

Does he not know that we proceeded to the Library and stated who the directors should be? Does he not know that the agreement was made before the charter was introduced into the House at all? And, then, where was the member for Picton; where was the member for Toronto Centre, and the other gentlemen, whose names are here, that I forget just now, and the brother of the member for West Toronto, in Toronto? Where were they then? In this charter? No. The member for West Toronto knows that he went into the Library with me after we made the agreement, and we sat down and said who the directors should be. I want to know, if that be true, what the statement reiterated with such gusto by the Minister of the Interior and other members of the House, following in the wake of the member for West Toronto, is worth? The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) said in committee that the other directors had to be consulted. Why, he was not in existence, he was not spoken of until we were in the Library. That is as true as anything I have read out of these papers, and I ask intelligent members of this House, I would ask any intelligent jury, what becomes of the statement that this agreement between us could not be and was not made, because the other directors would stand in the way, when they were not in existence? That is as plain, I presume, as I can make it. That is true. That is correct. I hated to make a second speech; I hated to make the first. It is a very unpleasant subject. I did not introduce it until I found myself hounded by this Conservative member of the House, and, when I find that the Government has taken him under their shield, when I have done as faithfully as I have, I say it was unfair treatment to me. The world will say so; the Province from which I come will say so; any Province will say so, where I have been and spoken, and where I intend to speak again. It was unfair treatment. It was not fair treatment between two members of the same party. One had been guilty of gross violation of fealty and party fidelity, and had taken advantage of the other, and the Ministry had no word of condemnation, they and their supporters. I do not blame some of them; they can hardly help it; but it was unfair and unjust, and I feel it most keenly. It was not a very pleasant subject when I got up in that committee, knowing that the wings of the press would take it almost over the four corners of the globe, at all events, would take it all over Canada and over part of the United States as well, when I got up and had to make this charge, when they came with this Bill before the committee, striking out every clause for the protection of the workingmen. There was the Bill that was sought to be introduced, and what does it say:

"The said Act 47 Vic., Chap. 72, and the said several Acts therein mentioned are hereby continued in full force and effect of law, except the 7th section of the said first cited act, which is hereby repealed."

What was the 7th section which was to be repealed:

"The existing liabilities of the company for work done for the said company shall be a first charge on the undertaking."

What did the member for West Toronto tell the committee? He told them he did not know how the clause got there originally. He told the House to-night: "Did I not protect the workingman and have in the Bill a clause protecting him such as is mentioned there?" And yet it was I who introduced that clause, and the member for West Toronto told the Committee on Railways and Canals that he did not know how it got there, and he took credit to-night for having put it there. Now, the 5th clause that the member for West Toronto introduced into this Bill, when we first went before the committee, was this:

"The mortgage and bonds authorised by the said Act to be executed and issued shall be the first preferential charge and lien, and shall have priority as such, on the railway and lands and assets of the said North-West Central Railway Company, as described and charged in the said mortgage."

MR. WOODWORTH,

Then, with the \$25,000 bonds they were going to issue, as I have proved, where would the working people have got their pay, putting in this clause and striking out the other clause? And yet, in a letter signed by Mr. Beatty's hand, which I read in the committee, directed to William Eccles, and dated the 13th March, 1885, he says:

"The Act does not throw upon the North-West Central Railway Company any obligations of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company. They are not revived."

And yet he knew they were revived, and, since, he has come into the committee and into this House to wipe out all the clauses, so that the workmen would never get their pay. I understand that there was some members of the company who did not want that done and others who did want it done, and I have their names. I think it was a most unfair thing for the workingman, and if it had not been for the revelations made in that committee, this clause would not have been struck out, and we would not have the Bill as it is now, merely extending the charter. Mr. Beatty was forced to abandon his prey on that occasion. Unpleasant as the subject is, I had to stand in that Committee and protest against that Bill. I say that after the revelations made by me, which I have proved, this House should reject this Bill and let the Government take the power, as they can without the delay of a week, and build this road. There are men ready and willing to build this road. I know they are ready to do it for the grant that you have so generously given, and are only waiting the opportunity. I know this for a fact. The hon. member for Monck says: "Give them another chance." I say this company has had that chance, and having failed to take the opportunity afforded them by Parliament and the terms of their charter, they cannot come to this Parliament and ask for a continuance of it. Every hon. member who votes for the amendment, is voting for a precedent, by which members hereafter who take charters from this Parliament, will, at least, honestly try to execute their provisions; but if you pass this Act as it is now, after these revelations of delay, and of the attempts to sell the charter for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of the president, you will have established a precedent for all time, that everybody can come and do likewise, and they have only to get some friends to surround them and it will be carried through Parliament. It is a dangerous precedent. Sir, what is the object of punishing crime? Not to punish the criminal, but to deter others from committing a like offence. This is an offence; it is an offence against the people out there; it is an offence in the attempt of parties to put money in their pockets at the expense of the country. Teach these parties a lesson by relegating them back to where they were before they got this extension of the land grant, and a company will be here at the doors of Parliament in a week. They are now asking for permission to build this road, having all the capital they want. I am sorry I have had to detain the House, but it was a matter in which I got mixed up myself. I have got abused where I did not deserve it. As I said before, I have committed no violation of my independence as a member of Parliament, I have got nothing from the Government that was a concession. I am as independent as the day I entered Parliament. Certainly I owe the Government nothing but that respect which is due from subjects to lords and masters. Having made the explanation that I desired, I hope the Government will consider anew this subject, and come to a different conclusion from that which was intimated here this afternoon.

Amendment to the amendment, to adjourn debate, negatived.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell.