

House will show it. I stated that this correspondence was of a private and confidential character, and it was either stolen or was obtained by the grossest fraud. This correspondence was in the hands of only five persons. My opponent, Mr. Patterson, distinctly repudiates having given it, as I showed a few days ago in the House. He telegraphed me that it was a gross breach of trust, and that the correspondence should have been destroyed. Mr. Ritchie, who had an interest in the suit which was brought, though—as the hon. gentleman was probably not aware—it was not tried, had a copy of it, and Mr. Mercer Adam had also a copy of it. They all repudiate having had anything to do with this. The only person who was concerned in the matter who has not stated anything in regard to its publication is Mr. S. H. Blake, Q.C.; and, if it was not taken from his office, it was obtained in some way which was not very creditable to anybody. I do not think the exposure of private correspondence should be encouraged, or that it should be received with favor by this House. I think I might fairly claim, if I chose to do so, and chose to screen myself under the technicalities of the law—not by the Statute of Limitations, for the hon. gentleman is probably not versed in law, but by precedent and by custom—that matters which took place so many years ago should not be brought forward under any circumstances at this time; that the hon. gentleman, being in possession of these documents, should have brought this matter up before. I complain of a judgment being rendered which is based on private correspondence, and I think the hon. gentleman cannot find any precedents for this course in the records of Parliament. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has had under his observation the question of the *Times* newspaper which was discussed in the Imperial Parliament a few days ago, when it was unmistakably admitted that time was of the essence of the matter. An attempt was made to have the *Times* brought before Parliament for breach of privilege, for publishing private correspondence, and it was admitted that time was of the essence of the matter. But I do not want to screen myself under any technicality. I have not violated the Independence of Parliament Act, I have done nothing of which I am ashamed, and I have done nothing which would cause my suspension or expulsion from the House; but there are facts and circumstances and documents in connection with this matter which should be investigated, and I shall ask the House to refer the question to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, so that we may have a fair and full investigation, and may see if I have done anything which is contrary to the privileges of Parliament. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) must stand or fall by the proposition which he has put before the House. He asks the House to declare that my conduct was corrupt, and yet he admits that my action was not corrupt, that no action was taken by me with the intention of corrupting Ministers. Still he asks the House to say that my action was corrupt. The evidence destroys his assertion. Then the question is whether my action was discreditable or scandalous. I do not think this House, in view of the past record of the hon. gentleman, will make such a declaration, especially when this is a matter which is confined to private conversations. The

Mr RYKERT.

hon. gentleman has abandoned his argument that members of Parliament have no right to get limits. He has endeavored to draw a distinction between the case of the late Government and the case of the present Government. In 1872, a law was passed by this Parliament, at the instance of the Government of Sir John Macdonald, declaring that no limits should be granted except by public competition. For reasons best known to the hon. gentleman, no doubt importuned by hungry supporters, the law was altered by his Government so that the Governor General was allowed to grant limits to any one to whom the Government might choose to grant them. The hon. gentleman says there was a great difference between the times when the regulations were made. I would like him to tell me how many inhabitants there were on the Saskatchewan or at Edmonton when limits were granted to Messrs. Cook and Sutherland. I think he will find there were no persons there at that time interfering with timber or lumber of any description. The hon. gentleman says that I, as a member of Parliament, had no right to act as agent for Mr. Adams or any one else. He says that I prostituted my position as a member of Parliament in doing so, and yet he says that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had a right to give limits to Mr. Cook and Mr. Sutherland. He (Mr. Cook) says the statement I made some time ago was false. Upon the occasion when he made that remark I was not present and could not refute the statement made by the hon. gentleman, but if any hon. gentleman will consult the *Hansard* of 1886, he will find that, upon that occasion, the member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) referred to by the hon. member who has just spoken, stood up in his place in Parliament and admitted that he got the timber limit while he was a member of Parliament and said he had a perfect right to do so, and that his constituents knew it. I have the speech of the hon. gentleman before me, and defy any one to contradict me. Looking at the resolution proposed, I would like to know what is the offence with which I am charged. I am charged with using my position and influence as a member of Parliament for pecuniary advantage. Will the hon. gentleman show where that advantage occurred? Will he point to the evidence which shows that I have used my position for pecuniary advantage? Does he not admit that I had a right to buy that limit? He admits that members of Parliament had a right to do so four years before. Where is the evidence that I used my position for my pecuniary advantage? Then he says that I made a statement which was entirely at variance with the statement which I had previously made in Parliament. If any one will read the statement which I made in 1883 in answer to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), he will find that I stated the facts as they are—the truth and nothing but the truth—and any hon. gentleman will see that my answers were perfectly correct. The hon. gentleman has stated that I was obliged to resort to corrupt practices with Ministers. Well, Ministers deny that statement, and I deny it also. Ministers have unequivocally stated that upon no occasion was any corrupt influence used or exercised towards them, and I have said the same thing. I say the letter which the hon. gentleman has quoted does not bear that construction, but that it shows conclusively that no improper