

"The Order in Council has been finally passed, and this although every effort was made to induce the Government to alter their minds."

Then, on the 10th of May :

"Laidlaw only got his Order passed this week, and he had to get me to help him: so you see who had the influence with the Government after all."

On the 8th of August he writes :

"It will be satisfactory to know, after my hard fight with the Government, that I did get what you anticipated. I would not go through the same difficulty again for twice the amount. I never spent such six weeks before as I did while endeavoring to force the Department to do justice. The fact of their having refused McCarthy before had a great deal to do with the delay and refusal. Poor Laidlaw, I am pleased he did not get the start of this child. He thought he was very smart and had all the influence of the country at his back. I think another time they will recognise the fact that J. C. R. is not very easily defeated at anything."

Of the hon. gentleman's skill in wire-pulling in every direction, perhaps the hon. Minister of Customs may find it convenient to speak before the debate is over. But there is one particular phase of it which, perhaps, deserves a little notice. As the House will perceive, the hon. member for Lincoln is nothing if not a good family man. The hon. gentleman, judging others by himself, thought the influence of parental feelings was likely to be very strong in certain hon. members of the Government: and finding that there were difficulties—and I give this as an instance to show that the hon. gentleman, as he would say himself, was up to every move on the board—he proceeded to inform Mr. Adams on the 12th February, 1883 :

"I have not yet succeeded in doing anything, but I am pulling wires in every direction. John A.'s son from Winnipeg, McCarthy's partner, is here, and I intend employing him to go for his father. I think if you had young Tupper here, and paid him pretty well, he would help us materially."

Mr. MITCHELL. He draws a distinction between them, does he ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apparently.

"The C.P.R. has a great hold on the Government, and we must counteract this in some way."

On the 5th of March, 1883, he writes from Ottawa :

"I have not yet succeeded in getting anything done in the limit matter. I have brought Macdonald and Tupper from Winnipeg, and hope they will be able to induce their fathers to act promptly in the matter."

And he proceeds to deliver himself, on the 8th of March, of a statement of a remarkable sort :

"I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the C.P.R. have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work for me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed."

On the 28th of March, 1883, he writes :

"I am having a hard time with the limit matter. It will cost us each at least \$5,500 to get this through." And the House will remember that they only made \$100,000 apiece.—

"I have laid my ropes, so that I expect to have it settled in a few days. I have a dozen at work for us. You must be prepared to pay the amount of your share at any time, as it will have to be all cash. When this is settled we must get rid of all the notes and have an end of it. It has completely used me up. The excitement and strain is too much for me. I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me."

Now, I accept frankly and fully the statement made by the hon. Minister of Customs, speaking, I presume, for himself and colleagues, that he did

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

not take, and did not expect or intend to take, one farthing from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I do not believe that, to put the thing mildly, there was the smallest foundation in facts for the statement in these letters to that effect. But, what I do believe, and what I say is the clear and obvious inference from these letters, is that the hon. member for Lincoln designed to impress on his partners the fact that he would be obliged to corruptly expend a large sum of money in Ottawa in influencing Ministers or other parties. That is the construction I put upon it, and I will say that, for my part, knowing Mr. Hugh Macdonald, I believe and entirely accept his statement in preference to that of the hon. member for Lincoln. It may possibly be some consolation to the Minister of Customs, and, peradventure to the Premier, to know that in the course of this, which, I fear, I must characterise as a very fraudulent transaction, somebody overreached himself—and hence the suit which was brought by the representatives of Mr. Adams against the hon. gentleman, and which led to these disclosures that are now staring us in the face in all these proceedings. But there was something more. Cleverly as the hon. gentleman had concealed his facts, he had not absolutely and wholly concealed them. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Charlton), being a lumberman, had obtained some little information as to the hon. gentleman's proceedings; and in the *Hansard* report of the proceedings of this House under date the 2nd May, 1883, the then and present member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), rising in his place, asked :

"I want to know if the hon. gentleman did not negotiate the transaction in connection with the timber limit in the Cypress Hills? I want to know if he did not, as agent for other parties, get a timber limit there at \$5 a square mile, and sell it at \$2,000 a square mile?"

"I want to know if he did not get that on behalf of one Adams; if he did not go to Winnipeg in person and sell it to Louis Sands of Michigan?"

"I want to know if the price was not \$200,000; if \$90,000 was not paid in cash, one-third of which he put in his pocket?"

In reply to that, the hon. member for Lincoln made the following statement, and I call the especial attention of every hon. gentleman here to the statement. I invite them to compare it with the correspondence, and I leave it with them as honest and honorable men to say what they would think of a man who, in his place in this House, made this statement :

"The hon. gentleman has asked me several questions, and I propose now to answer them. I neither directly nor indirectly drew the money he spoke of, nor put any sum in my pocket except professional fees, and professional fees only. I deny that I negotiated any timber lease for Mr. Adams or any other person. On the contrary, Mr. Adams had his own agents to negotiate for him; he made his own bargain, and I had nothing to do with it, and did not pocket the money the hon. gentleman has spoken of. On the contrary, I advised Mr. Adams not to dispose of the limit, but to work it. The hon. gentleman on several occasions has made remarks outside of the House to the same effect, and I am glad now to have an opportunity to give it an emphatic denial."

This is the statement of the hon. minister made three months after he had signed the following receipt :—

"WINNIPEG, MAN., 16th Jan., 1883.

"Received from John Adams thirty-five thousand dollars in cash by draft on the Bank of Montreal, and four notes of Louis Sands for thirty-nine thousand two hundred dollars, payable in one and two years. All payable