

lessly, and I have done so. I am neither afraid of the hon. gentleman,—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL—nor of those on my left who are pulled up and down with a string,—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL—nor of those on the other side who frequently attack me. I am neither afraid of the one nor the other.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have said what I have got to say.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You will not expect me, Sir, to make a serious reply to the speech of the hon. gentleman. The statement I made was simply this, that the hon. gentleman, who poses in this particular debate as the guardian of the honor of Parliament, as one whose pure soul is horrified at the idea of any member of Parliament using his position in Parliament to further his private ends, or feelings, or spite out of Parliament, was not altogether free from that offence, and I gave simply as one illustration that he had been opposed to the Grand Trunk Railway in Parliament in a very violent manner, in a manner so violent that the mention of "Grand Trunk" by him invariably created a burst of laughter from both sides of the House. It was looked upon as a matter of course that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the Grand Trunk Railway, and I said it was well known that the hon. gentleman had stated, not in the House, but out of the House, and that was my information, that, if Mr. Hickson would settle with him in a matter of \$10,000 which he claimed Mr. Hickson owed him for service in getting the purchase of the Riviere du Loup Branch by the Government, he would cry quits with him.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not true; that is what I say.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am bound in this House to accept that statement. It is the duty of a member of Parliament, and I do it promptly. I only say that I regret that so many people's ears should have deceived them outside of Parliament in a matter of that kind. Of course, their ears must have deceived them, because the hon. gentleman says so here. As to his attack upon me, I do not think it necessary to make any reply, not by any means that I do not think an attack from the hon. gentleman deserves a reply; because I would be sorry to say anything implying that disrespect for him; but because I do not think it necessary to interpose in this debate a controversy as to our relative actions in matters of this kind. As to the letter of Mr. Hickson, in relation to which he spoke, I may say that I did not vote in Parliament in accordance with the letter of Mr. Hickson, but against it.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman thinks it is not worth while replying to the hon. member's attack, I think he should have reflected before he made the attack which provoked the reply of the hon. gentleman. I am only surprised at the hon. member for Northumberland being provoked by an attack from the hon. gentleman. He ought to have remembered the hon. gentleman's code of political ethics, and should have reflected that political exigencies this evening are very overwhelming.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to explain. The hon. gentleman has renewed the attack upon me by making another statement, by stating that I had said that if Mr. Hickson—

Mr. SPEAKER. He has accepted the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, but I have a right—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MITCHELL,

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is unfair to attempt to prevent my putting myself right. He has taken advantage of replying to me to make a fresh statement in regard to me, which is also untrue. I never said anything of the kind. There is no place in which I said so. What I did say was that Mr. Hickson cheated me out of \$10,000, and I repeat it; I repeat that he cheated me, and it stands just in that way. What I might have done, if he had made an honest man of himself, is quite another thing.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, it is true at all events.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is on the question to adjourn the debate.

Mr. WATSON. As this opportunity presents itself, I should like to take the opportunity of explaining why I intend to vote for the amendment. Some of the members on the other side appear to think it very strange that I should pursue that course. I pursue the course which I think is the only consistent course I should pursue as a well-wisher of the citizens of that section of country through which this road is to be built. The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) seemed to think it very strange that I should pursue this course; and he has quoted Dr. Harrison, the Local member for Minnedosa, as his authority for the needs of the people in that section. I call attention to the fact that Dr. Harrison, who he thinks knows the interests of the people there, and who must have the interest of that section at heart, for this road passes through his property, is the seconder of the resolution I read before six o'clock, in which it is stated:

"This House expresses the hope that, unless the present holders of the land grant satisfy the railway company to-morrow, the committee will advise the summary cancellation of the Order in Council granted them."

Now, I think that, with the confidence which the hon. gentleman has in Dr. Harrison as a wide-awake representative of that section of the country, and seeing that this is Dr. Harrison's resolution, and that it is his particular wish, he being on the ground, that the grant to Mr. Beatty's line should be cancelled, the hon. gentleman will vote as I vote for the amendment.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. I stated that Dr. Harrison was the head of a deputation which was here last year to assist in carrying that free grant for the North-West Central Railway. I did not say what his feelings or views were now, but only that he was here promoting that grant, and was interested with many others in that matter.

Mr. WATSON. Dr. Harrison, as the Minister of Finance has well stated, was one of the deputation, and he also stated that I, as a member of this House, had repeatedly interviewed him and pressed upon him the importance of a land grant for this road; but a year has elapsed since Dr. Harrison and I asked him to give a free grant to this company, and they have done nothing, and Dr. Harrison as well as myself now thinks it should be taken out of the hands of the present company and placed in the hands of those who will build the road. I believe it is of such a character that it can be built for the grant. The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), was also grieved at my inconsistent course. My course is quite consistent, and it is in the interests of the people of that section that I vote for the amendment. I may further state for the information of the member for North Perth that one of the directors of this company, the hon. John Norquay, Premier of the Province of Manitoba, was present in the House when this resolution was forwarded to Ottawa. I have sufficient confidence in the Government of the day to believe that, when they state they will see the road is built, when they know the House