

been adopted by the other side, a policy of slander and vilification against one of the brightest minds in this House and one of the brightest minds in this country, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Now, Sir, I want to say with respect to this suit, that the hon. gentleman made some statements regarding it, some of which were true, and some of which were exactly contrary to the truth. The hon. gentleman stated that I, in company with certain other gentlemen, purchased from the the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a certain portion of land in the Northwest, some 200,000 acres; that we purchased that, he said, for a price some \$3 less per acre than the regular rate, and less than the value of the land at that time. That statement, Sir, is absolutely false and untrue. My associates and myself purchased that land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in an open market, at market rates, and upon the same conditions that any other hon. gentleman in this House or out of it could purchase land. We purchased it, it is true, upon a rising market, because land in the Northwest has been upon a rising market for some years.

An hon. MEMBER. On a Siftonian basis.

Mr. FOWLER. No, not on a Siftonian basis, oh, no, because we paid for it ourselves, the country did not pay for it. There was no tainted money used in payment for that land. I say we purchased that land at \$3.50 per acre, which was the market price at that time for land. We bought it at about the same time that the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company bought theirs for \$1 an acre, about the same quantity of land, or very near it, that that favoured company were able to buy from this generous government. We bought it, Sir, upon the same conditions that every other man could buy land at that time, exactly upon the same conditions. We bought it upon six payments, which is the condition that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company imposes, with 6 per cent on deferred payments. I do not think there is any particular advantage to us coming from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with the contract. Now, Sir, we afterwards sold this land, we sold it to a company that at that time was called the Ontario Town Sites and Farm Syndicate, or something of that sort, and that company's charter was acquired from the Great West Land Company whose contract passed over to them. We sold at an advance. I am very happy to say. I think it is usual in connection with the lands in the Northwest to sell them at an advance. We bought those lands to sell them at an advance, not to sell them at a loss. We expected to sell them at an advance, and we did sell them at an advance. Since the sale of those lands, a friendly suit—I speak advisedly when I say a friendly suit—has been instituted to

Mr. FOWLER.

settle the rights of the parties to the original contract. There has been no disturbance of the friendly and social relations that existed before that contract was made—the hon. members are here at present in this Chamber—there has been no disturbance of the happy relations between us. Sir, is it an unusual thing for people to have to appeal to the courts to settle disputed questions of legal rights? That happens very frequently, even among members of a family, and surely it is admissible among members of the same political party. Now, Sir, I say that the hon. gentleman states what is absolutely not true when he states that we bought that land, for any reason for less than the actual market value of land at that time. I say that he does a wrong and an injury to the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when he insinuates as he does, and almost plainly states, that my hon. friend from North Toronto was responsible for there being any difference of opinion between the member for Prince Edward Island and the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and myself with respect to this matter. I say that the hon. member for North Toronto has nothing whatever to do with the case. The member for North Toronto is simply an officer of the Great West Land Company, and the Great West Land Company are not interested in the decision of that case in one way or another. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, the man with a muck rake, has gone through the length and breadth of the country; he and his colleague from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) have tried in every way they could to rake up something against the member for North Toronto with which to vilify and slander him before this House and the country. But, Sir, nothing speaks so highly of the splendid honesty and integrity of the hon. member for North Toronto as to find that the only thing they could urge against him was this matter that was brought up by the member for Three Rivers. The circumstance was simply this, that the hon. member for North Toronto at one time was a member of a company which had been incorporated in one state of the union and had its head office in another—surely a serious offence. I say, Sir, that there has been no better vindication of the character of the member for North Toronto than the very matter that these hon. gentlemen brought up with the intention of trying to injure him in some way.

Now, Sir, the hon. member had some fun about the finances in connection with this land transaction, he said that these gentlemen had not put a great deal of money into it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had an idea that the gentlemen who formed this syndicate were in the same condition of impecuniosity as himself. A friend of mine has placed in my hand an advertisement of a certain newspaper—I suppose it is a newspaper, they call it the Boundary Creek