

the Grit Government went before the electors in 1878, they were soon turned out. When we come to the question before the House, I say the hon. member for West Toronto has been laboring hard in this matter; he has given two years of his valuable time, and spent some money, and what has he got in return? He has got \$380,000 of the old stock, on which 10 per cent. has been paid. Can any man tell me of the first subscribed stock of any railway in this country, except the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is worth 2 cents on the \$1 to-day. I do not know of one except the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) has spent two years of valuable time and some money in crossing to England, going to the United States several times, and working up this scheme to a certain point. Hon. gentlemen say he should not have an hour's delay, but that we should cut off his head at once. But, why this precipitated action? Have we not the authority of the Government that if he does not show his ability to go on with the work by the month of June, the Government will charter another company to construct the road? Should we not give the hon. gentleman another chance, now that it appears there is every probability of a company being secured by him who will build the road. I am not going to go back on the interests of that section, simply because there happens to be a difference of opinion between the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth). Let them settle their own difficulties, I have nothing to do with them. What I look to is the construction of this railway, and I intend to give my vote, in the interest of the country, in the way I think best calculated to secure its construction. Hon. gentlemen opposite raise the same cry to-day about the independence of Parliament and the purity of elections that they did formerly when in opposition, but they showed their hands afterwards, and they are at the same business now. The electors of the country know what they were before and what they may expect of them now, and have no confidence to-day any more than they had formerly, because these hon. gentlemen have been tried by the people and found wanting. I remember that hon. gentlemen opposite, when in opposition in former years, stated that they could not get through the corridors with contractors and expectant contractors, but the right hon. the First Minister, then member for Kingston, kept the contractors in the corridors. He did not do, as hon. gentlemen opposite did, take them into the House, and put a contractor in the Speaker's chair. That is the difference between the two parties.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). As this is an important question and the hour is late I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the debate is adjourned, I wish to make a few observations in relation to a personal matter, which I was prevented from making by the Deputy Speaker. A few minutes ago. If I understood the Minister of Interior rightly, he went out of his way to make a personal attack on myself, by stating that I had made use of my position and boasted of it in this House, to punish the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a personal grievance. Whatever my motives may have been, that is a matter for myself, and not for the hon. gentleman who made a personal reference to me. I never boasted in this House of doing what the hon. gentleman stated I did. It is true that on one occasion, in the Railway Committee, that gentleman, aided and abetted by some others who were only too ready to help him, who were the partisans of the Grand Trunk Railway, and whom I charged at the time with being partisans of the Grand Trunk Railway, did try to fix upon me that my motives for attacking the Grand Trunk Railway policy were of a personal character.

Mr. POPE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

Mr. POPE. And you have said it twenty times yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL. I tell the hon. gentleman, too, he may just as well keep quiet about me. Whatever my motive may have been that is for myself to consider. I have never denied, and I do not now deny that I have received from the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway treatment which is unjust and dishonest, and that I told him that I would have satisfaction out of him, and I have had it in many ways, but I have never boasted in the House that I would, in my position here, have satisfaction out of him. Whatever I may have done outside, I am responsible for not to this House, not to the Minister of the Interior, not to the Minister of Railways; and the Minister of Interior had no right to assail me in the way he did.

Mr. POPE. Yes, he had.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say he had not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know people not to tell the truth some times.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it was the place of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to attack me about my course towards the Grand Trunk. If he wanted to find reasons for my attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, he could very easily have found them. When the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway wrote a letter to this Government, three years ago, threatening the Government of the day, threatening the Parliament of Canada, threatening all Canada, that if they dared to pass a certain legislation, then under the consideration of the House, the vengeance of that company would come down upon them. Did the gallant and brave Minister of the Interior, who is so ready to air his eloquence, come out then in the defence of the Administration of which he has the honor to be a member? Did that hon. gentleman come out and defend the country against the attacks of the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway? No, Sir. I will not say why, but I will say this, that that champion newspaper, which they claim is the leading organ of public opinion defending the Administration of the day in the Province of Quebec, was the recipient of a very large amount of publishing and advertising patronage from the Grand Trunk Railway. Perhaps that had something to do with the silence of the hon. gentleman; perhaps it had not. Of that I leave the hon. gentleman to judge. When the honor of Parliament was attacked by Mr. Hickson, who, through his agents, smuggled legislation through the Senate of Canada, when that legislation was got through so surreptitiously, and when I brought the matter before this Parliament and arraigned the Grand Trunk Railway in so serious a manner that the First Minister felt it to be due to the honor of the Parliament of Canada that he should place a motion on the paper to recall that legislation, did we find the eloquent and hon. gentleman, the Minister of Interior, getting up and resenting an insult of that kind to the Parliament of Canada? No, Sir; the hon. gentleman, as characteristic of him, was on that occasion silent; it was probably his interest to be silent; I have not the slightest doubt it was. These are two or three instances in which I think the hon. gentleman, if he chooses to compare his public conduct in Parliament with my own, might very fairly not claim to be the aggressor in an attack upon me. My public character in Parliament is not like that of the hon. gentleman. I have not been subservient, I have not been desirous to crawl into power by scratching anybody's back like the hon. gentleman, I have endeavored to pursue such a course as would command the respect of the country, I have endeavored to express my views independently and fear-