

tion to it not a single member on that side has ventured to say that a Liberal was refused what a Conservative was given; but that any man on either side can get what could be got under the ordinary public regulations of the Department, adopted with a view to the development of the North-West Territories. Under these circumstances, I believe the House will reject the resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask for information if those colonisation companies were all outside the present limits of Manitoba?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, all of them are not—I think the Shell River Company is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The bulk of them are?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, I think so.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman appeared to be apprehensive in his opening remarks, that the tone of public morality would be lowered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen howl. They have had a good deal to howl about for the last few days, and they shall have a good deal more to howl about before this Parliament is over, and therefore it does not surprise me that they howl now. I say that the hon. gentleman appeared in his opening remarks to be apprehensive that the tone of public morality would be lowered, because the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) charged that members of Parliament had been in the constant habit of communicating with the Government on behalf of their political friends, and asking favors at the hands of the Government for their political friends. Now, Sir, I do not understand that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) charges it as a crime against the Government, or against members of Parliament, that they had so communicated with the Government. Had the hon. gentleman done so I for one am free to confess that I would not have agreed with my hon. friend for North Norfolk. The Government have enough sins to answer for without being responsible for the sin, if it is one, of members of Parliament, or the public generally, communicating with them upon matters relating to public affairs. Had the matter ended with communications from members of Parliament, as far as I am concerned, at all events, I would have made no complaint. The complaint is not that members of Parliament have communicated with the Government, seeking favors at the hands of the Government for their friends, but the complaint is and the charge is that the Government have yielded to those demands, not only when made by members of Parliament for themselves, but when made by members of Parliament for their friends. The charge is that members of Parliament have used their political power and influence in Parliament for the purpose of securing these advantages, and the charge is that not only have members of Parliament done so but that members of the Administration, gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, have so done. When we find that one Minister of the Crown, while he was a Minister of the Crown, secured a large bonus for a railway of which he was the head, the middle and the tail; when we find that the Minister of Railways appeals to the Minister of Railways, and the Minister of Railways appeals to the Government of the country to secure a bonus on behalf of his own railway, and secures it; when we find that the Secretary of State appeals to the Government of which he is a member, in order that a bonus should be granted of the people's money to the railway in which he has a controlling interest and secures it; when we find that a member of Parliament, who is now a Minister of the Crown, secures of the public domain a very considerable slice for himself and his family, when we find that a member of

Parliament, who controlled a leading newspaper supporting the Administration, converted that newspaper into a joint-stock company, to evade the Independence of Parliament Act, and when he became a Minister of the Crown, nominally severed his connection with that newspaper, and when we find that that newspaper received public money, to the extent of \$18,000 to \$20,000 a year—when we find these things, one is not surprised that public morality should be considerably lowered; one is not surprised, when such things are done by Ministers of the Crown, that members of Parliament think they have the right to do the same thing. Now, Sir, the defence of the hon. gentleman, in my judgment, is an extraordinary defence. He first states that the policy of the Conservative Government, before the Liberals assumed office in 1873, was that the public domain should be disposed of by public competition; that the Liberals changed that, and that their policy has continued since, as the Liberals created it after they assumed office. All I can say is, and I am prepared to establish it by the blue-books I hold in my hand, that whatever the law may have been on this subject, the policy of the Conservative Government, before 1873 and in 1873, before the Liberals assumed office, was to grant the public domain, without tender and without competition; and before I resume my seat, I shall establish that fact without peradventure, notwithstanding the statements of the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman complains that while the Liberal Administration were in power they granted of timber limits 605 square miles. Sir, if that is a ground of complaint what shall be said of this Administration which have granted of the public domain to their political friends, in Parliament and out of Parliament, not less than 25,000 square miles of the public domain in the short period of seven years? The hon. gentleman says: Can it be shown that any Liberal in Parliament or out of Parliament applied for a timber limit, and that the timber limit was refused to him and given to a Conservative? I am not prepared to say, but on reference to the Sessional Papers I find is one of the returns brought down some very extraordinary comments and remarks made by the deputy, or whoever prepared the return. For instance you will find this state of things. A. B. makes application for a timber limit. The answer is you cannot have it—reserved. C. D. makes application for a timber limit. The answer is you cannot have it—already granted. E. F. makes application for a timber limit, and the answer is cannot have it; it is embraced within another limit, and so on, until in one return you find some 40 or 50 cases of that kind. And singularly enough, if you will read them over, you will find that many of those applicants so treated are Liberals. Now, in regard to this timber limit business, if everybody was placed on the same footing, if the Liberals were dealt with as the Conservatives were dealt with, it is extraordinary that out of the hundreds of applications that have been granted, both in the North-West Territories and in what is called the disputed territory, not more than half a dozen were granted to men who, in so far as I can discover, can be claimed as Liberals. All the grants of the public domain which have been made by this Administration have been made to supporters of themselves, either in or out of Parliament. But, Sir, that does not make the matter any better or any worse. What the Liberal party has always complained of is that the public domain should be given away without notice and without competition to favorites of the Government or to those whom they expected to seduce into allegiance. The country suffers all the same, whether the grant is made to a Liberal or a Conservative. The hon. gentleman further thinks to justify the position of the Government by reference to a matter which he has brought up in the House a score of times—a letter written by the hon. member for West Durham to a person of the name of Moore, by which he alleges that some \$29,000 was lost to the Dominion of Can-