

to submit a substantial contract for its construction, the Government may be empowered to incorporate any other company that may undertake to build it. I wish most sincerely I could feel certain that in that event another corporation would come forward to build the railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. Amen.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I fear very much that the result of the defeat of this measure, whether it be defeated here or by the failure of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beaty) to submit his contract to the Government by the 1st of June, will mean the postponement for a considerable time of the construction of that road, to the serious drawback to that part of the country. In the meantime we ought reasonably to give to the company the opportunity of submitting to the Government such a contract as will secure the construction of the road, and thus secure to the people of that section the advantage of its construction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the motion is carried, I would like to make a few observations. I may say at the outset I am satisfied the practice of members of this House acting as presidents or contractors of railways, is contrary to the true spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act. I believe the time has arrived in the history of this country when such a state of things shall not be permitted longer to exist. The hon. the Minister of the Interior says, and he no doubt well knows, that it may be possible for members in the House, whose names do not appear as contractors in railway companies, to evade the law. He, I suppose, states of his own experience in connection with the *Gazette* Printing Company that it is possible for him not to appear as a member of that company, when every person in this country feels and believes that he is. He is but speaking his own experience that, while he is able to receive public money as sitting in this House, he is able to render nugatory the Independence of Parliament Act and draw large sums of money for work which he has never performed. Now, with that allusion to that hon. gentleman, I will proceed to state that the system pursued by the Government of Ontario in constructing the great network of railways that permeates every part of the Province of Ontario has been very different to that which has been pursued in regard to Manitoba. Is there any man in this House who has studied the railway system that was inaugurated by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in the year 1871, who will stand up to-day and state upon his reputation that the money that was then appropriated for railway aid was not judicious, and that it has not been well expended?

Mr. McCALLUM. For political purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to know if the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) can state one single instance where an appropriation has been made without its being submitted to Parliament. It has been in the public interest; it has been expended in the public interest; it has contributed to the development and to the welfare of the Province of Ontario very materially. There is scarcely a county that has not been aided, and with all the progress and the enterprise which has characterised the Administration in the Province of Ontario ever since the hon. the leader of the Opposition inaugurated that system, it has been marked by progress, and they have had railways built, long lines of railways stretching from one portion of the country to the other, which have received aid from the Province and have been a great benefit in developing it. I state here in my place in the House that I do not believe that the principle is right of allowing members of this House to act as directors of railways that approach this House for public aid. I do not believe that any gentleman in

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

this House should be a member of any company, whether it is a railway company, a newspaper company or any other company, that receives public aid from this House. I believe the principle has a tendency to demoralisation. I do not say that it always produces such results, but I do say that it has the appearance of evil and should be shunned. It matters not to me whether some members on this side of the House in the last fifty years have chanced to be directors of a railway company. I do not admire the principle any more for that, and it is high time that the people of the country should know who are those in this House who are directors or presidents of railways. Fancy, for instance, the Minister of Railways being a president of a railway company, being a member of the Government, coming to the Government and asking them to aid that railway scheme. Why, in the noon-day of the nineteenth century, it would appear improbable that, in a British House, a member of the Government should be found so barefaced and so shameless as to come to Parliament, where he was a member of the Government, and ask for aid to a railway in where he was interested. The principle will lead to nothing but demoralisation. It will lead the people of this country to look at this House as being composed of placemen, who are sitting here and are maintained here by the public money. It is a position that is beneath the dignity of this House. Since this matter came up, a serious question has arisen in connection with it, and I have looked through the "Parliamentary Companion" and ascertained how the House is composed. It may not be a pleasing duty, it may be a disagreeable duty, but I feel it is a duty I owe to myself to state what is there stated by the members, I suppose, in giving their reports to the author of this book; and I find that we have in this House a great many who are connected with different railways in this country, and I regret to say there are a great many there who have come to this House and asked for public money to aid the railways with which they were connected. It is a direct blow, a direct violation of the independence of Parliament. It is as much so as the case of a member of a printing company or a newspaper company who manages to evade the Independence of Parliament Act by keeping his name out of the company, though he says it can be done. He knows it can be done, and the people of the country know it can be done, and know it has been done, and that public money has been paid to that gentleman and the firm to which he belongs, for work he never performed. Prices fourteen times higher than should have been paid, were paid to that member and his firm for printing on behalf of this House. I have looked through this list and I will let you know what I find. I find that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) is a president of a railway company, and that that company has received a large grant of land from the Government of this country. I think that is indecent. Can it be said they have no railway men in Manitoba? Can it be said that, from one end to the other of this broad Dominion, there are no men capable of building a railway, that there are no railway contractors, that they have to go to West Toronto, and get a lawyer, who perhaps does not know a railway locomotive from a steamboat, to go there and construct their railway; and the Government find this a pressing emergency when this Bill cannot be delayed any longer, though I believe the charter was granted three years ago, and, in order to get this lawyer to teach the railway men how to build railways in the North-West, they grant him this money. He will be a pretty independent man. He will be most likely to vote against the motion of my hon. friend from Northumberland. He received 6,400 acres per mile for building this road. He has never built any of the road yet, although he is a lawyer and gets great credit for his efforts on behalf of this road, and we have it stated to-day that he had not put in one spade in the construction of this road. We find that he is associ-