

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not, of course, desire to detain the House, but in view of the charges made against hon. members, some withdrawn so soon as questioned, I think it due to myself and due to the constituency I represent to offer a few remarks regarding the insinuations, if not charges, made against me. This discussion commenced on the subject of timber limits; it has gradually drifted into a question of railway subsidies, a question fully discussed yesterday and just as fully discussed to-night. My friend, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proceeded, without investigating the subject, without giving notice to those he intended to charge with high crimes and misdemeanors—although I do not believe any hon. gentleman has been guilty of those crimes and misdemeanors—without any notice whatever to charge me with having, as a member of Parliament, degraded Parliament by personal application to the Government of a party which I have supported since 1867—benefited by my position as a supporter of the Government by securing a grant of timber limits.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I can only say that never since I entered Parliament have I made application to the Government for a timber limit or for a colonisation land reserve. In 1882, before I was returned to Parliament, several friends of mine wished to get a timber limit, and they asked me if I could apply and assist them. I did so. Where that timber limit was I have no idea. I simply recommended them, and immediately on being elected to Parliament wrote refusing to have anything to do with the matter. The lease has expired, and I never received a dollar of profit out of it. So far as the colonisation company is concerned, in May, 1882, I was asked by a gentleman named Moore, and two or three others in this city to assist them in getting a grant of land in the Prince Albert district. Shortly after, I was asked to give up any right in favor of the Press Colonisation Company, which I did willingly. I do not remember the numbers of the lots, and almost forget the circumstances, and even what officer of that company it was who asked if I had any objection to giving up our claim. I said I had no desire or interest in preventing it, and that we would surrender it with the greatest pleasure. There is all the profit and the emolument that I received in connection with lands in the North-West prior to entering this Parliament. I never received a dollar from any man since I entered this Parliament or before I entered, for advocating his interests in connection with North-West lands or colonisation companies, or for surrendering any right or claim I had. Now, Sir, my hon. friend for West Wellington has stated in his place that the hon. member for Ottawa County has benefited as a member of Parliament by being a promoter of the Gatineau Railway. This is absolutely wrong. That company was organised under a provincial charter. I was then mayor of the city of Ottawa, and the City Council requested me as mayor to do all I could to advance the interests of that enterprise. At that time I had no idea of entering Parliament: I think it was in the fall of 1881. I did all I possibly could to advance the interests of that enterprise; my late lamented friend Mr. Currier was then the member for the city, and applied to the Government in 1882 for a bonus towards assisting in the building of that road. The Government at that time, and before I entered Parliament, promised through Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, to grant a bonus the next Session which was done. So far as the Gatineau Railway is concerned, I have not got a dollar from it; I put my money into it honestly and honorably and have made an offer to those who are interested in it to return the money which I put in the enterprise and that if they did that I would only be too glad to be relieved of it. The people of Ottawa

who know me are aware that I have not trafficked in that enterprise, that I have not made money out of it and have never used it for the purpose of benefiting myself, but that I became connected with it when mayor of Ottawa and felt I was in duty bound, in justice to myself and my reputation, and in justice to the city of Ottawa, to take the course which I did, and all the sneers and charges of hon. gentlemen will not deter me from pursuing the strict path which I have marked out for myself. We have heard a good deal on the other side of this House about endeavoring to justify our conduct by referring to what Reformers did in the past. The reason I have always adopted that policy is that hon. gentlemen paraded the country endeavoring to make people believe that of all men they were of the kingdom of heaven, they were of all men most desirous for the independence of Parliament, they were the purest of the pure. Hon. gentlemen know me well enough to be aware that I am perfectly conversant with their record, and I assert that no party ever existed since Confederation, or since responsible government was introduced, who have degraded themselves as hon. gentlemen have, and yet they have the audacity to charge—

Mr. McMULLEN. What about Mr. Whitehead?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I cannot hear what the hon. gentleman says, but certainly desire him to speak if he wishes.

An hon. MEMBER. He wants to know about Whitehead.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. And perhaps you want to know something about Glasgow where you degraded the name of Canada? I will tell you about that presently. So far as I am concerned with regard to the matter to which my hon. friend for West Wellington has referred, I say that before a commission I have shown that I was agent for Mr. Whitehead when the Reform party were in power, and was the man who advised Mr. Whitehead to save his own credit and stop giving money to assist in the elections of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I have the documents to prove, if they desire, my connection with Mr. Whitehead. It is an old, old story, threadbare through age, but all I can say is that I sold the only property I had in Ottawa to pay notes in the banks in Ottawa in connection with that matter, and the hon. gentleman knows that, or else if he does not know it he should not say without being conversant with the facts.

Mr. McMULLEN. What did the judges say about it?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am interrupted, but if the hon. gentleman wants to know what the judge said it was this that no proof was adduced to show that I exercised any influence, direct or indirect, in order to get exclusive privileges for Joseph Whitehead. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? When interrupted, I was proceeding to say that those opposite had, notwithstanding their record, the audacity to charge Conservatives with corruption. As hon. gentlemen contend that we have no right to justify everything we do by references to their action, I will give them the maxim of their old leader, the gentleman whom they deposed, the gentleman whom my hon. friend from Simcoe could tell something about, in these very Glasgow transactions, if he desired. He said in 1877, when he was then Premier of this country, addressing an audience at Unionville:

"Far be it from me to cite their example as any justification of any single act of mine. I know I should have very little standing room in your presence if my defence was based on anything so weak as that, but when they say, as they do say, if not directly, certainly inferentially, that we are guilty of certain things, they mean, of course, that these things are wrong. If they are wrong, how are they to justify themselves in relation to matters exactly in the same line which they have done. I say we have done nothing that can in the slightest degree justify the attack which has been made upon us; but I say further that if you charge that these things are wrong, how are your own actions in regard to the same matters; how do you justify them?"

Now, in referring to a matter which it suits hon. gentlemen opposite to deem ancient history, I have always worked