

warrant this House in confirming an extension of time, to enable them to go any further in disappointing the people of that section of the country in their just expectations. The object of granting these bonuses is not to enable men who happen to be friends of the Administration to go into the markets of Europe and America and discredit the Parliament of Canada, and decried and run down, as their acts do decried and run down, the conduct of the men who form this Parliament. The object of Parliament in granting charters and these munificent donations is to get railroads built; but the object of the gentlemen who are now asking for a renewal of this charter and an extension of the time for building this road, is to speculate in their charter, and to get out of it an enormous sum of money irrespective of whether the road is built or not. Sir, these are bold statements to make, but they are made on the evidence that came out before the committee; and they stand uncontradicted. Whether they are true or untrue I do not know; but, from the evidence that came out before the committee, from the statements of Mr. Woodworth as to letters which he had handed over to the Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Marine, and which letters were mislaid, I will say that the statements of Mr. Woodworth have been sustained, and the statements of Mr. Beaty have not been sustained. Sir, the Minister of Finance wrote a letter which was laid before that committee. Mr. Beaty had stated that Mr. Woodworth held no letters which gave him a right to a division of the spoils. Between these two gentlemen I am not going to interfere; that is a matter for themselves; but when they are washing this dirty linen before Parliament, it behooves us as the representatives of the people, to refuse to take upon ourselves the responsibility for transactions which this Parliament ought not to sanction. The Minister of Finance, in a letter which was read before the Railway Committee, stated that the statement made by Mr. Woodworth, that Mr. Beaty was to divide the swag—excuse me for using the term—to divide the profits between them—was correct. If that is true, I am bound to accept the statement of the Minister of Finance, then I think this Parliament ought not to extend the charter to enable any further charter selling to be carried on at the expense of the credit and reputation and success of the enterprises of Canada in the North-West. These facts were brought out before the Railway Committee; and I did think, on the first occasion the committee sat, that the feeling of the committee was to reject the Bill and refuse to extend the charter. But, Sir, there were some influences; I will not say what they were; I will not even suggest to this House what I myself believe them to be; but I have my own convictions and conclusions about them, and I will say that much to my surprise it was announced at the last meeting of the Railway Committee, that the Government were determined to call on their friends to sustain them, and they did sustain them, in assuming the responsibility of these scandals, and they passed the Bill through the committee. Sir, I felt it to be my duty as an independent man in that committee, to endeavor to have an investigation. I felt that if an investigation were had, there would have been developments as to this matter that the public did not know of. I have myself some personal information, which is not in such a position that I can present it to this House, which leads me to believe that there are scandals behind this thing. I am not able to prove it; but I think if we had a committee of this House to investigate the matter, we would find that the gentlemen who voted against my resolution in the committee the other day would hesitate before they extend this charter and give the enormous bonus asked for. Does any man believe, when Mr. Beaty demands that he should have \$600,000 profits for a railway in the North-West, and that a majority of the stock should be given to him, that that is a transaction which this House ought to sanction? After the grave statements that were made

on the responsibility of a member of this House, statements sustained to a certain extent by written evidence, and after the correspondence with regard to a division of spoils that had taken place, was it the duty of the Government to bring to the aid of the promoters of this Bill their great majority, and all the forces they possess, in order to prevent us getting a committee of enquiry appointed? I moved before that a committee should be appointed to investigate this matter. Objection was taken to that motion by the hon. Minister of the Interior in a very able, and eloquent speech—and the hon. gentleman, when it suits his purpose, is always able and eloquent; but the main feature of the question, the immorality of the whole thing, was scarcely touched upon. Now, Sir, I feel that the Government have assumed the responsibility of these scandals; they have refused to enquire into them, and have determined to give their sanction to Mr. Beaty getting an extension of his charter; they have already passed an Order in Council to enable him to get his land grant. All these things place upon them the responsibility of this act. It is not yet too late, however, for them to retrace their steps, and I hope the leader of this House, the hon. Minister of Public Works, will take upon himself the responsibility, before this Bill goes a single further stage in this House, of moving for a committee of enquiry to look into the whole transaction, and if it is found to be a transaction which has anything shady in its character, which reflects discredit on Canada, which will retard the settlement of the North-West and prevent the construction of the road, this House should at once refuse to sanction it. I, at all events, have determined to wash my hands of the responsibility of this matter. I have framed a resolution, upon which I propose to divide this House, if I can get four other members to join me. It is this:

“That the House do not now go into committee on this Bill, but go into committee upon it this day three months.”

That is my motion, if any one will second it—I have not asked anybody.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will second it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would just like to ask the leader of this House to relieve himself of the responsibility, and say to his followers that the Government do not make this a party question, but leave it open to every one to vote as he likes; then he will see what a vote there will be.

Mr. BLAKE. I am simply amazed that we should not have heard from the Treasury benches on this question. I regard it as one of the most important questions that can possibly come before us. It is important in every aspect of it; it is important in the various aspects presented by the two hon. members who have spoken; and the decision we arrive at upon it to-day will very materially affect the credit and reputation of this Parliament and this country throughout the world at large, in so far as the world at large takes any interest in us and our concerns. This corporation is the continuation of an older one, and at a particular period of its existence, as it appears, it was thought expedient, in order that its interest might be promoted, that the complexion of its directorate should be to some extent changed. That was the period at which the hon. member for West Toronto obtained that share in the directorate which he has since retained. The corporation had not got on very fast or very far in the way of getting that assistance and recognition at the hands of the Government and of Parliament, which were thought important to its success. And being up to that time, as far as I could judge, a directorate of business men, it was converted very largely into a directorate of politicians and members of Parliament. Amongst the papers which were brought down to Parliament last Session, is an application