

ment. That report is not a report in the proper sense of the term. It is a compilation of partisan views prepared by partisans for party purposes. It begins, as my hon. friend did with an attack on the late Liberal Government, and ends with a criticism of the Government, of Parliament, and of the people of Canada, and another attack on the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the genesis and the revelation of this report. From one end to the other, I say, knowing the responsibility of my words, there is not one line that breathes an independent consideration or a judicial finding. It is a compilation of views, as I have said, to bring out and substantiate which, every means known to a lawyer have been used. It is for the most part regardless of the law, regardless of the facts, regardless of railway practice, and in many cases absolutely regardless of common business acumen.

Lynch-Staunton's Opinion in 1914 Coincides with Tory Campaigners of 1904.

These gentlemen had their minds absolutely made up before they took that position. The acting Minister of Railways and Canals has given the case away. He says : In 1904 we told you so, and Mr. Lynch-Staunton says : In 1904 I told you so. The minister says : In 1908 we told you so, and Mr. Lynch-Staunton, who is one of the ablest stumpers for hon. gentlemen opposite might well say : In 1908 I told the people so. In 1908 he could have written, with a few minor changes, what he wrote in 1913. His mind was as fully made up then as the mind of the acting Minister of Railways and Canals is made up to-day. From a party point of view Mr. Lynch-Staunton's mind was absolutely made up before he was appointed a commissioner, and everybody knows that the evidence that he sought was for the purpose of substantiating the pre-conceived views he held on this matter.

The other commissioner was borrowed, as the acting Minister of Railways and Canals told us—only borrowed—a call loan—from one of the big railway companies of Canada. That company, very naturally, was not very enthusiastic over the construction of another line, and I say what I know that particularly did that company believe that this road should not be built to the high standard laid out for the Grand Trunk Pacific. I was in a position to know, and I do know. Coming from that centre, Mr. Gutelius was imbued with the idea that the entire project was wrong, and particularly was it wrong to build this road to the high standard at which it had been started and from the moment that the Minister of Railways and Canals began to take his advice, the standard of the Trans-continental began to be lowered. I say advisedly that these two gentlemen, or any other gentlemen who held such strong views would not be allowed to sit as petit jurors, and much less as judges, on the most minor case in any of our courts. To these gentlemen, with their minds already made up, one against the policy, the other against the project, this Government committed the power to do this country and its great industries, to say nothing of a great national undertaking, lasting and permanent injury.