

Mr. OLIVER—The very object of building the Credit Valley Railroad, and the reason for granting bonuses in aid of it are to make it a competing road to other existing lines.

Mr. CASSELS—But this letter of Mr. Hickson never for a moment suggests that there should be any restrictions upon the business from the west to Toronto. The object was to make traffic arrangements from Toronto, eastward. I only refer to this to show that Mr. Laidlaw mentions frequently the friendly spirit in which we met him. I quite see how the Credit Valley Railway should object to certain terms. Is there a gentleman in this room who, in the management of his own private affairs, when he receives a letter like that, and one of the terms contained in it is objectionable to him, would not, the day after, write and say that certain things he agrees to, but certain others he could not? Would he in such a case, without replying, put five or six hundred men on the property in question to take possession of it? The Credit Valley Railway Company not only took possession of the lands but also of the ballast which we had laid down to grade our own line.

Mr. OLIVER—Why was that ballast put there?

Mr. CASSELS—It was necessary that the land in question should be kept for siding purposes, and I knew that if we did not cover that land it would be seized.

Mr. OLIVER—In other words, you laid those new tracks to prevent the Credit Valley Company from laying their track there.

Mr. CASSELS—No, we expedited it. We always had intended using it, but we put it there at that time because we wanted to prevent it being taken from us. The next thing that took place was the application to the Minister of the Interior for their license of occupation. I say that the license was granted on a misrepresentation of facts. I never complained of that license; the Government protected our rights, and we had no fault to find with the course they took. Mr. Frank Shanly represented it incorrectly to the Minister of the Interior, though unwittingly,—it was not intentional in any way—but he thought he was called upon to lay down the line on the hundred feet, and he represented to the Minister of the Interior that there was no vacant land available, and no means of getting any except from that strip. Notwithstanding that, the Minister of the Interior protected us, and the license was given to them subject to any legal or equitable rights that either of these two Companies—the Northern and the Grand Trunk—might have. The Chancellor, in his judgment, says :—

“That license was granted by Order in Council, which makes it subject to the legal rights of the railway in possession of the ground. I take this to mean all lawful rights, and the express reservation, probably not necessary to use, would be to assume that the Crown did not intend to override the rights, subject to the property in question, whatever those rights might be.”

That was the license that the Crown granted, and it is one that nobody objected to. The Crown said: “If we have a title, you may have it.” The Company litigated that, and set it up in answer, and it was said in the *Globe* that we hindered this litigation and prevented a final decision. When the matter came into court, we were not ready, and had to move for a short postponement. The Credit Valley Company were represented by counsel, who thought it best to have the matter thrown over until the spring. We opposed such a long adjournment, and the matter came up on the 8th December, and the decree was given in January following. Mr. Dalton McCarthy says that the decree is all wrong, and two months elapsed during which they could have appealed from it, but it has not been done yet. It is all very well to say that they come now and treat us as owners of the land, and say that they are willing to pay compensation for it. They know very well, from the feeling in this House, that as long as the decree stands—until it is reversed—they could not possibly come to Parliament and ask to treat us in any other