

an applicant, with a member of Parliament at his back. (whether of the legal or any other profession), at the expense of the public treasury, or to the disadvantage of an earlier applicant ready to comply with the conditions of the Department, he is guilty of a gross wrong to the first applicant, and commits an offence against the public. An honest Parliament would treat an offence of that kind with prompt punishment. My experience leads me to believe that applications of the class in question are hindered, rather than promoted, by the interference of members of Parliament, especially where there are prior applicants. The facts developed in the present case corroborate this conclusion. The prior application of Laidlaw, which seemed to cover a part of the territory applied for by Adams, was the first obstacle. Then followed the Canadian Pacific Railway claim. These conflicting pretensions arrested action in the department until removed by arrangement between the applicants. I see no departmental wrong in the ultimate solution, and no evidence of loss to the public treasury.

"As regards the sale to Sands, I fail to discover any ground for parliamentary interference or question on that matter. There was no stipulation against transfer of the right to cut timber by a sub-lessee. Whether he paid too much or too little, was of no consequence to the Department, and is certainly a dispute *ultra vires* of the Canadian Parliament.

"It seems equally clear that the re-publication in its 'Votes and Proceedings' of private letters surreptitiously made public for a political and party purpose is a waste of public money, and altogether beneath the dignity of Parliament.

"I predict that the Opposition will not provoke a comparison of the timber and land transactions of members of Parliament during the Mackenzie régime and the present one. History, in my opinion, will record mistakes and errors, if not misdeeds, in both.

"Believing that your case presents no legitimate ground for formal accusation in Parliament, I presume you will not need my professional services.

"You are much better able to defend yourself than any counsel unused to parliamentary manoeuvres, and even an old parliamentarian would probably make a poor exhibit in matters of detail in a case so many sided as yours.

"I remain,  
Very faithfully yours,

(Signed) "WM. McDOUGALL

"J. C. RYKERT, Esq., Q. C., M. P."

I fortified myself, Sir, with this opinion, which I sought with the view specially of bringing this matter at the earliest possible day before Parliament. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in this exhibition of temper, has somewhat insulted members on this side of the House. He seems to think that I am not the only sinner, although I am the greatest sinner. Sir, the hon. gentleman might have discovered sinners on his own side of the House as well as on this, but he does not propose to let the House know who they are. But it is not an evidence that a party is in despair when it is obliged to expose before Parliament private and confidential correspondence which is eight years of age, for the purpose of casting obloquy on the member who has written it and driving him from Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that I am pleading the Statute of Limitations. I make no such plea or defence. I am desirous that the whole matter should be fully investigated and probed to the very bottom; but there are circumstances connected with this transaction which have not yet been brought to light, and which ought to be investigated by a committee, in order that the House may have full cognisance of all the facts. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the whole matter was discussed in 1882? Does he not know that it was discussed in 1887 before the electors of the County of Lincoln, whom I have represented in Parliament for the last thirty years? But now, with his party driven to the last ditch, he thinks he can

MR. RYKERT.

throw some obloquy on myself by dragging it before the public again. There is nothing more contemptible in an individual than to make public a man's private correspondence, and when we find that this whole arraignment against myself is based on some private and confidential correspondence, which was stolen from myself, it is not worthy of this Parliament to discuss it for one single moment. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any charges to make against my public record, why do they not bring them forward? I have been told repeatedly by the public press, and by parties supporting the other side of the House, that they were going to discuss my public record; but they have ransacked it for the last thirty years, and they have been unable to find a single vote which I gave contrary to my pledges or in violation of the principles of the great Conservative party which I have consistently supported. My whole record shows my consistency as a public man. If to support the right hon. gentleman, leader of the Government, and the Conservative party for the last thirty years, and to endeavor to make this Confederation a great and prosperous country, is a crime, I have yet to learn it; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not point to my public record. I should like the hon. member for South Oxford to name a day for the purpose of discussing our political records, when I should be prepared to challenge the hon. gentleman on his past history, and show what kind of a man this gentleman is who now constitutes himself my public prosecutor. I should like to know how the hon. gentleman would like to hear read his private correspondence with "My dear Boyle," and with Campbell in the city of Winnipeg, with regard to half-breed lands?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perfectly willing; read away.

Mr. RYKERT. No, Sir; there is no man on this side of the House who would be guilty of making public the private letters of the hon. gentleman. But, Sir, they are well known. There is one thing, however, that I would say: I have never dragged money out of this country or out of my party, and then gone and deliberately vilified and run down my country. I hope the hon. gentleman can say the same thing, but I do not think he could stand up here and say truthfully that he has not done that. This is not the first instance that we have had in this country of private correspondence being exposed; but the records of the English Parliament are barren of anything of that kind. No person in the English House would dare to stand up and make use of private correspondence for the purpose of formulating a charge against an hon. member; he would be hissed out of Parliament, and would not dare to make a second appearance in the House of Commons. But, unfortunately, in this country we have a precedent for the act of the hon. gentleman. This is not the first instance of stolen letters being used on the floor of Parliament, and of the hon. gentleman having allied himself to letter stealers. We well recollect that some years ago, when an attack was made against the right hon. the leader of the Government, based upon the Pacific Railway charges, those charges were formulated upon private correspondence stolen from an office in the city of Montreal; and we know very well that the gentleman who was most prominent in that attack