

believe when they invested. But, Mr. Speaker, they could have come to Canada if they had thought proper under this magnificent Ontario system, they could have got their timber limits in the ordinary way; but they seemed to have preferred to purchase from the hon. gentleman opposite, on his representations, though God knows what there was in him to commend him to them. They seemed to prefer to take his recommendation, and they gave him an enormous sum of money for the limits he controlled. Now that was a transaction where the money really passed.

Mr. COOK. I just wish to correct the hon. gentleman. The statement that he is making is false.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not answer that. The hon. gentleman's business matters are not matters that concern me; but I do not think his statement that that is false will go down outside this House—of course here it must be accepted. Then finally we had the colonisation companies referred to. We were told those companies were an enormous source of corruption in connection with this Government, and the extraordinary thing is that we were told that those companies had actually obstructed settlement in the North West. The hon. gentleman ought to have known, and could have known if he had made enquiries or had visited the country, that but for the colonisation companies the settlers to be found on those tracts never would have been there. The result in connection with those companies has been this: In that case, as in the case of the timber limits, there were a large number of applications for colonisation companies, a large number of applicants for the privilege—for that is all they obtained—of placing settlers in the North-West, and obtaining payment for doing that by a grant of land at a lower price than the ordinary price. Let me say this—that hon. gentlemen opposite adopted this principle; they recognised the importance of securing outside influence in settling the country to such an extent that they actually passed an Order in Council by which they gave to people 80 acres of land for every settler they brought into the North-West and put upon a homestead. That is the policy they adopted; that is to say, taking the land at \$2 an acre, they gave \$160 for every settler brought into the North-West. There were, as I have said, a large number of applications for colonisation companies, no less than 260 applications, of which only 117 were authorised by Order in Council. But, as in the case of the timber licenses and timber limits, the Order in Council did nothing. It required before anything was done that a contract should be signed by the company under which they undertook to perform the duties imposed on them; and the number of contracts entered into, that is the number of colonisation companies which actually went into operation, was 28 out of 260 applications. I do not think those gentlemen ought to be charged with anything wrong in having applied for the privilege of colonising the North-West. That certainly is not the ground of complaint made against them. The number of contracts, I say, is 28, and the number of members of the House of Commons whose names appear as incorporators or shareholders of those companies is, so far as the records of the Department show, six; and curiously enough they are equally divided between the two sides of the House, three to each. And if my friends on this side will not consider that I reflect unduly on them, I venture to say that the great influence was on the other side of the House. I find that one of those members was Hon. Alexander Mackenzie; and yet the hon. gentleman not satisfied with having turned the hon. member for East York out of the leadership, not satisfied with having brought him down to sorrow and to what I fear is very nearly his grave, he insults him in this House to-night by intimating that his joining a colonisation company was an act of corruption of which no public man should be guilty. Who is the next? A gentleman who is

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

held in the highest respect by both sides of the House, an intimate friend of your own, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gunn, of Kingston. The third was a gentleman who, I am bound to say, turns up in pretty nearly everything, Mr. Hugh Sutherland. On this side of the House we had Mr. Small, Mr. Wallace (York), and another gentleman whose name I cannot distinctly make out as it is written in a very small hand. These are the only members of the House in connection with the colonisation companies.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any in connection with printing companies?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There were five Senators. They were, the late colleague of the hon. gentleman opposite, and present leader of the Liberal party in the Senate, Hon. R. W. Scott, Hon. Mr. Reesor, Hon. Thomas Ryan, Hon. A. W. Ogilvie and the late Mr. Gibbs. So altogether there were eleven members of Parliament, Senate and Commons, and of those six were Conservatives and five Reformers, including among the Reformers the leader of the late Government and the leader in the Senate of the late Government. That is perhaps the best answer that can be given to the charge that being connected with a colonisation company unfits a man for a seat in Parliament, and lays him open to the suspicion of being influenced by corrupt motives. Those colonisation companies, moreover, did not simply get their contracts and do nothing. The Government received from those companies \$760,253 in hard cash, evidence, I think, and pretty strong evidence of the good spirit with which they went in to complete the work they had undertaken when they entered into the contract. One company alone, the Saskatchewan Homestead Company, paid \$156,000 to the Government. In addition to that we have the sworn statement of their auditors, after an examination of their books, that the company had expended in securing settlement, in aiding settlers, in putting them upon the land, in erecting mills in some cases, in building roads, in supplying the settlers with seed grain and in assisting them in every possible way, not less than \$367,932, in addition to the amount paid to the Government. Yet we are to be told that the policy which induced numbers of persons, men outside Parliament altogether, for the number of members of Parliament was infinitesimally small, to undertake the colonisation of the North-West, is to be denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite as if it was a violation of the duty of the Government and reflected in some way upon the character of members of this House. I do not think it is necessary I should say more in relation to the arraignment of the Government by the hon. gentleman opposite. I have dealt with the several points to which he referred. I have shown you, Sir, that as to the timber limits any man could come in and get them under the regulations; that the policy of competition is now the absolute policy, and that as to one-third of the cases where limits were given since 1878, they were let by public competition. As to the coal areas, I have shown that they are open to anyone to go in and take a coal area, by paying his \$10, and that the result has been largely to reduce the price of fuel. I have shown that as to the grazing lands, we have received an enormous amount in actual cash, and that we have the advantage of a lower price for the food supplied to the Indians and the Mounted Police. I have shown as to the colonisation companies that we have secured through their instrumentality and the work they have done, important settlements in the North-West country which would not have been there to-day without their exertions; that the country has received a large sum of money—over \$750,000; that there has been received in connection with the settlement of the North-West \$365,000 outside of that; and that all that has been done under the operation of a policy open to everybody, which everybody can take advantage of, and that in rela-