

10,000 people within a few years in the new townships on the proposed line of this railway. He is endowed with an ardent patriotism and singular energy and intelligence. He recognizes distinctly the importance of railroad extension and development. Many years ago at a great banquet in Montreal, I heard the reverend gentleman enunciate his faith in railways as promoters of civilization. I think that the policy of the Government is likely to keep the people in our own country, although the great North-West may be all that it is described to be. I for one prefer our own country and should like to keep our people in it. I honestly trust that the Government will be able to give us an additional grant next year, feeling that its policy will meet the approval of the vast majority of the people of the Dominion.

Mr. RYKERT. I desire to place myself right before the House in consequence of the remarks made by the hon. member for West Middlesex. He seems to have the happy faculty of endeavoring to mis-state the facts he presents to the House, and in distorting what gentlemen say on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman has contradicted me on several points. What I did say before Recess was based entirely on my recollection of facts which took place twelve or thirteen years ago. Since that time I have consulted his own organ, the *Globe*, and I find that everything I stated is entirely correct. In order that the House may fully understand—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not object to the hon. gentleman speaking again, but, of course, he knows his position; I only wish to point out that sometimes an hon. member on this side who takes the course he is now taking, is objected to. I simply wish him to bear that fact in mind.

Mr. BERGIN. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. RYKERT. This is a little game that two can play at. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem desirous of having the facts placed on record; and inasmuch as they have made the same mis-statements throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, I desire now to set these statements at rest, and to place before the House and the country the facts; and I defy contradiction. I stated before Recess that the leader of the Opposition had, while Premier of the Local Legislature, brought down certain resolutions on the eve of the close of the Legislature without giving opportunity to the members fairly and honestly to discuss them. I stated also that the hon. gentleman had been challenged to give information as regards these resolutions, and the hon. gentleman shook his head, denying my statement. I think I will be able to show before I sit down from his own authority, the *Globe*, that my statements were correct, and justified what I did state. The member for West Middlesex states that all the information was given to the House in order that the members might come to an intelligent conclusion upon those several resolutions then before the House. The hon. gentleman said that certain petitions were presented in the early part of the Session. Certainly they were, but he forgot the most important fact that petitions are not before the House until they are ordered to be printed; and if the hon. gentleman consults the record he will find that a number of these petitions were not ordered to be printed until the day before the resolutions came down. Now, I have the facts as they are presented on the Journals of the House. There were ten resolutions which I say were sprung on the House and forced through in one sitting. Four of these petitions were presented on the 5th of February and the supplementary papers on the 20th of February: two of them were presented on the 7th and the supplementary on the 20th of February; two upon the 8th and the supplementary on the 23rd of February, that is, one day after the resolutions were carried in the House; two on the 21st of February; four were ordered to be printed on the 6th, two on the 16th, and two on the 21st

Mr. WRIGHT.

of February. The resolutions were introduced on the 22nd of February, and carried through Committee on the 23rd; the Bill was introduced founded on these resolutions on the 24th; it was passed on the 28th, and the Orders in Council were presented on the evening of the 28th. The first Order of the Day on the 29th was the resolutions moved by the leader of the Opposition. Now, the hon. gentleman says, I did not state correctly my position regarding these resolutions. I stated distinctly to the House—and I had before me the resolutions he referred to at the time—that I opposed every motion for the appropriation of money in favor of railways, and if the hon. gentleman refers to the Journals of the House, he will find on pages 201, 202, 205 and 206 two motions, on page 228 three motions, and on pages 229 and 230 that I opposed the resolutions at every stage; that when the House had decided to appropriate the funds in favor of railways, and when the Orders in Council were presented I distinctly told the House, as is reported in the *Globe*, that I offered all opposition to the appropriation of the money, but that it rested entirely with the House to say which railways should have aid. That is what I stated. I have the record before me, and it is just as well that I should set the leader of the Opposition right. When the resolutions were brought down I am reported as having said:

“Having done all he could to oppose the Railway Resolutions he could not raise any further objection, but would lend his aid in carrying out the policy of the Government in good faith.”

Those resolutions were brought down to the House, and one division taken, and I supported them. Eight others were proposed without any division in the House. When the resolutions were read in the House, Mr. Cameron moved, and I seconded, a resolution condemning the Government for bringing them down without giving proper explanations which would enable us to come to an intelligent conclusion. On that occasion I stated my views on the subject, and I am reported in the *Globe* as follows:—

“The country had not the right to expect such a dangling policy from the leader of the Government. The leader of the Government had ample means of knowing how many of the Railways applying for aid came within the meaning of the Act, so as to be entitled to assistance. The leader ought to be able to show to the House what Railways were entitled to aid, and ought to be able to show it was in the interest of the country that such and such Railways should be constructed. Until this was done, the House had no right to add to the Railway Fund.”

The answer made by the hon. gentleman showed that I was right in describing it as a dangling policy, for his reply was in these words:

“It was utterly impossible for the Government to bring down any complete scheme of all the railways that would require and deserve aid. It would be an injustice to all these enterprises to name which should receive aid until they know what fund the House could devote for railway aid.”

When the motion then came before the House on Concurrency on the report of the Committee, I asked the hon. gentleman to name the railways which he proposed to aid. The hon. gentleman knew what railways were to receive aid, and yet he refused to tell the House; and yet the first thing he did after the Bill was carried was to take the resolutions out of his desk and give them to the House. I said on that occasion:

“The Government had not dared to tell the House what railways they proposed to aid, though they must know what Order in Council had been passed, if any had. The Premier (Mr. Blake) had brought down a list of railways to which he said the late Government had promised to give aid. But the House would find that there were not two promises made without the saving clause, ‘if it comes under the provision of the Act.’”

Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman refused to give the information until the money was voted; and if the hon. member for West Middlesex will consult the records of the House he will find that the Legislature was not possessed of the