

and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), the member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), and the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), have evidently been endeavoring to place the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) in a position which he does not occupy. The arguments of those hon. gentlemen may have no weight in this Chamber, but they may have weight outside, where the question may not be thoroughly understood. They have endeavored to represent the member for Marquette as urging three months' delay. Such is not his position; such was not his position as a member of the Railway Committee. This proposition to renew the charter comes after a year's delay. No member in this Chamber, I venture to say, is more anxious for the railway, and feels that it will give the people who need it so much, and have waited for it so long, than the hon. member for Marquette. At the last session of the committee he asked if the promoter of the measure, the member for West Toronto, could not give satisfactory evidence of the ability of the company to do something within a short period. The Minister of Public Works informed the committee that they had not given such evidence. The member for Richmond and Wolfe has laid great stress upon the fact that a contract had been signed. Of the real metallic value of that contract we can form a pretty accurate estimation from the value which the Ministers themselves have placed upon it. So much value did they place upon it that the Minister of Public Works did not know who it was signed by, and had great difficulty in deciphering the names. This shows the value they themselves placed upon the contract, which the member for Richmond and Wolfe offers to this House as a voucher of their ability to do this work. This is not a matter of yesterday or of last week. The land subsidy has been a matter standing now for nearly one year. And I can well understand the objection of the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) in regard to this matter being put beyond the control of this Parliament absolutely. He has shown no indication of wishing to delay the matter, or even opposition to the present promoters of the road, but instead he has been anxious that the matter should not be indefinitely delayed. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has well asked what the stock amounts to. Stock, indeed, in the hands of inexperienced men, stock that is not all paid for, amounts to very little so far as finishing the road is concerned, but it may amount to considerable, and it has been shown in this instance to amount to considerable, in blocking the railway. The air brake is a very useful thing indeed on a railway after it is constructed, but brakes and delays are very little use until the railway is constructed. If I heard rightly, an attempt has been made to intimate that the leader of the Opposition considered the grants to this railway too large. I understood him to say nothing of the kind. I believe he did offer some objection to the large bonding power, but not to the grant given to the railway, and what weight the argument of the Minister Public Works had in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, that much larger grants were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I cannot understand. It is well within his knowledge, as it is within the knowledge of every hon. member of this House, that there are single miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway which cost more to construct than fifty miles of this road, because we have in the drawback against this undertaking, in the cost of the abandoned grade, an indication of the cost of grading, of about \$2,000 a mile. It seems that during the enjoyment of these privileges and powers, absolutely nothing has been done by the company towards the construction of the railway. We were informed this afternoon that not a single shovel of earth has been turned over, and I think it is high time we should have some definite proof of the ability of the company to carry forward this most desirable undertaking, or failing that, we should put the charter in the hands of men who will build it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There are one or two points to which I desire very briefly to call the attention of the House before the vote is taken. We have heard a great deal to night in relation to the disclosures which have been made. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to have used that expression as if there was a certain state of facts established beyond the possibility of controversy. Now, let us look for a moment at what the disclosures—as they are called—happen to be in this case. The origin of all these disclosures, the first step in all these disclosures, was the statement by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), president, of the railway company, of which the hon. member for King's was a director, had not dealt fairly with him, that the understanding between those two gentlemen, as stated by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), was that out of the profits of this road, whatever they might be, the other members of the company were to get \$50,000, and the balance, whatever it might be, was to be divided between those two gentlemen. That is the statement made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth). It implied, as you can readily understand, that these two gentlemen had entered into a conspiracy for the purpose of dividing a large share of the profits, after giving to their co-directors a smaller share, whatever that might be. The best answer to this charge, so far as this particular debate is concerned, is to be found in the frank admission of the leader of the Opposition, who said after having heard what was stated in another place as well as here, that he came to the conclusion, which he frankly stated, that he saw nothing and had heard nothing which justified him in believing that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) was dealing unfairly or dishonorably by his colleagues on the board. The charge, if it meant anything, meant that he was so dealing dishonorably, and therefore, I think, we may take the statement of the leader of the Opposition as the best answer, so far as the evidence goes, to that statement made in the first instance. Then, Sir, the next statement we have is that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) was waited upon by a couple of gentlemen—if one may use that term in referring to either of them—in relation to this matter, and that they offered a contract to the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) as president of this railway, and that he insisted as a condition precedent to anything being done that provision should be made for some \$650,000 to go to him, who, in that letter, was described as "the boy." Now, Sir, these two gentlemen—these two persons—Mr. Pew, and his clerk, I believe, McConachie, who masqueraded for the moment in the character of a millionaire—these two persons, whose statement, if made in the most formal way against that hon. member or any hon. gentleman as a mere verbal statement, I venture to say no man in this House who knows them would take. Mr. Pew is well known by his connection with the Manitoba and South Western, and his conduct in connection with that road, the revelations made in the courts, and the expressions used toward him by the judges, all show that he is not a man upon whose statement, in relation to a matter of this kind, any gentleman should be put on his trial. And, Sir, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), after reading Mr. McConachie's letter in another place—and I may say we have been referring all evening not strictly within the rules of Parliament to what has been going on in another place—after reading this statement of Mr. McConachie, read what he said was going to be confirmatory evidence of that statement, in the form of a letter from Mr. Beaty himself. What was that letter? Certainly not a letter demanding any \$50,000; not a letter demanding any advantage for himself or his company, but a distinct statement that the company should be kept distinct from the contractors—that the contractors should build the railway, and that the only object that he had