

this go upon *Hansard*, as I know my case cannot be answered. Mr. Beaty says he never sold the charter, he says he is as innocent as a butterfly; yet, as a little butterfly. He says he has been very much maligned. Why, he says: "I could have sold it, but I did not; I would not do such a thing." Well, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) is not unknown to fame, as the hon. Minister of the Interior knows, who had something to do with writing about the Pacific scandal, so-called, and who was said to be not very consistent, no doubt, by some ungenerous, uncharitable people—people who charged him with writing at one time against it and with saying at another time it was all right. But, of course, they are very uncharitable and unfair people. As I have said, the member for West Toronto was not unknown to fame. He did not sell the charter. Why? He says he is an innocent man, who, in his own town, never blushed. I do not suppose he did, nor do I suppose anybody ever charged him with blushing. He says he was never known to have the blush of shame brought to his face; no one denies that. He says: "I could have sold the charter, but did not;" and his friends back him up. He was a good man; he was mayor of his town; he placed himself upon record as a man who had great aims in life, and always did the right and proper thing; he had a large grasp of affairs, and he would not do it. But I have again, not Mr. Pew, not Mr. McConachie, not any of the witnesses who can be called perjurers here, because members of Parliament are protected by their privilege, but I have Mr. Beaty's own letters to people in the United States, written and signed by himself, and I think upon that occasion the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) called Mr. Beaty the minor villain of the plot. That shows he is not the quiet, inoffensive, little butterfly man you would suppose him to be who did everything in the light of day. Let us see for a moment. I have a confidential communication, which was written on 17th July, 1881, by Mr. James Beaty, member for West Toronto.

Mr. SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg your pardon, I am ready for that question of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it has.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will hear your decision, Sir, and reply to it. It has been charged here by Mr. Beaty and his friends that he has been telling what was absolutely true about this while I have not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg your pardon. It has been insinuated and almost in so many words stated. Hon. gentlemen have taken the character of Mr. Beaty for probity and honor, and made it the pivot upon which the whole case turns, and I say if I can establish that Mr. Beaty was not the innocent man he is represented to be—I know it is hard, but who brought this case up? Who took the man to their bosom because it was brought up? I am in order in doing this. I am not to be denied the right to reply, the right of showing that I can sweep away the whole cobweb of sophistry which has been wound round this case.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot go back to 1881 to show anything connected with the chartering of this road.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg your pardon, I can, if I can connect it with this subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I know the rules of debate, and am ready to abide by them. I have been in Parliament before, and gentlemen have no need to call me to order.

I wish to reiterate and amplify what I have already said. I have made a statement here which has been denied by the hon. member of West Toronto, on the ground of character, and the Minister of the Interior and some of his friends have come to the rescue of Mr. Beaty by declaring that he was incapable of doing a wrong act. That he would not think of such a thing, that he would not sell the charter, that he was interested in this road for the purpose of building it; and I say that, if I can prove that he offered to take \$100,000 from New York men to buy a charter, the same man can sell one. I say it is fair reasoning. I say it would be fair reasoning in a court of justice, and your Honor would not shut me out from doing what I can do in a court of justice. The rules of this House are not more stringent than the rules of a court of justice, and, if the question of character comes here, I can prove that the hon. gentleman who says he was incapable of selling a charter, was willing to buy one if he had \$100,000 deposited in the Bank of Toronto in his name. Now, I find: "Some"—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope that is not the letter. I have ruled on that.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then I appeal from your Honor's decision to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is in order to read anything of that kind.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Your Honor has not been in this House while the debate has been going on. I think it is unfair, when there is a dual Speaker here, when your Honor is out, that your Honor shall come in here and shut me off from debate. I appeal to the sense of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my ruling. We are not trying the characters of hon. members here, and I do not think a letter written in 1881 can be brought in to prove anything in connection with this charge, or can have anything to do with whether this Act should be put through Parliament now or this day three months. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my ruling. He has stated a great deal of the letter.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The last thing I wish to do is to dissent obtrusively or obstinately from the ruling of the Speaker. I recognise that order and decorum are necessary in a Parliament like this, and I would be the last to refuse to accept a decision, even if I thought the Speaker was a little wrong, which I confess I do just now. I will abide by your decision, and it will go very hard with me if I cannot get it in some other time. Perhaps I will not, because I do not like this business, and I shall not refer to it again if I can help it, but, if I find it necessary, I shall refer to it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member might hand it to the reporter as did the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The member for West Toronto has made one statement, and it has been reiterated in a modified form by some of his friends. How he got them as friends I do not know. They look pleasant and modest, and virtuous and kind, but how they got here as friends I do not know. Perhaps it is an illustration of the old couplet:

"Vice is a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But, seen too oft, familiar with his face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

The member for West Toronto said, and he has been industriously circulating this among the members, for I have heard him: "How absurd, how could I, without the consent of the other directors, make an agreement with Mr. Woodworth?" The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) took it up: "Look at the other directors; he could not do it behind their back." Did not the member for West Toronto know that, when the charter was issued here, there was not a man's name in it at all?