

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The hon. Minister cannot tell.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) will tell me what he wants to know, I shall be glad to get him the information.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There is an amount of subsidies paid in the four months up to the end of 1898, and the amount of subsidies paid since then; and we do not know whether they were paid beside the bonus of \$123,000 and the \$100,000 expended in building the road. These gentlemen have entered into a contract for the extension of the road from Forestdale to Chaudière Junction. Though they had an agreement with the Government they were by no means certain that such an infamous agreement would pass the Parliament of the country. They wanted to know that they would have some money for the extension of the road. Under the first agreement they entered into, in 1897, they got, I suppose, the subsidies—for I have heard no denial—they got \$123,000 in bonuses and the Minister comes to their relief with the expenditure of \$100,000. Thus they have at least \$223,000 at the hands of the Government, because that is the advance to them by the Government of the country for the purpose of carrying out the Drummond Railway arrangement. These are the principal features of the transaction.

This 115 miles of road is built over a comparatively level country from Ste. Rosalie to the Chaudière Junction, passing, as the Minister tells us, through a populous country well settled the whole way. But one of the witnesses before the committee, when asked what the character of the road was and whether it was equal to the Intercolonial Railway, said the fencing was not as good. When asked in what respect the fencing was not up to the standard, he said there were twenty miles along the road where there was no fencing at all. The Minister of Railways and Canals put it to the witness: Do you know that that is a country in which there is not a single settler, a wooded country? And yet, in introducing his resolution he told us that there was a magnificent country along the whole road.

The Minister makes a comparison between the purchase of this road and the purchase made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), of the road from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis. He states that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) paid \$14,000 a mile for that road, while he got this road for less than that. He says that the road purchased by the present leader of the Opposition was in a degraded state; that the country had to spend large sums to bring it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. But he forgot to mention—and he knew it—that the

Mr. **HAGGART**.

object in taking over that road from the Grand Trunk Railway was not merely to secure connection with Quebec, but that one of the conditions was that the money obtained was to be used to build a connection for the Grand Trunk from Detroit to Chicago, and to double the track between Toronto and Montreal. The hon. gentleman says that that was not in the arrangement. If he will look to the Grand Trunk Act of 1884, one of the conditions of the arrangement related to the securities of the Grand Trunk Railway. A certain set of the securities were to be applied towards doubling the track between Montreal and Toronto. I heard the debates in the House. I heard my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition introducing the resolution into the House, and stating that these two conditions were the conditions of the purchase of that road, and comparing the road, such as it is from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis, with the portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie to Forestdale, built under a subsidy contract, but not finished up to the subsidy contract. The only difference the hon. gentleman made in the contract was, that the two grades were to be reduced to 52 feet, as embodied in every subsidy contract, and the part to be finished was to be finished under a subsidy contract with the Government, plus this arrangement that was afterwards to be worked up to the standard of the Intercolonial. That is the contract that he made in reference to this road.

Now, there are some very suspicious circumstances about the sale of this road. The negotiations for this road were made in January, 1897; the contract was virtually completed in February, 1897; the Order in Council was passed by the Government in March, 1897. Let me draw your attention to some peculiar occurrences that took place in February, 1897. A debate took place in the House on June 26th in reference to the cheque which was received by the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works is not in the House, and I will not discuss the matter, but only read his statement before the committee. I will also read the affidavit of Mr. Greenshields in reference to it, and let the House and the country draw their inference. This is what the Minister of Public Works said, as reported on page 5302 of the Debates, June 26th, 1897:

I arranged that Mr. Greenshields, who was my lawyer in many other cases, should act as the purchaser of "La Patrie," as the lawyer of the party. They speak of a cheque which Mr. Greenshields gave. There is no secret about it. Mr. Greenshields had a cheque in his hands, not of his own money, but of the money of the party, and he paid that cheque. Let an inquiry take place, and all this shall be proved. Every private act of ours is scrutinized; our private affairs are no longer private. We are treated as if we were thieves and knaves.

Mr. Greenshields gave evidence in reference to that before the committee. He said: