

pockets. That is the first question we have to answer. I ask any sensible and candid man, what degree of independence can be expected of a member of Parliament who is suing and soliciting, first the Administration of the day, and afterwards the Parliament of the day, to make a grant of money or of land, tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars of which he expects practically to pocket if he is successful. He expects to place himself in a position in which he will be enriched by means of the greater degree of strength and availability which is to belong to the enterprise by virtue of the public domain. Now, you find this matter before us in this plain example. You find it a case in which it is impossible for any sensible person, who does not impute to members of Parliament a moral stature altogether different from that which they would have if they were not in this House, to say that their independence of character here can consist with their being allowed to assume unrebuked and approved of by this House such relations to the Executive and to the Legislature of the country. What degree of independence can the man have who knows that, if he stands up and opposes the Government upon any public question, the Government, which holds in the hollow of its hand the question whether it will make the grant or will submit it to Parliament, without which it cannot be made, will turn round and say: We support our supporters? What independence can you expect if these relations are allowed to grow up between members of Parliament and the Government? I was quite rejoiced to hear the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) open his observations by saying that, after the developments which had been made in this case, he felt disposed to come to the conclusion that he, at any rate, would not be any longer a promoter of railway enterprises in this Parliament. I believe that was a wise and just view of the hon. gentleman's. I admit with him that the practice has become largely common. It has been objected to on this side of the House; it has been objected to by us in the country; we have pointed out what the fruits would probably be, and the hon. gentleman now perceives that it is at any rate liable to abuse. I go further and say it has been shamefully abused, and I say it will be in the most marked manner shamefully abused if we agree to grant this Bill under the circumstances which have here been developed. Now, what good will we do the country if we consecrate this principle of members of Parliament having to do with grants through the Executive of money or of lands out of which they may personally profit? We will do a great evil. What good will we do the country if we approve, advertising to the particular ground that the member for King's took, of the principle of charter selling anyway? I say it is a wrong principle. I fully supposed, after the hon. member for West Toronto declared to us that he was prepared, or rather would be prepared, to lay before us the proof of ability to construct, that we were going to have had the opportunity of seeing what that proof was. I thought it was for that we were waiting. We were told we were to have it; we adjourned twice for it, and we were told it had been actually despatched prior to the last adjournment and would be received in a day or two. We gave a long time in order that we might be quite certain that the proof would be here. I say we have no right, irrespective of any other consideration, to grant charters to people in order that they may speculate in them. It is on the presumption that they are persons prepared to go on with the building of the road that we grant them. In this case, the hon. member for West Toronto has \$386,000 of this stock upon which 10 per cent. has been paid by some body else, and he does not pretend that it is proposed to call up the stock or to put a dollar in that way into the enterprise. The proposition is to sell the charter, not merely in order to build the road, but in order to make something good out of it for the company of which he forms so large

a part. Now, if there was anything to be made by the stockholders, it ought to be made out of the stock, by reason of the substantial character of the enterprise, after the road had been built on the cheapest and best terms on which the road could be built. It is said to be quite a cheap road to build. The evidences of that are before Parliament. They are contained in statements which the hon. gentleman himself submitted to the Government, and which have been laid on the Table of the House, from which it appears that the road ought not to cost more than \$15,000 a mile to build. It is through a settled country, a country so very largely settled for the first 100 or 150 miles that the promoters say its operation will, from the very beginning, be profitable from the local trade. I have before said, and I repeat, it is of the last consequence to the future of the North West that we should take care that the country is not burdened unnecessarily by having to pay tolls upon too high a capital account for the construction of its branch railways. That would be a public and permanent burden, and, when you find this sort of arrangement, that bonds to the extent of \$25,000 a mile are to be issued, besides a large quantity of stock, to build a \$15,000 road, although 6,400 acres a mile have been granted to aid it, you then want to know what it is to become of the difference. You want to know where the excess between the \$15,000 and the \$25,000 is to go. I know a considerable portion will go in discount on bonds, and in that private account which I am told some railway corporations keep under the name of "oil and waste." But there is a large margin between fifteen and twenty-five, and I believe that, if you were to investigate the matter, it would be found that this arrangement partakes in some shape or form of the character of former arrangements such as the hon. member for King's read a while ago, by which there is to be a reservation out of the money paid to the contractors to go into the pockets of the members of the company. That is so much charge upon the North-West country for the benefit of a few members of Parliament and others. It is just that. I have understood, and I believe the committee understood, that to us, who were asked to consider whether we should extend this charter, would be submitted the evidence of the ability at any rate of the people to build, and the Legislature of Manitoba called upon us not to do anything which might practically throw the road over by continuing the charter to those who had not the ability; and their last telegram was very strong, in truth, against granting it to this corporation at all—at least, so I interpreted the words. Instead of that, when the matter came up the last time, I find by the reports—I was unfortunately unable to remain in attendance—and I find by the clause in the Bill itself that, so far from the ability of the company being pretended to be proved, the clause introduced into the Bill is an express statement, to which the House is asked to assent, that it is not proved, that it has to be proved at some future time, that therefore this company which is to obtain in this extension is to obtain it not having proved, though the member for West Toronto told us most emphatically he would prove, its ability to go on. There is, therefore, to be a further attempt to sell this charter, to speculate in this charter for a short time, and then the Government of the country, it is proposed, shall intervene. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that these transactions are such as we ought to approve of. I think this Bill is an unclean thing, and that we ought to reject it.

Mr. BEATY. I only propose to make a few words of explanation of certain points which have been raised in this discussion and I do it for the purpose of placing on record a few facts which, I think, can be corroborated by the fullest evidence. In reference to the stock which has been mentioned, I state this simple fact, that that stock was assigned to me absolutely, but with the view of controlling