

men in this House to contrast the actual facts, as given to me by the officers of the Department to-date, to the first of May, with the arraignment of the hon. gentleman. He has been good enough to refer to letters, and to one written by myself, which I confess, had passed out of my mind until I heard it quoted either by the hon. gentleman himself or his coadjutor in this work, the member from Huron. It was a letter written on behalf of Mr. T. H. Schneider, who was formerly a resident of Montreal. Now, to show how little politics there was in this application, I may say that Mr. Schneider was the gentleman in whose office was held the caucus, at which the late Mr. Holton presided, when I was a candidate for Montreal West against Mr. Mackenzie, and at which the arrangement was made that I was to be beaten, by Mr. Mackenzie being made the temperance candidate. Mr. Schneider was the gentleman who went round Argenteuil, carrying, although he was a temperance advocate, the jar which went round for the benefit of the late Mr. Cushing at the time he defeated Mr. Abbott, and who was afterwards disqualified for eight years for the conduct chiefly of Mr. Schneider who was a prominent Liberal. My connection with him arose through the friendship which springs up very often in such cases. He and I were brother vestrymen of the same church in Montreal, St. George's Church, of which he was a prominent member, and when he removed to Winnipeg he wrote to me saying he was applying to the Department in connection with some timber limits, and he wanted something done, and asked me to write to the Department to urge action. That feeling of friendship, notwithstanding our political differences, induced me to send the letter referred to. I never knew what was done in that matter until somebody else intervened, and that was done which my letter failed to do. Among other names was that of Mr. R. S. White, who, I am told, got a timber limit in the North-West, and who is said to be editor of the *Montreal Gazette*. I was astonished to hear this. I know Mr. R. S. White as well as most people, and the last thing I ever dreamed of his going into, was timber limits or anything else outside his ordinary business. He sticks to his desk and attends to his work, and does not bother his head very much about matters outside. I dropped him a line to the gallery to know if he had a timber limit—it was an astonishing revelation to me—and I had this letter in return:

"Magee asked me in 1882 to apply for timber limit for him. The application was granted, but not a cent was paid thereon, and the whole thing lapsed. I had no interest good, bad, or indifferent in it, and had no intention otherwise than that of promoting his object. I was informed by a notice from the Department, a year or thereabouts after the application, that some money was due on the limit and tore up the paper at once. I never had a word of intercourse with any member of the Government on the subject, and no interest direct or remote in the matter."

Now, that is the result of that letter. Then he gave other letters, but surely hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to say that the writing of a letter to a Minister is an offence which is to be condemned, an offence which is to justify the passage of a resolution such as that which has been put in your hands. Who does not remember the very famous letter, which I have no doubt the gentleman who wrote it was very indignant to think got on to the file, as private letters sometimes do, the famous letter addressed to the late Premier by the leader of the Opposition, in which it was announced that "my friend Moore" wanted a contract for the Goderich harbor, and which recommended "my friend Moore" to the favorable consideration of the Minister. Now, in that particular case there was this difference. No one has pretended to say, the hon. gentleman has not pretended to say that anyone of these letters which he has recited here produced any result, that is to say, that it secured for the applicant anything which under the law he was not

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

entitled to as applying for it; but in that case we know what did occur, the giving of the contract to the person in whose interest the hon. the leader of the Opposition wrote this timely and private letter, at a very much higher price than a good contractor had offered to do the work for.

Mr. McCALLUM. \$30,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Oh, no; surely not \$30,000.

An hon. MEMBER. \$29,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think that was about it—\$29,000 lost to the country as the result of a private letter written by the leader of this hon. gentleman, who is horrified that anything of this kind should happen, that members should write letters to a Department in matters of this kind. So much for this matter. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the subject of grazing leases; and he told us that we had given away an enormous area of land at 1 cent an acre, which he said was 6 per cent, on 16 cents an acre for grazing purposes in the North-West; and he hinted, although curiously enough he did not name the people in this case, that these must all have been given to friends of the Government. All I know is, that all the recent applications, or the great majority of the applications that I have seen, are from Montana ranchmen, who are going to move their herds over to our side of the line, because they believe that our side is, on the whole, better suited for ranching than theirs. Some of them are from persons who are driven off the United States ranches in consequence of the recent action of President Cleveland in connection with Indian reserves, and they are coming over and bringing their herds to establish their ranche business on our side. But the hon. gentleman says we have given lands far in advance of the requirements of the country. The applications which we are receiving from ranchmen, from Americans who have nothing whatever to do with our politics, who do not care anything for our politics, are of a character which indicate that we are not going in advance of the wants of the country, or of those who are disposed to establish that business in the North-West. He tells us that we have to-day cattle only to the extent of one for every 38 acres. That, perhaps, as a general statement, may appear to be an extraordinary fact, but when you know that the rule is that there shall be one for every 10 acres, that it requires 10 acres of ranche country for the grazing of a single animal, I think you will agree with me that, in view of the fact that many of these leases have been granted within the last year or two years, and that these people have three years within which to complete the filling up of their ranches, tolerable progress has been made in connection with them. We have adopted the plan now, in consequence of the numerous applications which are being received, not from Canadians but from Americans who are coming over to our side and bringing their herds, of charging two cents, and the greatest possible pressure is being brought to bear on the Department by interests that are intimately connected with the North-West, not in any sense political, but connected with the ranche business, representing that we are charging too much, and ought to revert to the one cent an acre. For myself, I do not think we ought, and I believe it is the intention of the Government to adhere to the policy we have adopted of charging two cents. But the hon. gentleman says we have sold these lands—that is practically the statement—at 16 cents an acre, the one cent rental being 6 per cent. on that. What do we give these people? We give them the right to graze their cattle upon a certain area of land, but we reserve to the settler the right of going into that country; and every even-numbered section in that whole ranche country is as open to-day for settlement as if there were no cattle grazing upon it. These people run the risk, therefore, if they get a good ranche, with a good deal of bottom lands upon it, of having settlers