

those lands, as well as engaged in a number of contracts under Government—he, Peter Johnson Brown, in his testimony, gives the price of those lands in 1873. I was present when that gentleman gave his testimony. He was asked about the ownership of certain lots, and answered that they (five) were in his wife's name; that he “wanted to invest some money for the benefit of his wife, and he bought “those lots in her name.” Hon. gentlemen, when I heard the witness make this statement, I was immediately prejudiced in his favor. I said to myself, “the man “who thus provides for his wife must have “his good points, and when my hon. “friends from Saugeen and Toronto are “hard on him, and when even, perhaps, the “Government are giving him the cold “shoulder, I’ll stand up for Peter Johnson “Brown—I’ll speak a word for the man “who, perhaps, has by pinching and saving “denying himself the luxuries of life, and “from the sweat of his brow—been investing for the security of his wife and family.” But hardly had I formed this conclusion, when the Senator from Toronto put this plain and, I admit, very proper question, “What price did “you, in 1873, pay for those lots?” And the answer, I regret to say, was—four dollars! Ah, it is painful to reflect how suddenly the fairest fabrics fancy builds are overthrown! “Wanted to invest “money for the benefit of his wife!”—“Four dollars,” Artemus Ward, of patriotic memory, in the hour of his country's need, in a gush of enthusiasm, freely offered for the war “all his wife's relations,” but I am sure, patriotic as Artemus was, he would not have hesitated to have kept them at home and invested, not only for Betsy Jane, but each of her relations, four dollars in lots at Kaministiquia; especially if he had had any warning, intuitive or otherwise, that he would be the agent of the Government and advise at their valuation, and have the extreme felicity of paying \$600 for what cost four dollars. Hon. gentlemen, I need scarcely say that I have abandoned Peter Johnson Brown, and you may press him as hard as reason and justice demand without a word on his behalf from me. And yet he is scarcely so deserving of censure as is the Government that employed him. Brown, though employed and instructed by the Government, at-

Hon. Mr. McLelan.

tended to the interest of himself and partners. The Government gave the valuator a copy of the Railway Act, which declares that all lands shall be valued independent of the enhanced price that the road shall give them. A copy of this Act, with the clauses containing this declaration, specially marked by the Minister of Public Works, was sent to the valuator. They were also instructed, as Mr. Reid, at page 35, tells us, that no improvements made after the date of taking the land in January, 1875, should be paid for. These were plain, positive and unmistakeable instructions to the valuator. It is curious, however, to notice that these instructions were given at a time when the Premier, in his evidence on page 152, says he did not know that “Oliver, Davidson & Co. owned any lots “in the town plot which had been laid “off for the terminus.” The valuator holding these instructions, visit the premises, but, advised by P. J. Brown, the agent of the Government and the partner in Oliver, Davidson & Co., who are interested in nearly all the land taken, set the instructions aside. On page 33 of the report, one of the valuator tells us that Mr. Brown advised that the Act which Mr. Mackenzie gave for their guidance did not apply to their case. Brown, being interested in nearly all the lots, seems to know better than the Government how they should be valued, and, strange to say, brings the Government to the views of himself and his partners. The Premier, when first informed of Brown's advice, says, in his evidence, on page 152, that he was greatly “surprised and wrote “him a somewhat angry letter.” That letter is dated 2nd August, 1876, and I shall trouble the Senate with this extract:—

“When the valuator were informed they could consult you on any difficulty in titles, it was certainly not the intention of the Department to submit to you the interpretation of an Act of Parliament, but simply to render any legal help in the routine business they might find necessary to ask. The opinion you did give is repugnant to the law, and contrary to the interest of your employers, and, of course, is in the interests of the former owners of the land who took possession of it in January, 1875.”

The Premier starts well—he calls the attention of the valuator to the Act of Parliament, and gives the correct inter-