

in it for some of the promoters. As to the manner in which the road has been constructed, I repeat that the culverts are wooden; I said nothing about the bridges; and I say again that the iron on the road is light and not at all suitable for heavy traffic. More than that, the road has no station at Aylmer; it has a couple of small stations along the line; it has a few passenger and freight cars; but its total equipment is quite insignificant, and would not to any great extent enter into a consideration of its cost. So that I venture to say that there is not a dollar of the money of the promoters or the present stockholders in that road, but that it has been built entirely out of the subsidies granted and the money borrowed on the bonds issued by the company. I am not complaining of the hon. gentleman. I am not saying that he had anything to do with the road, directly or indirectly; I know nothing about that; I care nothing about that. I simply instanced that road to show that we were adopting a system which, in my judgment, was pernicious. People are now beginning to think that instead of asking for \$3,000 a mile, they must get enough money, by hook or by crook, to build the whole road, and they are coming to this House for \$6,000 a mile, and one road a few years ago received \$12,000 a mile. I protest again against a system that makes the people lean upon the Government for everything instead of depending upon individual enterprise and capital. All that this Government ought to do is to encourage the investment of private capital by slight aid to these undertakings. The mere fact that a road passes through a section of country that requires accommodation is no reason why the Government should undertake to provide the principal cost of its construction. It is shown unmistakably that this road which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue speaks about has been subsidized enormously, and at this particular time this Parliament should not entertain the proposition to subsidize it further. The proposition should be postponed, at all events until the conclusion of the investigation which the Government have shirked in this House, and which they have handed over to a tribunal appointed by themselves. Sir, the hon. Postmaster General in his utterances showed considerable courage—not Dutch courage, I hope. That hon. gentleman had no right to charge the hon. member for West Ontario with want of courage when he was afraid himself to face the charges in this House, and the Government came to the determination to vote down the charges entirely, but I have no doubt that, on account of the pressure of their followers, they devised the scheme of referring the charges to a special commission for investigation, which was an act of cowardice on the part of the hon. gentleman and the Government who permitted him to escape in that sort of way. If my hon. friend should refuse to appear before that commission, he would, I conceive, be doing nothing more than he has the right to do, because having made those charges in this House, it was the plain duty of this House to investigate them and not throw the responsibility of doing so on other shoulders.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I repeat what I have said, that the statement of the hon. gentleman who has last spoken is unwarranted, ungenerous, and untrue. I say this of my own motion, and not as **Mr. LISTER.**

speaking on behalf of those connected with that company; and in so doing, I speak especially for the gentleman who has devoted his energies to the building of that road. I refer to the promoter of the building of the road. My hon. friend has said that those who are interested in that company never risked a dollar of their money in it. That is untrue. Mr. Beemer has put more than \$100,000 of his money into the enterprise, and has involved his credit to a still larger extent. Those who are assisting him in a smaller proportion have also risked their money, and they have never asked for or received a single dollar out of any subsidy voted by any government or municipality; and if an investigation were had, it could be conclusively proved that not a dollar of public money has been expended on anything except for the work actually done on the road. I challenge an investigation into this matter, and I do so in the interests of the gentlemen who have advanced their money to construct the road, and of the capitalists who have assisted them. My hon. friend has insinuated that these railways were built by construction companies. They were built by the regular chartered company, with the money of the promoters and the assistance of the two Governments and the county which subsidized them. The enterprise is not one of those great commercial enterprises, the bonds in connection with which require only to be put on the market to find purchasers, and it is not by slandering the gentlemen connected with it in the way they have been slandered and by treating them in the acrimonious and ungenerous manner in which they have been treated, that hon. gentlemen can show their zeal for the interests of the country. The attacks made are unwarranted and untrue, and calculated to do injury to the promoters of this enterprise, who are honestly striving to bring it to completion. These parties are beside engaged in other public enterprises, as, for instance, the bridge on the Ottawa River, the construction of which will cost \$200,000 or \$300,000, and which might be impeded by these slanderous accusations with reference to the enterprise under discussion. I challenge my hon. friend to ask for an investigation; and if he should do so, I am confident it will result in proving that the promoters have not spent a dollar on that railway of all the Government and municipal subsidies except in its lawful, just and economical construction, and that the work, which is of the best description, has entailed considerable sacrifices on their part.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The company in making their railway returns, gave the original subsidy granted which was a bulk subsidy of \$462,000, being the value of the land given them, valued at 70 cents per acre. But that land subsidy was afterwards commuted by the Quebec Government for a cash subsidy of just half that amount, or \$3,500 per mile, and that is the only subsidy paid in cash under that arrangement. The first subsidy, however, was put down in the return, and this explains the discrepancy. The actual payment by the Quebec Government was \$3,500 in cash instead of twice that amount in land.

Mr. FRASER. When a road of only 12 miles is to be built, Parliament should see that the promoters have means of their own to build it before granting any subsidy. I can very well understand how a large enterprise may be depending upon the