

Q. Now, do I understand you to say, Mr. Greenshields, that the amount of the negotiations had closed with the Government, would have been financially a better one for the Drummond County Railway than the arrangements you have made with the Government to-day?—A. Undoubtedly it would have been.

The reference to Mr. Hugh Ryan is also at page 36. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the gravamen of the attack of gentlemen opposite has been this statement, that the road can be acquired for \$500,000. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if they do not care to listen to what has been said, in fairness to themselves as well as to us, to read the evidence contained in that report. And I contend that this evidence should be the basis of consideration of this matter, that we cannot travel outside of it, and that we should not try in any way to avoid it. As I said before, there were two reports, a majority report and a minority report. Now, as I have said, the majority report was based on the facts. It is found at page viii. of the report. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to read it, and I venture to say, they will find that there is not a statement in it that is not fully borne out by the evidence. The first statement in that report is:

The only difference between parties being the price to be paid for the extension. There was no question of corruption.

The Drummond County Railway, as it exists, consists of a completed line from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière, a distance of one hundred and fifteen and one-half miles, and the branch known as the "Nicolet Branch," extending from St. Leonard to Nicolet, on Lake St. Peter, a distance of seventeen miles, making a total mileage of one hundred and thirty-two and one-half miles.

That in order to connect the Intercolonial with the city of Montreal, it was necessary that the said road should be extended from Moose Park Station to Chaudière Junction, a distance of about forty-two and one-half miles. That has been done by the owners of the road and the road now has a total mileage, including the Nicolet Branch, of one hundred and thirty-two and one-half miles, as before stated, and has actually cost in its construction upwards of two million one hundred thousand dollars. (See evidence of S. Newton, p. 46.)

Then it goes on to refer to the cost of the road and the negotiations. It is a resumé of the salient parts of the evidence, and it is entirely based upon the evidence.

But contrast the minority report with that for a moment. I venture to say, that there is hardly a line, if there is a line, in that minority report that follows the evidence, and not a statement but is fallacious and unreasonable. I say that advisedly, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to stand up and contradict successfully what I say. I would expect the functions of a committee to be to fairly and dispassionately state their conclusions, and not to draw inferences unless they had facts to support them. It is bad enough to plaster a report over with a lot of inferences, even if you have facts upon which to base them; but, when you have no statements of facts, or,

at least, when the inferences are not based on the evidence, then the gentlemen who signed that report misconceived their duties as committee men. The first important point is this:

In 1893 the Drummond County Railway Company unsuccessfully endeavoured to dispose of their railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

There was the first instance they tried to give this "hawking" of the road, as they choose to call it. Then, they make a statement as to the indebtedness of the road, the amount borrowed from the Eastern Townships Bank, and so on, things that, in my opinion, were quite irrelevant and surplusage. Then, they put in the option which I read, the option pertaining to the \$500,000. Now, clearly, the object of putting that there was to mislead this House and the country in the way gentlemen of that committee and other responsible gentlemen on that side have tried to mislead them before and since the investigation, by trying to make out that the railway could have been purchased for \$500,000. Then, they say:

This option was either extended from time to time or there was an understanding that it might be acted upon at any time to the end of 1894, but as it did not result in the sale of the road, a second option in similar terms was subsequently given by the shareholders to Mr. Farwell at the price of \$400,000.

I ask gentlemen opposite to produce categorical evidence upon which they based that statement.

Options were also given to other persons by the company, but without any result.

Where is the evidence for that? There is not a jot or tittle of evidence for it.

The object of granting the first-mentioned option was to induce Mr. Hugh Ryan, a contractor, to undertake the task of completing the road and afterwards selling it on the best terms possible.

If that is true, is it not slightly contradictory to the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals?

From the amount which he would receive there was to be deducted, in the first place, the amount of the option, \$500,000, then the cost incurred by Mr. Ryan in completing the road, and the balance, if any, was to be divided, according to Mr. Farwell, between him and his associates, who were to receive one-third thereof, and Mr. Ryan, who was to receive two-thirds thereof. Mr. Ryan, however, does not remember this feature, but says that he was offered the road for \$500,000.

Mr. Hugh Ryan, from one end of his evidence to the other, says nothing of the kind, nothing upon which such a construction could be placed.

In consequence of the unsatisfactory service afforded by the Grand Trunk Railway between Lévis and Montreal, Mr. Haggart, at that time Minister of Railways and Canals, turned his at-