

In reference to this matter, the first that I remember about it is a conversation that, I think,—

I think—

—I had with Mr. Ives in 1894.

He is not positive about that, but he thinks he had a conversation, in 1894, with Mr. Ives:

The result of a little conversation we had between ourselves in reference to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal.

It was simply a little conversation between these gentlemen about this important question out of which hon. gentlemen are now attempting to make so much capital. This is a question which, in 1899, has grown to such tremendous proportions, such vast magnitude, which was made the subject of a little conversation between the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and Mr. Ives.

He was a colleague of mine. I entertained favourably at that time an opinion of the extension of the road, for a good many reasons.

He entertained an opinion for a good many reasons. I may anticipate and say that he did not give these reasons and, doubtless, he had reasons for not doing so.

We had trouble making connections with the Grand Trunk Railway, we had a great deal of trouble with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I thought that it was in the interest of the country that the road should be extended to Montreal.

Why, in heaven's name, he did not extend that road into Montreal, or do something whereby that road could be extended, when he swears that he was of the opinion that it was in the interest of the country that the road should be extended to Montreal, is something that it is impossible to understand.

That was my personal idea at that time. Mr. Ives proposed to me, then, the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. Ives could not have been moved by anything of private motives in suggesting to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that the proper thing to do would be to extend the road into Montreal. He turned a deaf ear to that.

He told me—or at least I do not know if he told me—

I just want hon. members to note the style of the evidence and the manner of giving the evidence which, if attempted before any judge of any Superior Court in this country would result in the witness's expulsion from the witness stand immediately. There is not a judge from one end of the country to the other but would have asked that witness to step down if he had given his evidence in the way in which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals gave his evidence in this case:

He told me—or at least I do not know if he told me—I made inquiries about it.

He does not say from whom he made his inquiries.

And I found that the railway could be very cheaply obtained.

If he was of the opinion that it was in the best interest of the country that the road should be extended to Montreal, as he swears, and if the road could be obtained cheaply, why did he not obtain it cheaply and conserve the interests of the people whose interests he was sworn to protect?

If I remember rightly, the principal indebtedness of the railway at that time was, as I understood it, in the neighbourhood of \$170,000, to the Eastern Townships Bank. They had floating liabilities of from \$25,000 to \$30,000 more. I heard they were anxious to realize, and for a sum, I do not know how much above that, that the railway might be obtained.

At a certain stage he does swear the amount he was offered the road for. He stated to-day, and I venture to say that there is not an hon. gentleman, on either side of the House, but who would go out of this room and say truthfully and honestly that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals stated that he could have obtained that road for \$500,000, yet, he swears that he does not know for what amount he could have obtained it.

Mr. HAGGART. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to misrepresent my evidence.

Mr. MORRISON. I am giving it as it occurred.

Mr. HAGGART. The explanation is entirely different from what the hon. gentleman is giving. This conversation I had with Mr. Ives was prior to the option I got, and that is what I referred to in my evidence.

Mr. MORRISON. But this has no reference to the conversation with Mr. Ives at all.

Mr. HAGGART. It was at that time.

Mr. MORRISON. It is disassociated from the evidence, and in any event it is needless for me to make any further remarks, because the evidence speaks for itself. Does the hon. gentleman deny that he said, more than once, that he might have obtained the railway for \$500,000? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to deny that? The words have hardly stopped resounding in this Chamber that this railway could have been obtained for \$500,000.

How to get in from the terminus of the railway to Montreal was another matter for consideration. I went down, and I think I saw the then president of the Grand Trunk Railway. I had a conversation with him upon the subject, and although he could not speak authoritatively without consulting his board, I understood from him that there would be no difficulty in making an arrangement to get into Montreal, and for the user of the terminal facilities there on the same terms as he allowed other railways, or on a mileage basis.