

these gentlemen indulged in vituperation of the grossest kind, that I ever heard any gentleman so violate the proprieties of debate, or so insult the decorum of this House, as that hon. gentleman who has just sat down; and I say the cause must be poor indeed that that gentleman has to advocate when he has to resort to the kind of argument he has used to-night. I say the cause must be desperate when he drags into a debate like this—a debate so important—a debate which should be approached by the man who has been Finance Minister of this country with gravity—when he drags into such a debate such personalities, such gross accusations, such slanderous insinuations. If there could be anything calculated to unite any who in the slightest degree hesitated in regard to this question, it is the language used by that hon. gentleman. Much as I have heard of that which I may call his vitriol-throwing from public platforms all over the country, I never listened to anything so gross as that which I have been compelled to listen to to-night, and I believe that in rising now to express my indignation, I express the feelings of both sides of the House. I say language like that will not be tolerated, either by this House or the people of Canada, and I hope every word of this debate will go forth to the people, and that they will judge of the kind of argument that is used by a gentleman from whom, from the position he has previously held—a position more responsible almost than that held by any other member who sits on the Opposition benches—we might have expected better things. I was glad to hear my hon. friend rise in his place and challenge the gentlemen on the other side to formulate, like men, the charges they have been insinuating against him. I was glad he rose in the hearing of the man who has been pouring out his venom upon him in the public press week after week and month after month with diabolical ingenuity that just stopped this side of libel and that has never been equalled in the press of this country, licentious as it may be. Yes, it was a fitting opportunity, and I hope every gentleman within the sound of his voice has profited by his experience to-night. We are not in a temper, nor do I think this is a proper time, to enter into a discussion of this question in answer to the hon. gentleman, who has not only, I may say, degraded the debate, but he has introduced in almost every word of his argument fallacies that can be answered even by the most casual hearer. Point after point made by that gentleman can be refuted by the simplest reference to the statute. He stated a little while ago that this company which was to be chartered might have such tolls as it chose, when he had only to turn to the statute to find that, whereas the General Railway Statute permits a railway company to charge until it makes 15 per cent upon its paid-up capital; in the case of this Syndicate the restriction had been brought down from 15 to 10 per cent. The hon. gentleman could easily have seen that no location of that line can be made unless it is approved by the Governor in Council. He could easily have seen that the standard by which that line was to be accepted was the standard of the Union Pacific Railway, as first constructed. It was the only line at that time which was analogous to this, and the hon. gentleman knows that in dealing out those vile insinuations with which he has interspersed his speech—those flowers of rhetoric by which the hon. gentleman is distinguished—the hon. gentleman lashed himself into such a passion that when he rose his voice was almost inaudible. But I must say that, apart from the venom with which his speech was charged, I never heard, even from him, a speech so devoid of argument, and I believe that the hon. gentlemen to whom he seemed specially to address himself, who sat behind him, felt themselves disappointed in every possible way, first by

the manifestation of temper with which he approached the subject, and next by the weakness with which he handled his points. I am willing that his arguments shall go to the country uncontradicted. I do not think anything that has been said in this House is better calculated to strengthen our case. I do not think that any utterance which can be made on our side will be better calculated to draw the attention of the public to the strong points of this contract. I believe we only need a few more speeches like that for us to allow the question to be submitted to the country. When the proper time comes the judgment upon that hon. gentleman and his confederates will be similar to that which was given in September, 1878, a judgment for which he, in his campaign speeches, is mainly responsible, and which he has largely brought upon his party. It is notorious that that hon. gentleman, with the aid of the newspaper which published his speeches *in extenso*, were the main causes of the delusion by which a bright and intelligent party was so utterly wrecked, that they came back to Parliament with but, to use an expression which I quote with pleasure from the hon. leader of the Opposition, a corporal's guard.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise, not to speak on the subject of debate, but simply to express my great regret that we have heard the language which we have heard from the last speaker and the hon. the Minister of Railways. If the hon. the Minister of Railways had aught to complain of in my hon. friend's allusion, I believe he would have better served his own cause and conserved the dignity of this House and inspired us with more confidence in his repudiation of the charge, by keeping himself within the limits of parliamentary language. I think it is a very great mistake in any member, because he conceives himself to have been aggrieved to put himself in the wrong by the use of language, which the hon. gentleman did use, language which was unquestionably of the most unparliamentary character. We heard from him the words, "base," "unmanly," "lying," "slanderer," "most dishonorable."

Mr. BOWELL. Quite true, quite true.

Mr. BLAKE. We heard from him, also a repetition, as against the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), of the very same thing which he was so indignant at the hon. member for Centre Huron imputing to him. Now, if it be wrong for the hon. member for Centre Huron to suggest an insinuation against the hon. gentleman, which he publicly withdraws a moment afterwards upon reading the speech in the *Hansard*, and accepting the hon. gentleman's explanation, is it right for the hon. Minister of Railways to make an insinuation against the hon. member for Centre Huron. The hon. Minister of Railways said that the hon. member for Centre Huron had made a sale in secret, by private bargain of £3,000,000 of bonds on the London market, and that he had never disclosed and refused to disclose the names. There was but one result of the insinuation, that there had been some personal and corrupt transaction on the part of the hon. member for Centre Huron in that matter. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways does not make his own attitude before the House or the country any better in replying to insinuations against him by making insinuations against other people. I venture to say that this House would be much more respected in the future if we abstained during the rest of this session from a repetition of the unparliamentary language which has been used this evening. I say another thing: I do not believe myself that all that outburst of indignation which the hon. gentleman—and we know he is very good at outbursts of indignation—in this case, directed against the hon. member for Centre Huron—because he believed he had an opportunity of hitting another person over his shoulder—was real. I say that it is degrading to the dignity of this House that we should find hon,