

ably the hon. gentleman was not aware that he had got such a very good bargain in this matter. Should there be any such, I would call their attention to a few letters written by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). You will observe that the Order in Council was granted on the 17th April, and a week before that date he writes as follows:—

“10th April, 1882.

“(Re Limit.)

“MY DEAR ADAMS,—After calling at the office eight or ten times I got the enclosed copy of Order in Council. It will be pushed through very likely to-morrow if the Government is not too lazy. You will see they give us 400 square miles to choose from. If this is not satisfactory I do not know what is. Get your surveyor ready, and I will have his instructions in a few days. They give us six months.

“Faithfully,  
“J. C. RYKERT.”

Then comes the postscript, and perhaps, like many others, it is the most important part of the letter.

“If you can get \$40,000 let it go, and we will get another. Try McCarthy. Perhaps he will buy.”  
McCarthy would not, though.

Mr. MITCHELL. What McCarthy is that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, I understood, was the hon. member for North Simcoe; but I am open to correction on that point, if I am mistaken. Then, Mr. Speaker, we find that, on the 24th April, this gentleman who did not know that the limit was of any particular value, writes as follows:—

“24th April, 1882.

“MY DEAR ADAMS,—I have daily gone to the office for instructions and copy of Order in Council. I now enclose order, which you will see gives you the right over 400 miles. This is the largest privilege ever given to select from, and none has ever passed in the same speedy manner. I enclose memorandum of one of the clerks, showing he will prepare instructions in a day or two. I will keep at him daily. Get ready to leave at once. Laidlaw offered to bet me \$1,000 I could not get the order passed for you, as he had been refused in January and again in February. You ought to get up company if possible and sell half for, say, \$85,000, or the whole for \$70,000. If this is done I will go for something else.

“Faithfully,  
“J. C. RYKERT.”

And on the 24th July, this gentleman who was not sure that the bargain was worth anything, writes:

“St. CATHARINES, 24th July, 1882.

“MY DEAR ADAMS,—I am in receipt of your favor, and am pleased to learn that the limit has panned out all right, as I was in great dread it would be a failure. I am in a certain sense glad that Laidlaw has failed, as he acted so infernal mean about it. I think if you can get \$80,000 you had better sell immediately, or less than that. If as good as you say the C.P.R. can give us at least \$60,000 and expenses. You better see them at once, and if they will bite at all tell them I will assist them in getting all the timber within the twenty square miles. It is important to realise the cash, when we can look out for more. Have you stopped them from cutting? This is necessary. I see by the papers that the C.P.R. is cutting timber at the Cypress Hills. I do not think it will pay to work. The cash is very much better. I would not delay at all in seeing the company. Perhaps Muckle can urge them to buy.

“Faithfully,  
“J. C. RYKERT.”

We find the value goes up by leaps and bounds, according to the hon. gentleman. First it was \$40,000, then \$70,000, and then we find it was underestimated at \$80,000. On the 1st August, 1882,—because it is really of some moment that we should understand how well posted the hon. gentleman was in these matters—he writes from St. Catharines as follows:—

“I still am of the opinion that you had better sell out boldly and get the cash, if they will pay you \$75,000 or \$80,000. We would then be in a position to go in for something larger, if possible. That notice in the paper is pretty well got up. I guess I can see who wrote it or dictated it. Can you not get some railway man in whom you have confidence to go to Van Horne and tell him the Railway Company ought to purchase, and that the limit is well worth \$150,000. Some such a game as this might take well.”

On the 19th August, 1882, I find another letter dated St. Catharines:

“I see by the report that there are 37½ miles of timber instead of 50 miles. If this is all timber, as it appears to be, you will have a grand future. Would it not be well to make an effort to get up a company, putting in the land at \$150,000. We might take stock to the amount of one-third. How would it do to give Wolf, say, \$5,000 to get up a company, or whatever you can agree upon. I read Laidlaw's letter. He thinks you are mistaken as to the limit he applied for having no timber. Now that it is well known that you have a grand limit, I think there will be no difficulty in getting up a large company. I want Mrs. R.'s half to bring her in \$50,000 if possible. I hope you got telegraph, and that you have sent me the outh.”

I think, Sir, that correspondence will show tolerably clearly—remembering that the Order in Council was passed on the 17th of April—that the hon. gentleman had a pretty good idea that he had got a very valuable property. Sir, it is not often that the hon. gentleman is guilty of the sin—for I suppose he will consider it such—of underestimating a property that belongs to him; but, Sir, it would appear from an important document which has been laid on the Table of the House that, fast as the hon. gentleman raised his price from \$40,000 to \$70,000, from \$70,000 to \$80,000, from \$80,000 to \$150,000, he had not yet measured the full value and importance of his plunder. The following receipt, dated Winnipeg, Manitoba, 16th January, 1883, witnesses the crown of his virtuous efforts, and his success, as he says himself, in making provision for his old age:

“WINNIPEG, MAN., 16th January, 1883.

“Received from John Adams thirty-five thousand dollars in cash by drafts 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 to the order of Mrs. N. M. Rykert, and in full of the moneys payable to her under agreement.

“J. C. RYKERT,  
“Her Attorney.”

Now, Sir, this shows, as I have said, and as the hon. gentleman has admitted, that the plunder was “honorably divided.” As to the question of the use of influence by the hon. gentleman, I must refer you to the hon. gentleman's correspondence *passim*. The hon. gentleman, on the 11th of April, 1882, writing to Mr. Adams, says:

“I to-day saw McCarthy, and he was terribly surprised to hear that I had got the limit, as he was refused point-blank. He is willing to join with us in the survey, and I go to Hamilton to get Laidlaw to say where he wants the limit. He has written me he will do almost anything if I will assist him in getting his. I will write you from home on Thursday. The Order in Council went before the Government to-day, and it is likely it will pass at once. Instructions will then be given to the surveyor. We are awfully lucky, as the Deputy told me that no other man could have forced them to yield.”

On the 16th of April, he writes:

“The Order was passed several days ago. Laidlaw is to meet me in Hamilton to-morrow. He has not yet got his order, and is now of the opinion that I have more influence than McCarthy, who told me he was refused by the Government.”

Again, on the 21st of April: