated and made a report to Sands of the amount of pine timber standing upon said lands; that he made the estimate carefully and honestly

Mr. RYKERT.

and according to his best judgment, based upon his experience; that for such service he was paid by said Sands the sum of ten dollars per day while engaged in the work, and his expenses; that he was not paid or offered any other or further sum by John Charles Rykert or any other person whomsoever, either directly or indirectly, for such service, or for making any report or doing anything connected with said transaction; that he never had any conversation or dealing with said John Charles Rykert. That since mailing said report to said Sands he has done other work for him on other lands, on which reports said Sands has bought and sold said lands so estimated, and satisfied with his work; that the estimate he made of the Cypress Hills limit was true in every particular, according to the best of his judgment; that he has understood from said Sands that there has been a falling in the price of lumber at Cypress Hills, and that fire had got into that limit.”

Although the matter is extraneous to this discussion, and although this House has no power to consider the matter as to whether Mr. Sands lost money or not by the transaction, I wish to place on record this affidavit in rebuttal of the charge of the hon. member, and I ask to place it on record to show that his statement is entirely untrue. I have here a statement made by young Sands on 20th June, in which he states that his father has got a regular bonanza there, and is likely to make money out of the transaction. And when the hon. gentleman opposite and his friends had this evidence cast in their teeth, there was a regular panic among them. Then they turned round and said that it was not Sands that was being robbed, but the Government was being robbed. That was the ground they took. I ask to put in as evidence a letter written by Mr. Sands himself, dated 5th June, 1883, in which he says:

“MY DEAR SIR,—I trust, and I am in hopes still, that you will succeed in getting a license for the whole limit, in which case I will have lost nothing in the transaction.

(Signed) “LOUIS SANDS.”

On 23rd September, 1883, he wrote to me the following letter:—

“MY DEAR SIR,—Let me hear from you if anything turns up. Also, if you can receive for me permission to locate a new limit as you spoke about. I and my family are well, and my business fairly prosperous and good here. Hoping you may have the same blessing,

“I remain,

Yours very respectfully,
(Signed) “L. SANDS.”

I think it is a most extraordinary thing that, if I had robbed Mr. Sands, he should call the blessings of Heaven down on my head. If hon. gentlemen could only have seen the look of consternation on the face of the hon. gentleman and his friends when this record appeared during the election, they would be astonished. I do not intend to go over any more of the facts of the case. I say that the statement which the hon. gentleman has placed before this House is not a correct statement of the facts. I have pointed out its untruthfulness as regards the application for the limit. I have pointed out that, instead of the limit having been applied for in 1882, it was applied for in the early part of February, and in fact long before that time permission was given to go and make a survey of that limit, but the Order in Council was not issued until 17th April. The hon. gentleman further states in his motion that an agreement was signed whereby a consideration was to be paid to J. C. Rykert, and I was to obtain a certain sum for that limit. I have denied emphatically, and I repeat it, that when the limit was granted to Mr. Adams I knew nothing about its value, and in fact I knew nothing about it; and