

tention, in 1894, to the question of extending the Intercolonial Railway to the latter city.

He "turned his attention," but how? He had a little private conversation with one of his colleagues, he had an opinion of his own, but he did not make any overtures to his colleagues to the end of putting his opinion into effect. That is the way he turned his attention to it, and the gentleman making this report seriously put that statement in to try to make it appear that he was serious. Any way, this herculean effort of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals proved abortive, for some reason for which he was not responsible.

He caused an estimate to be made of the cost of constructing such a railway as the Drummond County Railway would be when completed, according to the requirements for subsidy, and made inquiry as to the cost of running rights over the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, and of terminal facilities at that city.

What evidence is there of negotiations by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals about terminal facilities? Is there a syllable of his evidence showing any terminal facilities that were available to him at that time? Not a line.

At a later stage, Mr. Ryan opened negotiations with Mr. Haggart for the sale of the Drummond County Railway, but the latter, after making some investigation of the matter, declined to recommend the purchase of the road, and no further negotiations appear to have taken place between the company and any member of the Government until the year 1897.

That is not the fact, because Mr. Farwell and Mr. Greenshields both positively state that they were negotiating, and that Mr. Ryan was a go-between up to 1896. This part of the report is not based upon any evidence or any fact. Now, I want to show the invidious and unworthy nature of this report, and the procedure adopted by the hon. gentleman.

In 1897 the present Minister of Railways and Canals entered into negotiations with Mr. J. N. Greenshields, the president of the Drummond County Railway Company for the acquisition of the road by the Government of Canada. These negotiations were principally carried on between Mr. Greenshields and the Hon. Mr. Blair, but Mr. Greenshields and his associate, Mr. Mitchell, had interviews also upon the subject with the Hon. Mr. Tarte, Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Tarte, at page 120 of his evidence, categorically states that any of the interviews that he had with the Drummond County people were interviews for which he was not responsible, such interviews as he was bound to give any person who choose to come and ask for one. He could not shut the doors on Mr. Mitchell or anybody else, and if they choose to come there and discuss this question with him, he could not refuse to do so. But he says that in no case did these interviews amount to anything that could be termed negotiations. Then they go on to say

Mr. MORRISON.

something that is absolutely extraneous to the point at issue. They drag in "La Patrie" the paper that was acquired by Mr. Tarte's son, but in which Mr. Tarte himself has not a farthing's interest. In the most irrelevant way they refer to Mr. Greenshields acting as solicitor for Mr. Tarte and his sons, and quote Mr. Tarte's statement that Mr. Greenshields gave his cheque for \$25,000. Now, the fact is that, according to the evidence of Mr. Greenshields and Mr. Tarte, it was simply an accommodation cheque, no money was passed. No matter what Mr. Tarte said, he might not have used just the right words in stating that it was simply an accommodation. What does it matter in what words we clothe a fact so long as we are able to express the fact? We find that in all these dealings, Mr. Tarte had had nothing to do with these negotiations about the railway, nothing of a substantial nature; that neither Mr. Tarte nor Mr. Greenshields had any idea of this railway when the purchase of "La Patrie" was arranged. Mr. Tarte was only doing the most natural thing in the world, doing nothing but what the leader of the Opposition himself or any other gentleman would do for his own son, or for persons who occupied a less fiduciary relation to him than a son. He simply tried to assist his sons in the acquisition of that paper, and he succeeded in doing so. But that had absolutely nothing to do with the negotiations for the Drummond County Railway. That has been sworn to time and again on oath; still hon. gentlemen will put that reference to the purchase of "La Patrie" by Mr. Tarte's sons into their report. They cannot produce one jot or tittle of evidence to show that there was any connection between the purchase of "La Patrie" and the Drummond County Railway. They do not dare to follow out the insinuation that they make. You would suppose that, after giving place in their report to that reference to the purchase of "La Patrie" they would follow it up, and show a connection between the purchase of "La Patrie" and the purchase of the Drummond County Railway by the Government. Why did they not do so when they had an opportunity of completing the link between the two transactions? But they did not do it, and they did not have the decency to acknowledge that they were unable to accomplish their unworthy effort for the reason that there was no evidence upon which they could do so. These are the same gentlemen who reiterate on oath that there were, forsooth, charges of corruption against the Government. What is the use of stating that if there is no attempt to prove the charges? I will not read the whole of the report, because it is rather long; but I tell you that every syllable of that report proceeds upon a false basis, and is wanting the element of fact upon which to rest. Then, they wind up by saying:

Your committee are satisfied that the rental payable to the Grand Trunk Railway Company