

or form, directly or indirectly, up to the time when Mr. Ogilvie was appointed commissioner—from which time he is held responsible for dealing with the subject, I not even having returns of what he has done—are the following: James H. Brown, fifteen gallons of whisky for personal use; Dr. Itimer, a reputable physician of Aymer, Que., who went to Dawson City and was allowed to take fifty gallons of alcohol as part of his stock of drugs; the clerks of the Bank of British North America, who were granted a permit for twenty-five gallons for the personal use of the members of that staff; the clerks of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, a similar permit for twenty-five gallons; T. Trotter, Antigonish, five gallons of liquor for personal use; total, 105 gallons. That is the list. Now, I think the House will bear me out that I have answered the accusation of favouritism. The hon. gentleman went on to make the statement that—

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not wish to leave the House and the country to understand that 105 gallons of liquor is the total quantity for which permits have been issued for the Yukon district between these dates. If the hon. gentleman has not issued these permits, somebody else has issued them. I suppose he will inform the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give that. I will explain the subject to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) fully and completely. "Nothing extenuate nor set down aught in malice." My hon. friend the hon. member for Pictou said this:

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If Mr. Woodworth, instead of attacking the Administration, was in their confidence, was a heeler and a friend, he could do as a heeler and a friend, was able to do in the city of Victoria, a member of the bar, also, that is, to charge and collect a fee of \$500 because he was able, by telegram and by a letter, to obtain from the Minister of the Interior a permit for his client, to send liquor into the Yukon. That is my statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who the client was that got the permit?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I will not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will he tell me by whom the permit was got?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I certainly will not. But I will write to that gentleman, who is a member of the bar, and ask him if I may give his name to the Minister of the Interior and to this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Surely the hon. gentleman will not make a statement without giving the name of the lawyer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, I will. I have been telling hon. gentlemen here all this evening, on these Yukon charges, the reason why some of these names must be withheld.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be a reason why a man who comes from the Yukon is fool enough to think that he will damage his interest by making an honest statement as to the acts of the Government; but there is certainly no reason why a member of the bar of British Columbia, who does business with the Department of the Interior, should be afraid to have his name known in connection with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no reason in this case.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may be allowed to state for the information of the hon. gentleman that the statement he has made is absolutely untrue.

I do not, of course, charge the hon. member for Pictou with insincerity, but, reading this report, it will be evident that the hon. gentleman took the ground that he had not made a positive statement and that, a positive statement not having been made, I could not deny it, there was nothing to deny. That was practically the position he took. Now, here is what he said. Is this a positive statement or is it not? Is it a statement that I could deny if I knew all the facts, or is it not?

If Mr. Woodworth, instead of attacking the Administration, was in their confidence, was a heeler and a friend, he could do as a heeler and a friend of theirs, also, a member of the bar, was able to do in the city of Victoria, that is, to charge and collect a fee of \$500 because he was able, by telegram and by a letter, to obtain from the Minister of the Interior a permit for his client, to send liquor into the Yukon. That is my statement.

He could do what another man did who was able to get a permit from me—that is his statement. Well, I said then that a member of the bar did not get a permit from me. I said the statement was untrue, and I say it is untrue now, and I will prove it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not intend to say what he did. Perhaps he intended to do what he said afterwards he had done, perhaps he intended to insinuate without saying it, but inadvertently he said it—there is no question about that. Now I have read a list of the permits, and the question I am going to consider before this House is whether a member of the bar of the city of Victoria—I do not care how much he charged, he may have charged whatever he liked—got a permit from me upon a telegram as stated by the hon. member for Pictou. I do not know that it would be a crime if he did. If the law gave me authority to give a permit, if it was part of my official duty to decide whether a permit should be given or not, I would decide it; and if, as a matter of policy I thought it was best to give it, and if I gave it on the soli-