

influence was brought to bear upon Ministers to have these matters rectified. The hon. gentleman has referred to the subject of Mr. Laidlaw's limit. Let me again briefly state to the House the facts in connection with that limit. The hon. gentleman is wrong in his dates. He states that, in the month of April, 1882, I applied for a limit to be granted to Mr. Adams in the North-West Territories. If he referred to the documents, he will find that he is just six weeks astray. On the 18th February, I applied for the limit, and on the 6th March, information was conveyed to me that the limit would be granted. That was made by Mr. Adams, and at that time nothing was known of that country. Mr. Adams was in entire ignorance of the position of affairs in that country, in entire ignorance of the value of that timber limit; although the hon. gentleman says he knew the value of it, I say he never knew the value of that limit until months after. It was only after the Canadian Pacific Railway deflected its line and made it valuable, that enquiry began to be made with regard to the value of that limit. That limit was granted by the Government long before that agreement was signed, and Mr. Adams made that agreement upon the day he left Ottawa, some time after having been informed by the Department that his application was granted. At the time that limit was granted the Canadian Pacific Railway was obliged to go to the Yellow Head Pass. On the 13th April, a Bill was presented to the House, long after the Minutes of Council were prepared, asking this House for power to change the line southward, making no particular point except the objective point, that instead of going to Yellow Head Pass they might go to the Kicking Horse Pass, or some other place south of the Yellow Head Pass. This Bill was not passed until 18th May following. Some time after the limit was granted, it was found that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in locating their line, had run some forty miles from that limit, and had commenced to cut down the timber therein, in order to make a bridge at Medicine Hat. As soon as the survey was completed, and as soon as the license was issued, Mr. Adams called upon me, as solicitor, to go to Winnipeg and compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to give remuneration to him for having destroyed that limit. The limit was cut down by the lumber agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who was in league with parties who were interested in that limit; he cut that down ostensibly and with the view of compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway to buy that limit, and when Mr. Van Horne was asked to pay compensation for the destruction of the timber, he agreed to pay it; he made no claim whatever for the limit until long after the limit was sold. In the month of January the limit was sold to Mr. Sands, sold without my knowledge. I did not know who Mr. Sands was, never knew who he was until I saw him in Winnipeg after the bargain was concluded. I went to Winnipeg to act for Mr. Adams, as solicitor, to pass that title, to see that the title was properly arranged; and then, for the first time, I saw this gentleman. When the money was sent to Ottawa to renew the license, I learned that the Canadian Pacific Railway had set up a claim to a portion of that limit. I contended then, as I contend now, that the Government had no

right to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to infringe upon that limit, to interfere with it at all, because, at the time the limit was granted they had no rights there at all, and according to Act of Parliament they could only take such lands as belonged to the Crown, or were not under license of occupation. Although the Canadian Pacific Railway was determined to hold that limit, I used every effort in my power to induce the Government to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to abandon its claim, and also to renew the license. Now, I wish to explain how I came to make use of the name of the Minister of Customs as having helped me in that transaction. My first intimation that the Minister of Customs had interceded on behalf of Mr. Adams, was a telegram that I received from Mr. Gouin of the Russell House in Ottawa, telling me that Mr. Bowell was interesting himself on behalf of Mr. Adams. That was the first intimation I had upon that point. I made the first use of his name in the year 1882, when I stated he was helping me as regards the issuing of the license. I received in that year from Mr. Bowell a telegram as follows:—

"Telegraphed you last week that neither Sir John nor Russell were here. Will give it personal attention as soon as Sir John returns; have seen papers; think it is all right."

That was the paper sent down by the Surveyor General in order to have the license completed. That was the first time that I heard that the Minister of Customs was helping in this matter. He did what he had a perfect right to do, and he did it voluntarily, after everything was satisfactorily arranged, after Mr. Lindsay Russell had made his report in favor of the license being issued, and he did nothing more than his duty in that respect. Again, in the early part of 1883, I received a telegram from Mr. Gouin, in the city of Ottawa, stating that Mr. Bowell was doing what he could to have the license renewed. So you will see that in using his name I simply used the information I got from other people, which information was correct. Whatever the Minister of Customs did, was simply done in order to help the matter on, but not with a view of using any particular influence in my favor either one way or the other. I entirely exonerate him from that, as I have always done. It has been stated by the hon. gentleman that I made an effort to defeat Mr. McCarthy as regards the Laidlaw limit. Now, there are facts in connection with that transaction which I have a right to ask this House to consider; there is evidence to be produced which cannot be produced here now—it is utterly impossible for me to go into the whole evidence—but there is evidence to be produced which, I think, will justify me in saying that my whole course throughout that transaction was strictly honorable, and if the hon. gentleman will call for other reports sent by Lindsay Russell in reference to that transaction, they will show that my course was straightforward and honorable, and everything I did was strictly in accordance with law, and I did nothing outside. But the hon. gentleman has been pleased to read certain expressions in my letters, certain garbled statements; and if he had wished to be fair and candid to this House, and desired to do justice towards myself after accusing me of a serious offence and crime, he would have read the whole correspondence, he would have read the letters written