

is no ground for the attacks made on the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, oh.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not a bit of ground; and if the hon. gentleman whose pure soul I know is terribly horrified at the idea of a public man making the slightest use of his public position for his private objects—if the hon. gentleman says so, I am bound to accept his statement, but I would hardly have expected him to say so, from his general idea how public companies are organised and carried on.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a wonderful statement, I can scarcely grasp it. State it plainly.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman wants my reason, I will give it. An hon. gentleman who has sat in this House for sessions past, who has made use of his position in this House against a public corporation in this country, and who has openly avowed that he has done it because the manager of that corporation did not pay him the sum that he thought his services to that corporation were worth, it does not suit that hon. gentleman well to assume the high tone he has taken and exhibit the pure soul he has exhibited to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has got something specific. Go on, now.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was good enough to say what we had to guard against in this connection was the over-charging of these railways with capital account, and in consequence the imposing on the people too high tariffs in order to meet these charges. What is the fact? The first, the only fixed charge, practically, on these railway corporations, is the bonded debt. Parliament fixes the limitation of the amount of the bonded debt, and in this case, if I remember rightly, the bonded debt was limited to \$20,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Put on another five.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Whether the amount be \$20,000 or \$25,000, the argument is precisely the same. The hon. gentleman, as a member of this House, has, if I mistake not, not offered any opposition to this amount. It is quite true, the hon. gentleman is a member of the Railway Committee, but he has practically abdicated his function as a member of the committee, unless there is a party advantage to be gained, for we have never the advantage of seeing him at the meetings, except when an opportunity presents itself for party advantage, and then he always turns up. But it was his business to attend the meetings of the committee and oppose this amount being fixed, if he thought it was too high. It was not opposed, it was granted by the Railway Committee without opposition; it was assented to by Parliament without opposition, and therefore it is the limit fixed by Parliament, to which the fixed charges on that railway can be raised. It is therefore simply childish to talk about our having to be careful about the fixed charges, in view of the fact that they are within the purview of Parliament, that they have been fixed by Parliament, and may be guarded by Parliament in the future. Then, as to the grant of subsidy by the Government. There is not a dollar of subsidy granted by the Government or an acre of land, which is not dependent on the construction of the railway. Why do we give a grant? We give it that the people in that district may have the advantage of a railway running through it; and in this particular case we have declared that not an acre of land shall be given before fifty miles of the road are constructed, and then the balance of the subsidy shall only be

given as the road is constructed, from time to time, on a fixed mileage. Under those circumstances, the subsidy which we give is one that must be earned before it can be received. It cannot be trafficked in, except upon the basis of the construction of the road; and the construction of the road is what is desired, when this Parliament gives a subsidy. Is there anyone opposed to the granting of a subsidy towards this road? Nobody, I have heard, has ventured to say the Government did not act wisely in granting the subsidy. Everybody admits the road runs through an important section of the country, and therefore deserves to be subsidised and assisted out of the public domain. We have had votes from the people of Manitoba, and from members of Parliament on both sides, in favor of granting a subsidy. There is no question whatever about that; and when we grant it in such a way that not one single acre will be given until fifty miles of the road are built, the only way in which trafficking can take place in reference to this charter is on the basis of the construction of the railway, thus giving the people the advantage of railway connection under the fixed charge agreed to by Parliament. We are told, however, that members of Parliament ought not in any way to be interested in railway charters. There are more ways than one in which a member of Parliament may be interested in a railway corporation. Suppose we declare that members shall not be so interested. I know there have been cases in which prominent members of Parliament were counsel for railway corporations. I know that presidents of important railway corporations in England have announced the opinions they had from counsel in Canada, members of Parliament, and even declared the amount, \$2,000, which they paid for the opinion. That, of course, would not influence the particular gentleman who received it, in his parliamentary course, although it may be regarded as a somewhat significant fact that everything the corporation opposed in Parliament that hon. gentleman opposed as well. I do not say the two things are in any way connected, but if I were disposed to deal with the question in the spirit of hon. gentlemen opposite, I might assume that what is possible must be true. I might very well connect the two things together, and point out that a prominent member of this House could be connected with and influenced by a railway corporation just as easily and as well as if his name were in the charter and he was getting advantages as the result of his name being in the charter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. By printing contracts, for instance.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In this particular case what we have to do is to see, if possible, that this railway is built. I believe its construction would have been commenced before this, but for the preliminary charge against the road for the fifty miles of grading done on the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. It is a serious matter to ask contractors or capitalists to enter upon an enterprise of this kind with a first charge upon it of \$100,000 to \$125,000 for which they received nothing, since it is not as if this road had been graded on the present line and the company were to get the advantage of the work done, but they have to pay the amount on a piece of road which they are not permitted to use at all. That has been one of the difficulties to be contended with. The Railway Committee properly determined that these people should be paid, and so reported to this House, and this House is now asked simply this: that certain negotiations having taken place, certain progress having been made in the negotiations for the construction of the road, we shall not interrupt those negotiations until, at any rate, a reasonable time has elapsed in which it may be shown that they are negotiations looking to the construction of the railway or that they are not of a serious character. If we find that the company are unable to construct the railway; if we find that the president is unable