

and millionaire, was brought to me, and I found out that he was Mr. Pew's clerk and was not worth a thousand dollars, and that he just did and talked as Pew ordered him. That was proved in the case of *Pew vs. Schultz*. This is the kind of evidence with which I have to be slandered, with which this Parliament is to be outraged, with which this country is to be agitated, for the purpose of damaging a political opponent. That is the effect of it and that is the design. I say it is an outrage on public decency that such witnesses should be introduced for the purpose of damaging a man appreciated in his own city, a man who never had to blush for shame on account of any charge brought against him. The allegation is laid and repeated without a tittle of evidence being adduced in support of it, that there has been charter selling. There is not a word of truth in that statement, from whatever quarter it may come. I deny that I have ever offered the charter for sale; the charter is not sold, and will not be sold, as I have stated again and again. I have said so to the men with whom have been dealing. I could have sold it.

An hon. MEMBER. For how much?

Mr. BEATY. For as much money as would buy some hon. members, but it did not buy me. Why? Because I had interests entrusted to me which I would not betray, and I would not allow any private interest whatever to interfere with those interests so entrusted to me. That was the reason the charter was not sold. It never has been offered for sale; it never has been arranged or negotiated for sale, and it never will be while it is under my control.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope it will not be.

Mr. BEATY. The hon. member need not hope anything about it. Whatever he might do if he held it, he need not fear as to what I will do. Then observations have been made in regard to what took place in the case of Mr. Macdonald, who wrote me a letter offering to do the work. I said: Certainly if you can do it, take your opportunity for doing it, and it will afford a chance for paying you the old debts. That has always been one of the objects of the company. But how could we pay the claim made in court for \$140,000 unless we got the money out of the contract? And that is what I am providing for. Notwithstanding what has been said by the member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), in regard to this matter, when the Bill was first presented to the House I introduced a clause providing that all workmen and claimants for work done, for material supplied or money paid should be reimbursed. That is substantially the clause which is now introduced, and which is clause 3:

"The company shall remain liable for all debts due for the construction of the railway, and if such debts are due to contractors, shall cause all just claims for labor, board and building material in respect of such construction to be paid by such contractors, and in default thereof shall be directly liable to the persons having such claims."

In those words the company were to pay the old claims for work done, material supplied and money expended on the old grading, not one foot of which we would use in the present construction, because that grading was between Melbourne and Rapid City, and our line goes from Brandon to Rapid City; and yet we made provisions to pay for the work done. The amount claimed is \$140,000. I repeat, how was that to be paid? And that question was one of the greatest difficulties in all arrangements in connection with entering into a contract. The clause is inserted with the object of paying that debt—and I regret there are yet men who are not paid, but with that matter I have nothing to do, as the undertaking was entered into in 1882-83, and I had nothing to do with the road until the winter of 1884—and it is for the purpose of paying those debts that the money is asked.

Is it not reasonable, just and fair that the farmers, workmen and merchants in Winnipeg and elsewhere who have not been paid should be paid, and that I should see they are paid? I said I would do so in the first instance, I have wished to do so ever since, and I propose to do that so long as I have anything to do with the road. This is the original clause:

"The said North-West Central Railway Company shall not be chargeable with any liability of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, except for actual work done or material supplied in the grading between Melbourne and Rapid City, which shall be payable directly to the several workmen and claimants respectively, on account of such work or supplies."

Then I added: "or money paid." Is that not substantially the same clause we introduced to carry out the purpose and object I have mentioned? Whatever may be said in regard to a member of Parliament having a charter of this kind, I and you, Mr. Speaker, know that this has been done during the last thirty years.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been too much of it.

Mr. BEATY. That may be. But why make me the scapegoat? I might say so myself now; but again I ask why make me the scapegoat in regard to this matter? Why not refer to other hon. members of the House, to the hon. member for Northumberland, or some other hon. member? Why not have all matters connected with rail-
was charters opened up?

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you intend to imply that I was ever connected with any railway charter? If so you say that which is not true.

Mr. BEATY. If the hon. gentleman says he has not been so connected, I accept his statement. If there is any objection to members of Parliament having charters, let a Bill be introduced setting forth that members of Parliament shall have no share in companies, banks or institutions of any kind which have dealings with the Government, and I will support and vote for such a Bill. But is it not the express law that members of Parliament may hold shares in all companies having relations with the Government? Has it not been passed over by all Administrations for years and years, and I am told the Reform party enacted the law. If that is so, why should I be made a scapegoat in regard to this matter, when I positively and unhesitatingly deny that there is anything whatever in the transaction that cannot be announced from the housetops of the world, and no transaction which is not honest and honorable in every respect.

Mr. LISTER. Then let it go to a committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. leader of the Opposition stated just now in his remarks that we had three telegrams or communications from the Legislature of Manitoba about this road, and the inference he drew from those communications, especially from the last, was that the Manitoba Legislature was not favorable to this company and wished another company to be incorporated. I am sorry I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The inference I drew from those communications was not to that effect; but it was this: That the Legislature of Manitoba wished to have the road built, and fifty miles built if possible this season; and they asked us to see that the present company, or another company to be incorporated, should show they had ability and means to build the railway. It was with that view that the Railway Committee considered the matter; it was in that light that the Government thought they would consider this charter and see whether they could meet the wishes of the Manitoba Legislature and of the people of the North-West who are so much interested in the building of the railway, and whether Parliament could do this by giving the company an extension of time. The hon. gentleman said a great deal about the position of