

gentlemen opposite, but rather to express the conviction of my hon. colleague that the scheme which is being promoted by hon. gentlemen opposite partakes, in some measure at least, of the character of a fake. I took the trouble of looking up Webster's dictionary to find out what the meaning of the word fakir is. It is there described :

Fakir is an oriental religious ascetic or begging monk.

I am sure nobody who knows the managing director of the Grand Trunk Railway or Mr. Wainwright or Mr. Morse or any of the gentlemen associated with this enterprise would ever charge them with being ascetics. They are certainly not religious ascetics. Whether they are begging monks or not, I shall leave hon. gentlemen opposite to decide; but they seem to be doing fairly well in the negotiations with the government for a subsidy for work they were quite ready to proceed with themselves. I have also consulted the Standard dictionary to find out the meaning of the word 'fake.' It is there defined :

Anything prepared or prearranged for the purpose of deceiving, especially fictitious or manufactured news printed in a newspaper.

Turning over the files of the 'Globe' of December last, I find the following announcement :

Ottawa, 19th December, 1903.

The following official statement was issued to night by the government :—

The Grand Trunk Railway deposited £1,000,000 of their guaranteed stock as security for the carrying out of the agreement entered into last session between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, subject to the ratification of their shareholders at a general meeting. Inasmuch as the contract requires cash or government securities for the deposit, legislation will be required to confirm the acceptance of the securities which have been deposited, though such securities are worth to-day more than par and their value is unquestionable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the definition of a 'fake,' what would you call that announcement, made on the authority of the government, in the great Liberal organ of the Dominion of Canada? Was my hon. colleague (Mr. Osler) libelling anybody connected with this scheme, whether occupying a seat on the treasury benches or a member of the company with which the government was dealing, if he said that that statement was a fake, that it was prearranged for the purpose of deceiving, that it was a fictitious statement manufactured for publication in the newspapers? Will anybody say that that statement presented to the people of Canada the real cause or reason why this session of parliament was to be called? Parliament could easily have amended or modified the contract of last year if the only breach in that contract was that the Grand Trunk

Company wanted to deposit its own securities, more valuable than their face, instead of depositing cash or government securities. No, Mr. Speaker, it was what was covered up, it was what was concealed in that statement, not what was published, which proved that statement to be a fake, and proved that those who authorized the statement were prepared to fake the people as to the real differences that existed between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Mr. Hays made a statement to the 'Globe' newspaper on the 25th of December, Christmas Day—thinking, perhaps, 'the better the day the better the deed.' He said :

The Grand Trunk never had any difficulty in raising the money, and will not have any in carrying out the transcontinental project.

Sir, the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite this session, and especially by the leaders, is that the condition of the money market was such that it was very difficult for the Grand Trunk to raise the money, or even for the government of Canada to obtain money at reasonable rates, to carry out this enterprise. But Mr. Hays proceeded :

The securities deposited with the government are better than the cash equivalent. They were deposited because of convenience, not because of any failure to raise the money. There was a delay of a few days, but the time allowed by the government was rather limited. Neither have we violated any moral obligations to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk or broken faith with the government. The Grand Trunk possessed these securities for the purpose of the company, and they were utilized.

Perish the thought that financial stringency prevented the cash deposit being made by the Grand Trunk Company. Perish the thought that this session of parliament was called solely for the purpose of amending the Act of last session, so as to make it legal for the Grand Trunk Railway Company to deposit its own bonds rather than deposit cash or government securities. Sir, if my hon. colleague from West Toronto used the word 'fake' in connection with this project, was he not pretty nearly justified in doing so? Or will anybody say that the sole reason that the Grand Trunk did not deposit the cash or government securities was for convenience? Are we not called upon to discuss many changes, all against the country and all in favour of the company, instead of a change to enable them to deposit the securities of the company in place of cash as an evidence of their bona fides? These two statements that I have taken the liberty to read are, to my mind, conclusive evidence that, whether intended or not, the publication of these paragraphs deceived the people as to the differences that existed at that time between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. And I say that