

through it; when I assailed him and brought him almost to the bar of the House; and when the Government of the country had to put a notice on the paper to withdraw the legislation which he stole through Parliament, that hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Minister of the Interior did not dare to resent the insult which was thrown upon this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; order.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is out of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can make a personal explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am making a personal explanation, and I am making a pretty stringent personal explanation, too. I wish to say one word more.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order. The hon. gentleman will please sit down when the Chair rises. The hon. gentleman is entitled, as I said before, to make a personal explanation, but in doing so he is not entitled to make attacks on others.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) allow me to interpose for a moment? I might suggest to the hon. gentleman, upon whom certainly a severe attack has been made, that after the ruling of the Chair, it would perhaps be better that he should make his explanation on a motion for adjournment—I have no doubt any hon. gentleman will move the adjournment of the debate and give him the opportunity to reply.

Mr. MITCHELL. As, Sir, you have ruled that I can only confine myself to a personal explanation, as I thought I was only doing that, and as it seems to be the impression that I should not go as far as I am going, I will reserve my remarks for the present. I want to give this hon. Minister just a bit of my mind.

Mr. McCALLUM. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to some of the expressions which have been used by hon. gentlemen opposite. A good deal has been said about the independence of Parliament. I am a pretty old man, and I have lived a good while. I have got a good memory and I know, Sir, that from 1867 to 1872 these gentlemen on the other side were then, as they are now, always crying out for the independence of Parliament. It was one of the planks in their platform that they should keep the people's representatives free from favors from the Crown. But, Sir, when they crossed to the other side they forgot all their pledges; they scattered their principles to the four winds of heaven. When they talk about the independence of Parliament, the electors of the country know well what they mean. They know they are using that cry as the means of getting into power. No sooner did they get into office than they let contracts and gave employment to members of this House and members of the Government. They had a contract with the Speaker in the Chair, and he farmed it out. Now they tell us about the independence of Parliament, and that no man should be a director of a railway; and the member for Grey (Mr. Land erkin) spoke to-night about the railway grants in the Province of Ontario. The hon. member for Grey spoke about the purity of the grants to railways in the Province of Ontario. I had the honor of a seat in that House at the time those grants were made, and they were made on a different principle from what the grants have been made here. I am sustained in the language I used in this House on former occasions by no less a gentleman than the present Prime Minister of Ontario in reference to those grants. How were those grants made? Sandfield Macdonald's Government was turned out of power because it gave as much as \$1,500,000 to aid railways in the thinly settled

Mr. MITCHELL.

districts of the Province; but when the hon. member for West Durham came into power, he found that that was not sufficient to control the House, and he added \$400,000 more to it. He set up \$2,000,000 as a bribe, as a railway fund, and he said: "Send a man to support me, and I will give him a railway grant." I can remember a few who went back on their party in order to get railway grants. Now, there was a difference between the hon. member for West Durham and myself last year, when I said that when he brought down the resolutions, we were to have five days time to consider them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. What have we to do with all this ancient history of quarrels in Ontario ten years ago? I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The debate has wandered off a good deal to the question of the independence of Parliament. I hope the hon. gentleman will try to confine himself as much as possible to the question of the railway charter.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not think any action of any member of this House in promoting a railway will affect his vote in the House. Does the hon. member for Grey mean to say that the hon. member for Pontiac, or the hon. member for West Toronto, has been influenced in their votes in this House by grants given to railways in which they have been interested? Does he mean to say that the action of the Government in giving lands to assist in the construction of railways in the North-West has anything to do with the way hon. members vote in this House? It is too ridiculous. If there is anything the so-called Reform party has admired the hon. member for West Durham for, it has been his action in reference to railway assistance, because it has had the effect of controlling the Province of Ontario to this day. They may talk about the independence of Parliament. If the House will permit me, I will read the words of the present Premier of Ontario at the London banquet, where the leader of the Opposition was called the uncrowned king. This is what Mr. Mowat said:

"We have been able to maintain the Liberal party in power for thirteen or fourteen years, and I rejoice to know that we are not ashamed of the record, and I do not forget, and the people of this country will not forget, during that time we have held the fort, and the Liberal party has been in power in Ontario, it is owing to our distinguished guest. He has fought the battle by which the Ontario Parliament has held power, and I am convinced has spared no effort to retain it. He entered upon that task under circumstances of great discouragement. Our friend was then a new man in parliamentary life. He had opposed to him an old parliamentarian. He had opposed to him the whole Tory party of this country, and likewise a large portion of the Reform. Mr. Mackenzie had the affection of a large number of the Reformers. Mr. Blake had to contend with those who had the support of the whole Conservative party, and a large section of our own party, but he struggled with a wisdom and ability that could not be surpassed, and after the first general election he changed condition with the parties, and he found himself with a majority in the first instance of one."

There is the point where the hon. member for West Durham and I disagree. I said that he made that into a majority of twenty-five with the railway swag, but he denied it and said it was nine.

Mr. BLAKE. Nineteen.

Mr. McCALLUM. I leave you and Mr. Mowat to settle it between you. Mr. Mowat added:

"But that majority soon became a wise majority under his management, and the result was a strong Government to which we have succeeded."

What does that mean? Does it not mean that the majority jumped to the side the corn was on? That is the way the so called Reform party in the Province of Ontario has been able to hold that Province for some time. But that is nothing new to those hon. gentlemen. When on that side of the House from 1867 to 1872 they talked about purity, but when they get over here it was corruption in many branches of the public service, and the electors of this country know it. They used to cry that the Conservative party of this country was corrupt, but when