

passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act for the suppression of Voluntary and Extra-judicial Oaths.'

"Declared before me at Toronto, in the county of York, this thirty-first day of May, A.D. 1886. (Signed) "D. H. ALLEN.
(Signed) "THOS. P. GALT,
"A Commissioner, &c."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are gone into, I feel called upon to speak with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) respecting my great criminality in dealing in public lands. I was not here when the hon. gentleman spoke, and I was rather surprised when I was told that I had been put in the category of those concerned in public plunder. I was particularly surprised at this, because, whatever my sins otherwise might be, I had never dealt in any lands, or scrip, or limits of any kind from the time I came of age until this moment. Never did I apply on behalf of myself or of any client that I can remember for any lands or privileges from the Crown in any way, and, therefore, I could not understand how I could be implicated in the charges brought by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). I, therefore, could not well understand how I was implicated, but, upon reading the hon. gentleman's speech, which I did since I was well enough to do so, I found that my sin was in having a son, that my son was practising in the North-West, and his sin was in having for a partner the son of Sir Charles Tupper, and that these two gentlemen, practising lawyers, had actually committed the great sin of dealing in lands and speculating and making applications as others did in the North-West. The language of the hon. gentleman is most extraordinary, and I was going to say, if it was parliamentary, most infamous. This is his language:

"Now, Sir, I find that the son of the First Minister of this Dominion, and the son of Sir Charles Tupper, have for years been using their all-powerful influence with this Administration, in order to secure large slices of the public domain and the public resources of this country. For years they have been trading on and speculating in that influence, and in the resources of the Dominion secured thereby. I say the startling disclosures that have been so far made in the equity side of the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba are enough to arouse the indignation of any people in any country."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this charge, if it means anything, means that my son and the son of Sir Charles Tupper, using their influence with their parents, had secured slices of land improperly in this country. Now, I state here, in my place as a member of Parliament, and on my honor as a gentleman, that neither of those two young men ever addressed me, or spoke to me, or approached me, directly or indirectly, upon any claim or application that they were about to make, and I would further venture to say that both Mr. Stewart Tupper and Mr. Hugh John Macdonald are honest and honorable men, and I am quite satisfied that they would not do anything which would disgrace their parents or disgrace themselves. They are, I am happy to say—because I am interested in my son's prosperity—doing very well as lawyers; they have a very considerable business, and they deal, as all other legal men are doing and have a right to do, and as everyone does in the North-West, with land purchases. It is their affair altogether, and it is too much to say that, because their parents happen to be public men, they alone of all Her Majesty's subjects in Canada should be precluded from doing legitimate business if they choose to do so. I said that I was perfectly ignorant of any one of the transactions mentioned here, but, being satisfied that the honor of these gentlemen was without stain, I caused enquiries to be made. It appears that the statements that were made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) were based on certain exhibits filed in an equity suit in Manitoba. The firm of Macdonald & Tupper had two partners, Mr. McArthur & Mr. Dexter. The partnership was severed, there was a difference between the partners as to the accounts, and they have gone into chancery to settle the accounts between them, and these papers

Mr. EDGAR.

which were laid before the court were published in one of the newspapers, and hence the hon. member for West Huron gathers these facts, which he utterly distorts, utterly misstates, and grossly and malignantly insinuates as being dishonorable and discreditable to these two young gentlemen and to myself and to Sir Charles Tupper. Now, here is the first case, which he refers to in the following language:

"From the evidence, so far as it has been submitted—and it has only been partially submitted—these two young men appear to have secured a timber limit on the Swan River in the name of one John McMahon. Several partners were interested in that limit, and these two young men had a ninth blind share in it. But that was not sufficient to compensate these two young men for the valuable services they had rendered in securing the limit, and so the Order in Council granting it was cancelled. A new deal was effected; a new Order in Council was issued, granting the timber limit to T. P. Walsh, for T. P. Walsh, John McMahon, the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, and Macdonald & Tupper, and in that timber limit Macdonald & Tupper held a three-fifths interest; and the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, pet and friend of this Administration, offered to sell his interest in it for \$50,000. I have always been amazed and astounded, considering the charges that have been made against Edgar Dewdney by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite in Parliament and out of Parliament, who have denounced this man as utterly unfit for the position he occupies—I say I have been surprised that a man so described by the Government's own friends, should have been retained in his place until a rebellion broke out, to some extent through his instrumentality, and even after it broke out. The mystery is no longer a mystery, this litigation has unravelled it."

I sent over to the Department of the Interior to find out all about this John McMahon and his grant, and these are the facts, as conveyed to me by the officers of that Department:

"On the 18th January, 1883, an application from John McMahon was received in the Department for a timber limit on the Swan River. This application was originally signed J. B. McArthur, but McArthur's name was erased and John McMahon's substituted therefor. On the 16th March, 1883, an amended application was received from John McMahon by his attorneys, Macdonald & Tupper. This application was granted on the usual conditions, which McMahon found so onerous that, on the 15th November, 1883, he surrendered the limit, having paid \$250 ground rent thereon. On the 19th December, 1883, the same limit was granted to T. P. Walsh. Walsh never complied with the conditions, and has therefore no longer an interest in the limit, which remains in the Crown."

That disposes of that. The next case is this:

"Macdonald & Tupper also applied for, and were able to secure in the name of John Apter, a timber limit on the Rolling River, in which they held a fourth blind share, and for which a firm of manufacturers offered \$25,000, although it cost these young men, I suppose, but \$250, if they paid for it."

The memorandum which comes from the Department is this:

"Apter, through his solicitors, McArthur & Dexter, applied on the 24th August, 1883, for a limit on the Rolling River. Order in Council, 27th October, 1883, granting Apter limit on usual conditions passed. On 25th March, 1885, Hugh J. Macdonald applies, on behalf of his client, for an extension of time in which to make the survey. He is informed that, upon the receipt of one year's ground rent (\$250), his request will be complied with. This was paid on the 14th August, 1885, and Apter notified accordingly to his address, Niles P. O., Michigan. The Department has had a good deal of correspondence with Apter, who is clearly a *bona fide* applicant, acting for himself alone."

This is all on that. Then:

"These same young men, in the name of Alexander Moffatt, secured the passage of an Order in Council on the 20th August, 1883, granting them a timber limit of fifty square miles in the disputed territory, in which they held one-fifth blind share. They also obtained a limit on Swan River in the name of someone unknown, in which they had one-fifth blind share."

In regard to that, I have this:

"On the 8th November, 1882, Moffatt applied for a limit on the Leaf River. This limit was afterwards found to be in the disputed territory. In accordance with the then policy of the Department, it was granted, but no license has been issued since the decision of the Privy Council. Moffatt is a member of the firm of Moffatt & Caldwell, bankers, Winnipeg. He is a responsible man, and there is nothing to connect the firm of Macdonald & Tupper with the application beyond the fact that Hugh Macdonald wrote a private letter to the Deputy Minister."

That is Mr. Burgess —

"—telling him who Moffatt was, and later McArthur, owing to Moffatt's absence in England, applied for extension of leave within which to make survey."