

House, with the meanness, the avarice and cupidity of a certain member of a certain company, could not and would not, if they had the will to do it, have helped the Conservative party one tithé as much as I helped them, and they know it, and my reward has been such as it is to-night. Now, Sir, so much for that. The only member who had the manliness—I won't say that—who had the kindness of heart, to stand upon his feet and give one grain of comfort to me, was the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and he, steadfast and loyal as he is, thought that it was a little too much when he found the Minister of the Interior and the members of the House supporting the Conservative party, having nothing but dry herbs, vinegar and the sponge for the member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), while they have honey and wine and everything nice for the president of the North-Western Railway. Sir, I did not intend to go into this matter. But I am prepared to go into it at any moment. I do not have to go to the Library to search any books. On the tablet of my memory are written indelibly that which I can collect in a moment. I do not wish to go into altercations of that kind. But I tell the Minister of the Interior here, and his Government, that when they think that by any side issue, by any slight, or by any intended insult, they can place me in a false position for one week, they are very much mistaken, they are much mistaken indeed. The member for West Toronto made a speech here this afternoon. His speech was not thought sufficient, however, and hon. gentlemen have rushed to his rescue. The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) made a nice mess of it. He spoke like a lawyer who had got the wrong brief. Some one had given him some statements and he sought to make the best use of them. Everybody knows he is clever, but he did not understand the subject. Among other statements he made was one that he would like to know how the president got the capital stock. He said his brother directors gave him the stock in order to give him control. Did he know anything about his co-directors having no stock except what they got from the great Mikado of the whole thing? Where did he get the stock? Did the hon. gentleman not know he was talking nonsense? Where did the president of the railway get the stock? He got not a cent and not a piece of paper from his co-directors. He gave them what he liked. He got the old Souris and Rocky Mountain stock. The member for West Toronto did something with that stock. I stated in the committee that he sold some of the stock. I stated that upon information received by me. I said I had understood such to be the case, and I invited that gentleman to deny it. To this hour he has never denied it. I said that the amount was in the thousands; I did not know the exact figures. This is my answer to the question—what did he get after two years? He got the Souris and Rocky Mountain stock—but not from his brother director—amounting to \$386,000, 10 per cent. paid up, and the statement has been made in the presence of the president of the North-West Central that he had sold the stock and pocketed the money and had been living on it for two years. That statement has been made. Has it been denied? No. The Minister of the Interior has said there is not the slightest charge against the hon. member for West Toronto. If that were done in England—if before ever a spade was put into the ground, before a level was ran, one man got hold of the stock and put the money in his pocket and did nothing for two years, how long would he retain his seat in Parliament? How long would he sit as an alderman, or as town clerk, or in some more humble position? Not one hour. Yet the Minister of the Interior, who can make a specious and plausible speech on almost any subject, told the House, told you, Mr. Speaker, and told me to my face, that there was not one word or tittle of a charge against the great and good president of the North-West Central Railway. Let them answer that one charge and see if it is true, for it has never been

Mr. WOODWORTH.

denied and it has been made over and over again by me. If it is said that it is not true, I say that I am informed and believe that I can produce witnesses to swear to it, and I believe the witnesses are in this city to-day. If it is true, what about the Minister of the Interior's white-washing of the president of the North-West Central Railway? What is the good of his brush; what is the good of his wash? The Minister of the Interior has really come to the rescue and made the best defence put forward to-night. It is a cunning, clear and plausible defence; but it lacks the essential element: he has left out of sight certain facts and put other facts very prominently forward, and on the whole he made a plausible and good case. But the hon. gentleman said: What is the evidence? The evidence is that he (Mr. Beaty) attempted to get \$675,000 for the charter. We all know that companies pay contractors to build railways and contractors do not pay companies. Did it ever occur to the Minister that it is an unusual thing for companies to receive money from contractors to build a railway? I always thought a company paid contractors and got them to build a railway. But they have reversed this in the new order of things. But what is the evidence, says the Minister of the Interior. There is the evidence of a man by the name of Pew, of New York, whom the Minister says he will not believe, and he is cheered in that statement by the member of North Perth and some more of the friends. But I said there was a man by the name of McConachie. He says he will swear that he was present at the time. But the Minister of the Interior will not accept him. You can get plenty of men to swear against a member of this House for \$5,000. You can get men, if they be men, that wear clothes and look like men, to swear against other men they hate. I do not know anything about McConachie, but I would see that a negro had fair play in this House, even if I did not know it. I do not know anything about McConachie, as I have said, but he cannot be condemned because some men say they will not believe him. That is no proof against him.

Mr. KIRK. Where are the letters?

Mr. WOODWORTH. But Mr. Beaty—I forgot the rules in naming him, but the debate has taken that turn—has been with Mr. Pew, and yet he denounces him now. He was worthy of being talked to, worthy of being negotiated with, but all at once he is a man not to be believed. I have here a letter from McConachie. The Minister of the Interior says that he knows that a man of that name is in the case; but he says McConachie masqueraded as a millionaire. How did he know? He did not tell the House he heard it. I never saw that man in my life; but the Minister, speaking *ex cathedra*, as Ministers always speak, said he masqueraded as a millionaire. How did he hear that, except from the president of the North-Western Central Railway? Is it thus men's characters are to be bandied about without a tittle of evidence being forth coming. Let me read McConachie's letter, and let hon. members say if he is not a man capable of writing a good letter, and from all we know is a reliable man. It is said that he had something to do with Mr. Pew, and that therefore he is bad. Yet Mr. Pew has had to do with thousands of men, and you will find hundreds of persons ready to say he is a fair man; of course he has his friends and his enemies. But Mr. McConachie was said to have been a clerk—I do not know whether he was a clerk or not. Why should he not be believed? Is it because he referred to the conduct of the member for West Toronto? I say as a member of this House that when an hon. member makes a statement I am prepared to accept it in preference to a statement made by a person outside of this House, but at the same time I am prepared to give other men fair play. If they were members of this House their word would be taken without abuse of this kind. They did not happen to be members of the