

other names was that of Mr. R. S. White, who, I am told, got a timber limit in the Northwest, and who is said to be editor of the Montreal GAZETTE. I was astonished to hear this. I know Mr. R. S. White as well as most people, and the last thing I ever dreamed of his going into was timber limits or anything else outside of his ordinary business. He sticks to his desk and attends to his work, and does not bother his head very much about matters outside. I dropped him a line to the gallery to know if he had a timber limit—it was an astonishing revelation to me—and I had this letter in return:

"Mr. Magee asked me in 1882 to apply for timber limit for him. The application was granted, but not a cent was paid thereon, and the whole thing lapsed. I had no interest good, bad, or indifferent in it, and had no intention otherwise than that of promoting his object. I was informed by a notice from the department a year or thereabouts after the application that some money was due on the limit and tore up the paper at once. I never had a word of intercourse with any member of the Government on the subject, and no interest direct or remote in the matter."

Now, that is the result of that letter. Then we have other letters, but surely hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to say that the writing of a letter to a minister is an offence which is to be condemned, an offence which is to justify the passage of a resolution such as that which has been put in your hands. Who does not remember the very famous letter, which, I have no doubt, the gentleman who wrote it was very indignant to think got on to the file, as private letters sometimes do, the famous letter addressed to the late Premier by the leader of the Opposition, in which it was announced that "my friend Moore" wanted a contract for the Goderich harbor, and which recommended "my friend Moore" to the favorable consideration of the Minister. Now in that particular case, there was this difference. No one, has pretended to say, the hon. gentleman has not pretended to say, that anyone of these letters which he has recited here produced any result, that is to say, that it secured for the applicant anything which, under the law, he was not entitled to as applying for it; but in that case we know what did occur, the giving of the contract to the person in whose interest the hon. leader of the Opposition wrote this timely and private letter, at a very much

higher price than a good contractor had offered to do the work for.

Mr. McCALLUM—\$30,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell)—Oh, no; surely not \$30,000.

An hon. Member—\$29,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell)—I think that was about it—\$29,000 lost to the country as the result of a private letter written by the leader of this hon. gentleman, who is horrified that anything of this kind should happen, that members should write letters to a department in matters of this kind. So much for this matter. Then the hon. gentleman referred to

THE SUBJECT OF GRAZING LEASES,

and he told us that we had given away an enormous area of land at 1 cent an acre, which, he said, was 6 per cent. on 16 cents an acre, for grazing purposes in the Northwest; and he hinted, although curiously enough he did not name the people in this case, that these must all have been given to friends of the Government. All I know is, that all the recent applications, or the great majority of the applications that I have seen are from Montana ranchmen, who are going to move their herds over to our side of the line, because they believe that our side is, on the whole, better suited for ranching than theirs. Some of them are from persons who are driven off the United States ranches in consequence of the recent action of President Cleveland in connection with Indian reserves, and they are coming over and bringing their herds to establish their ranche business on our side. But the hon. gentleman says we have given lands far in advance of the requirements of the country. The applications which we are receiving from ranchmen, from Americans who have nothing whatever to do with our politics, who do not care anything for our politics, are of a character which indicate that we are not going in advance of the wants of the country or of those who are disposed to establish the business in the Northwest. He tells us that we have today cattle only to the extent of one for every thirty-eight acres. That, perhaps, as a general statement, may appear to be an extraordinary fact, but, when you know that the rule is that there shall be one for every ten acres, that it requires ten acres of ranch country for the grazing of a single animal, I think you will agree with me that, in view of the fact that many of the