

were to be mutually interested in. That letter he never replied to. I wrote him another asking him to reply to the first, but he did not reply, and I found out afterwards that he had taken those letters, while ostensibly a member of the same party to which I belong—if I belong to any party—and showed them to members of the party opposed to him, if he belongs to the Conservative party; I found that, without being accosted by the reporters of the Reform press, he interviewed them, and made statements to them with regard to his connection and mine with the road. He even went so far as, when I came into the building and he was talking to a Mr. McNee, the reporter of the *Winnipeg Free Press*, to ask Mr. McNee to come out into the corridors, as he did not wish to talk before me. After having filled the ears of the members of the Opposition and the correspondents of the Reform press, he went to New York and attempted to make another agreement. When this Session opened, the member for West Toronto introduced a Bill to amend the North-West Central Railway Act. I looked at the Bill, and found that all the guards, all the checks, ensuring payment to the workmen upon the road, the old Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, of which this was a revival, had been left out. I found that, in so many words—and I have the Bill here—he introduced his measure, leaving out those clauses, without which the North-West Central Railway Act would not have passed in 1884. When that Bill came before the Committee of Railways and Canals I objected to it, and in the course of my objection I made, in substance, the statements which I have just made in the beginning of the few remarks I am addressing to the House. The committee at once, almost unanimously—I think quite so, with the exception of the member for West Toronto and two or three of his co-directors—struck out all these objectionable clauses, and left the Bill merely an extension of time; but then they told the member for West Toronto that they would give him certain time to produce evidence of his ability to build the road. The committee adjourned, and when they met again the member for West Toronto could not show any ability to build the road, but said he expected the papers that night, and asked the committee to be kind enough to adjourn again. The committee adjourned for a week, and I think there was another adjournment, besides, to give him time. There were three adjournments altogether, and when the committee met last Friday, they met for the purpose of enabling the member for West Toronto to show his ability to build the road, because the statements made during the meetings of the committee at different times seemed to me to indicate the feeling of the whole committee that the present promoters of that charter, notably the member for West Toronto, as its president, should not be allowed to go on. That was the unanimous feeling of the committee, but when we met last Friday we were informed that it was determined this Bill should pass, extending the time, and if the promoters did not show their ability to build the road by the first of June next, when the proclamation would issue, bringing into effect the charter, the Government would take upon themselves the responsibility of adopting such measures as would ensure the building of the road. That was certainly not what the committee expected. I am sure I was never more surprised in my life than when that announcement was made, because I thought we had been adjourning from time to time to give the member for West Toronto an opportunity to show that he was able to build this road. However, when it came to this announcement, which was an entirely different matter altogether, the member for West Toronto sat there and never opened his lips. The remarks were all made by the hon. Minister of Interior in the favor of the member for West Toronto, and perhaps some other hon. gentleman made remarks as to the position of members of Parliament; but

the Minister of the Interior made the defence. Now, during those meetings of the committee, that had been adjourned from time to time, to which I alluded, I made the statement, as I told you, at the first meeting of the committee, that we were mutually interested in the road. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) got up and denied it *in toto*; he said there was not a word of truth in the statement. Well, I said, I have your letters—I had one which I had not handed over—and I have given them to the hon. the Minister of Finance; I gave them to him last summer, and I said they will prove my statement. I was there in the presence of my peers, I was there in the presence of almost the whole Parliament—160 members formed that committee—and, having made the statement that I did and having it denied by the member for West Toronto, I found myself uncorroborated; and when I made the statement that the Minister of Finance had letters which would prove it, I was asked to produce those letters. I wrote to the Minister of Finance and asked him to produce them. The Minister of Finance replied what has been in the papers, but, as it was done before a committee, of course it was not taken down in the *Hansard*. The Minister of Finance replied to me that he could not find my letters, that he had mislaid them in shifting his office from the Ministry of Marine and Fisheries, but that the impression made upon his mind by reading the letters, which he had done, was that the member for West Toronto and myself were mutually interested in the road and all connected therewith. Therefore, I was enabled, although my letters were not forthcoming by no fault of mine, to prove from the Finance Minister of Canada, my statement made before that committee and most solemnly and positively denied by the member for West Toronto in the presence of the chairman of the committee, in the presence of the leader of the Opposition, in the presence of every member of that committee—and it was filled to overflowing—notwithstanding his denial. After another adjournment, I stated to that committee that I had a letter to show that the member for West Toronto had demanded as his share of the profit in building that road, from a contractor whom he wished to undertake the work, the modest sum of \$675,000. I read that letter. That was denied, as my statement had been denied to which I have alluded as corroborated by the Finance Minister. At a subsequent meeting I read a letter from another man whose name I forget now, saying he was present when the member for West Toronto saw the man to whom I have referred as writing the first letter, and that he heard the member for West Toronto demand that as the modest sum he wanted for what he called "the boy." That was also denied. Now I have in my hand another piece of evidence of the member for West Toronto endeavoring to sell this charter, for it is nothing but that. There was no honest attempt made to build one foot of this road. There was not an honest attempt to put a theodolite on the road, to take a measurement, to take a level, to do anything, to go out there even, as I understand, to put a foot on the road, but merely to hawk the road, not from Dan to Beersheba, which were the old Palestine distances, but from America to the continent of Europe, to hawk it about; and had there been an honest attempt, and had there been a spade stuck in the ground in order to build the road, or anything given excepting wind, which always was given, I would never have been heard from in regard to this Bill, we never would have had this Bill introduced into this House to amend the North-West Central Railway Company's charter. We might have had one for an extension, but we would not have had one with the obnoxious clauses to which I have referred, and which the committee at once unanimously struck out. I say this was a charter selling, and nothing else, and no honest attempt to build the road. Here is a copy of an agreement which I shall read in support of the contention I make. It is signed