

do not think Messrs. Lynch-Staunton's and Gutelius' letter was ever before me. These gentlemen, however, do not give any reasons for the opinion at which they have arrived and though great weight would have no doubt attached to their authority I do not see any reason for varying the conclusions at which I have already arrived, for the present the reasons stated in my opinion. I may briefly remind you that I thought that was impossible to suppose that a railway extending from Moncton, N.B., to the Pacific ocean could be said to be completed without provision of repair shops, and that if such shops were a necessity for the operation of the railway, they had to be constructed by the Commissioners.

I may call attention to the recent award of Sir William Whyte which I think confirms the view I adopted. In that award he says: 'With respect to the shops at Transcona considering their location and the circumstances under which they were produced and furnished, and the specifications and interpreting the said agreements and Acts, in the light of modern railway practice, and considering the contemplated use of the said eastern division by other railways, I award, order and determine that the said shops are to be regarded as and are a portion of the said eastern division within the intent and meaning of the said agreement of the 29th of July, 1903, and the 18th of February, 1904, and Acts confirming the same. I further award, order and determine that all repair shops at divisional points are to be regarded as and are a portion of said eastern division within the intent and meaning of the said agreements of 29th July, 1903, and of the 18th of February, 1904, and of the Acts confirming the same. I consider these are a material part of the railway and necessary convenience for its proper and efficient operation.'

On page 5 of my opinion special reference is made to the proposed shops at Quebec and it is pointed out that it is for the commissioners to determine whether any and what shops are required at this as at all other points along the line.

I return Mr. Leonard's letter to the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the memorandum of Mr. MacPherson. I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) E. L. Newcombe,

Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. Newcombe included the Quebec shops, as Mr. Leonard always did, but this non-partisan commission never mention them in their report—why? The Postmaster General knows the answer, and he is right in paying no attention to this part of this report, because it is contrary to law, fact, railway practice and good business. The Government do right in ignoring it, but they do wrong in spreading the report throughout the country as campaign literature when they know that it is wrong, when they do not believe it and dare not act upon it. I want to place another letter on record. It is dated June 26, 1913 :

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sirs:

As directed by you, on the 10th of May last, I submitted the copy of letter from Messrs. G. Lynch-Staunton, K.C., and F. P. Gutelius, C.E., of the 15th February, 1912, to you on the question of the construction of shops and equipment thereof on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway, and herewith is his opinion which confirms the opinion given by the undersigned to you on the 16th November, 1911, and further confirming the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice as expressed in his letter dated 5th of March, 1912, to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. I understand the opinion is approved by the present Minister of Justice himself.

I am, yours very truly,

(Sgd) H. Atkinson, Law Clerk.

### **Exit—Six Millions of Alleged "Waste."**

What will the country think with the Government spreading a report like that broadcast? That takes \$6,000,000 at once out of these forty millions.