

such royalty. The result is, that the province could not discriminate between the coal mines in the interior and the coal mines on the coast. Therefore, this whole argument of the "Globe," based on this idea, is utterly fallacious; yet it states that this is the chief ground on which it opposes disallowance. You would have thought that the "Globe" would have been actuated by higher principles; and, indeed, from the former part of the editorial of that day you would have thought that it would have agreed with the Hon. Mr. Davies, and would have supported the policy of the Liberal party in regard to disallowance. It stated, however, that this was its chief reason for not supporting disallowance. That reason is now swept from under its feet, and I am going to wait and see whether it will now come out and support a motion for disallowance. Sir, it will not support it, and for a very good reason. It is not for the reason that it assigns in this editorial, or because it believes in the Liberal principle of non-disallowance. It is because if that Act were disallowed, some of the prominent directors of the "Globe" would fail to make the big haul which they are now making because of their interest in the charter of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. I have stated that for months past the "Globe" has been suggesting what it dared not openly state. There can be no doubt about that. So apparent has that been that one of the prominent Liberal papers of Ontario—a paper which I do not think takes a second place even to the "Globe"—a paper which has been consistently Liberal, whether it pleased the people in Quebec or anywhere else—the Hamilton "Times"—took occasion on the 26th of February to make the following remarks on the "Globe's" attitude on this subject:

The onus rests with the "Globe" to show that the interests of the people will be better served by handing the railway over to the C.P.R. than by allowing the control to remain in the hands of the Government. So far, the "Globe" has lamentably failed to make out a case in favour of C.P.R. control. Its arguments are all on the defensive. It does not attempt to show how the country will be benefited by allowing the C.P.R. to control and operate the road. Its argument in favour of C.P.R. control takes the form of an apology. It excuses the proposed deal. It does not champion it.

That language is almost identical with the language I have used; and, coming as it does from that high Liberal authority, I do not think any exception can properly be taken to my remarks in that regard. Sir, I said that the conduct of the "Globe" in this matter had been characterized by lack of principle, and I said it advisedly; for we cannot forget that the time was when the "Globe"—

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member allow me to make a suggestion to him? So

far as personal explanations are concerned, I certainly think that the limit has been somewhat passed; but I would suggest to the hon. member that he should state to the House now, if he proposes to go on, that he intends to move a motion that will put him in order; because I do not want a precedent established that personal explanations may be accompanied by such a lengthy argument. If the hon. member wishes to continue in the same line, he will be good enough to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McINNES. Then, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will move the adjournment of the House. I was proceeding to say that I charged, and charged advisedly, that the action of the "Globe" in this matter was characterized by lack of principle. I say that because we cannot forget that for years past the "Globe" was the avowed opponent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To-day we find it the greatest friend in the country of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We see it advocating subsidies being granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway for bogus concessions in return. In the past the "Globe" has always opposed monopoly and everything which partook of the nature of monopoly; but, Sir, we see the "Globe" to-day supporting a policy which will create the greatest monopoly that has ever existed in this country. The "Globe" in times past has appeared to be very much interested in the progress of that western country, but its attitude at this time will have the effect, if effect is given to it, of placing the future of that country in the hands of a grasping monopoly the like of which has never before existed in this country. I say again that the "Globe" has been unprincipled in this matter, that it has been a mere political weathercock, that it has acted more like a nickel-in-the-slot machine that is prepared to do any turn or take any stand that is lucrative to its owners.

I said further:

After all these months of pretended discussion and unfair statement of facts with regard to this matter, they finally pretend to come to a conclusion, and that conclusion definite only in this, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, their masters, should build that line.

It is evidently to that statement, above all others, that the "Globe" takes such strong exception. Sir, I have not one syllable of that to withdraw. There are circumstances which amply justify it. True, I come to a conclusion from circumstantial evidence, but, as hon. members know, many a man has been hanged on circumstantial evidence, and evidence nothing like as strong as that which can be adduced to show that the "Globe" is implicated in this deal. There are several circumstances which point to that. The first is that the "Globe," although in the past has been the avowed enemy of the Canadian Pacific Railway—none stronger in the country—is yet, at the present, pleading for the Canadian Pacific