

PER. Yes, I gentlemen here charges, the must be with-

be a reason the Yukon is will damage statement; but there member of ho does busi- the Interior. name known

D FISHERIES.

RIOR. I may mation of the t he has made

hon. member but, reading that the hon. at he had not that, a pos- een made, I s nothing to the position he said. Is this not? Is it if I knew all

attacking the fidence, was a as a heeler and er of the bar, tectoria, that is, 500 because he etter, to obtain r a permit for e Yukon. That

did who was e—that is his that a mem- mit from me, ue, and I say ill prove it. an did not ld. Perhaps e said after- e intended to t inadvertent- uestion about of the permits, g to consider a member of —I do not care have charged mit from me the hon. mem- that it would law gave me it was part of ether a permit ould decide it; thought it was t on the soll-

citation of a member of the bar of British Columbia, I do not know that that would be any dreadful crime. I did give some permits, but not just in that way, and I am prepared to answer for them. I do not know that there would be any crime in doing what the hon. gentleman charged, but what I am prepared to say now is that it is not so, that is all.

Mr. HAGGART. Did not that party get a permit from your office in any way?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot find out who the party was. Tell me who he was, then I will tell you.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps I have not followed the debate very closely. I thought that the name of Mr. Woodworth was mentioned, and the hon. gentleman denied that he had given him a permit. I may be mistaken. Did this man Woodworth get a permit?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understand my hon. friend was not here the other evening. The name of Mr. Woodworth came in because he was the man who wrote a letter which the hon. member for Pictou was quoting. But Woodworth had nothing to do with the permit, nothing whatever. I gave last year the list of permits which I had granted, and in that list there is no permit that was granted upon a telegram from any lawyer in the city of Victoria, and I have granted no permits since—that is permits for commercial use; so where is the hon. gentleman's statement? In that list there is a permit that was granted upon a telegram from Victoria, and the telegram is here. But it was not granted upon a telegram from a member of the bar or a heeler of the Grit party; it was on a telegram from the Hon. Jas. H. Turner, leader of the Conservative party in British Columbia. If the hon. gentlemen want to look at it, they can look at it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it, read it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say in the first place that I had received, I think, three applications, one from a man named Chambers, and another from a man named Menzies, the last permit, I think that was granted—the last permit for liquor for commercial use. First, I received a letter from Chambers, then I got this letter from Mr. Turner, who requested me to give a permit to Sullivan, McLeod and McPhee. I did not know the men, I never saw them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. An Tories.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose they are Tories. In answer to this letter I wrote to Mr. Turner and said that I regretted that I could not give the permit, that I was in great doubt about the advisability of granting any more permits, and had about come to the conclusion that I

would not do it. I had also told Chambers that I would not give him a permit. Then I got this telegram from Mr. Turner, dated 21st of August, 1897:

Have had no reply to my telegram—

There must be a mistake of a day or two about the dates of the issue of the permit. They probably refer to dates entered upon the files here.

Have had no reply to my telegram re permit to Sullivan & Co. It is urgently wanted, as last steamer sails in few days. Please wire permit to collector customs.

That would be after my answer to his letter of the 14th of July, but before he had received it. Then he telegraphs later:

Will you wire reply to my letter of 20th July?

J. H. TURNER.

In response to either one of these telegrams, whichever I got the last, I thought the matter over, discussed it with my deputy, and solely out of consideration for the request of the Prime Minister of British Columbia, I decided to grant that permit. I said to my deputy: Well, I have told these other men—I think two of them, one certainly—that I could not give him a permit; now I will have to give him the permit. If I give it to one man I must to the other. So I gave permits to both. Then I closed the bill, as I have said, and we have not granted a permit since for liquor for commercial use. Now I must say this, that I do not believe there is a fair-minded man upon either side of the House who will not admit that I am correct in saying that there is no possible palliation for the unfairness of the hon. member for Pictou in attacking me about a telegram alleged to have been sent, and positively refusing to give me the name of the man that sent it or the name of the man it referred to. Why, Mr. Speaker, in my department last year, I am told by my deputy, over 175,000 letters and telegrams have come in and gone out. Would the hon. gentleman expect me to remember a telegram when he won't give me the name? Now, I will tell you what I have done. The name not being given, my secretary and my deputy have taken the directory of British Columbia, and they have looked up the name of every lawyer in Victoria. They searched the files of the Department of the Interior and they searched my private files. There is not a telegram from a lawyer there in regard to a permit that can be found.

Mr. FOSTER. That is conclusive of nothing.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If a telegram has been sent to me by a lawyer in Victoria, and is not on the file, if I have received a telegram somewhere else, when I have not been in Ottawa, or a telegram which has been lost or mislaid, then I tell the hon. gentleman, that the man who sent that telegram got no permit in reply to it.