

the recommendation of the then Minister of the Interior, now the Minister of Finance, confirming that grant with certain modifications; and later on we find that the present Minister of the Interior, in November, 1855, recommended the Governor in Council to pass, and the Governor in Council did pass, an Order in Council granting further modifications, all to the advantage of this company. Now, to-day we find these grave charges made against the *personnel* comprising and controlling this company; and it appears to me, that as trustees of the property of the people of Canada, we are not justified in handing over the property to this particular company, until these grave charges are investigated and disproved, and if not disproved, then in not refusing to make such a grant. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), stated that he did not desire to be the first to suffer by a stringent rule. Is there any rule clearer and better understood by men of honor, than that a trustee must not commit a breach of trust? Who are the people's representatives and trustees of the public wealth of Canada, but the Parliament of Canada? The hon. member for West Toronto is one of those trustees. He says: Introduce a Bill, and say it shall be unlawful hereafter for members to commit breaches of trust, so that hereafter it will be unlawful for me to commit a fraud on those I represent here, and I will vote for such a measure. But the hon. gentleman says, you have not shown me such a measure in black and white as being on the Statute-book, and therefore I insist on retaining for the present the fruits of this breach of trust. I would deplore it if public opinion in Canada should ever become so degraded that we would find it necessary to pass an Act of Parliament declaring that members shall not be guilty of—shall I say stealing the public property. I would ask those hon. gentlemen why did we not have this investigation before the Bill was passed in the House to its present stage? When it was before the Railway Committee an investigation was moved for by the hon. member for Northumberland, and had that motion been carried the charges made would have been investigated, and if proved untrue—and I would be glad if they could be proved untrue—then we would have had no difficulty in dealing with this case to-day, for there would have been no conflict of testimony on the subject. But now if called on to vote on this measure these charges remain unproved or uncontradicted, and we are doing what clearly we have no right to do, because we have due notice from two hon. members that there are circumstances in connection with the transaction which, if their statements are true, should make us refuse to give this grant. Under these circumstances it appears to me that we have but one course open to us. If we propose to carefully guard the public domain we should investigate these charges. We should give those hon. gentlemen an opportunity to make good their charges. If we cannot make them good it will be to the advantage of those who are at present affected by them. I am surprised the Government is not the first to ask for the investigation. I was amazed that the Government, when the matter was brought before them in the Railway Committee, voted against an investigation. I was surprised that hon. gentlemen whose characters are affected by these insinuations and charges did not rise in their places with indignation and demand an investigation before progress was made with the measure. But Sir, they have not done so. They have had every opportunity, and late as it is, I would be glad to give way on this occasion and allow the Government to adopt the suggestion I am about to make, and have the Bill referred to committee for the purpose of enquiring into these matters. But, Sir, should the Government not see fit to do so, I beg leave to move the following motion. I may say if you refer to the Bill which is before the House, you will find in section 3 the names of the directors, and as has been stated before, amongst those names are the names of four

Mr. MULOCK.

members of this House. If these charges are true, if those hon. members are parties to those charges, they are not to be trusted with this land. The Minister of the Interior, with sophistry, said he thought they could do no harm with this land. But, Sir, if these charges are true, they can do harm with this land. If these charges are true they could lock up or misapply the proceeds of this land. These charges are that these gentlemen are not engaged in a *bona fide* enterprise in building the railway, but for the purpose of speculating in the grant which is proposed to be given. Supposing those hon. gentlemen were to stand up and admit the truth of those charges, would the House grant that land? If it would not grant it then, it cannot grant it if the charges are true in spite of the admissions. Would the House grant that aid if those hon. gentlemen should stand up and admit that they were to receive a bonus of \$50,000 amongst themselves? They have not admitted it; I hope it cannot be proved, but if it were proved would the House still grant public money with which to pay such bonuses? If, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) says, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) still stipulates that they were to be paid \$675,000 to be derived from the land which is proposed to be given, would under these circumstances, Parliament grant this land for such a purpose? If any such charge can be proved, the House would not be justified in making such a grant. I take no responsibility in connection with these charges. I know nothing about whether they are true or not. I have doubts as to whether some of them can be established; but having been made by some hon. members it is the duty of the House to hold those hon. gentlemen responsible for those charges and give them an opportunity of proving them before a proper committee under the control of this House. Therefore, I submit that before passing to the final stage of dealing with this Bill, we should have the charges thoroughly sifted and investigated, and then, and not till then, will the House be in a position to pass a proper judgment on the merits of this measure. I, therefore, move:

That the Bill be not now considered in Committee of the Whole, but that it be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, having regard to the Orders in Council for grants of land to the company, to enquire into the relations of certain alleged directors of the company, being members of this House, namely: James Beaty, member for West Toronto; L. A. Billy, member for Rimouski; C. H. Tupper, member for Pictou; L. J. Riopel, member for Bonaventure—to the company, and into any provisional contract which may have been entered into for the construction of the road, or any portion thereof.

In conclusion, I can only add that I hope the Government will see their way in adopting a motion to the effect of the one I have just read, to have a proper investigation made. Nothing will afford me greater pleasure than to withdraw my motion in favor of such a motion by the Government.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mulock.

YEAS :

Messieurs.

Allen,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Béchar, Gillmor,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Blake,
Bourassa,
Burpee,
Cameron (Huron),
Cameron (Middlesex),
Campbell (Renfrew),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Cockburn,
Cook,
Davies,

Edgar,
Fairbank,
Fisher,
Gillmor,
Glen,
Guay,
Harley,
Innes,
Irvine,
Jackson,
King,
Campbell (Renfrew),
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Lister,
McCraney,
McIntyre,
McMullen,
Mills,

Mitchell,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Platt,
Ray,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Shelburne),
Soriver,
Somerville (Brant),
Somerville (Bruce),
Springer,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Trow,
Vail,
Watson,
Weldon,
Wilson,
Woodworth.—55.