

ter was got for that road, over the same line, which came into the possession, indirectly, of the Grand Trunk Railway, through Mr. Cox, of Peterboro', who purchased it, I believe, from Mr. Scott. They commenced to build that road and have laid out in the vicinity of \$100,000 on that line almost side by side with the road of the Ontario and Quebec Company. When we were getting our charter, Mr. Hubertus made a claim that because Sir Hugh Allan failed to pay him the \$2,000 he had promised, he had, notwithstanding his charter had expired, a claim on our company for the payment of that amount. Hubertus alleged that his plans and specifications and experience and outlays had been of some service to the company. When the matter came before the Committee of the Senate, it was arranged that the directors of the company should enquire into his claim, and if it was found that he had any claim, they should settle it. That was the understanding come to in the Senate at the time. At the earliest meeting of the directors, therefore, the matter was taken up, and I wrote to Hubertus asking him to send in his claim. I got nothing but a long rigmorole, signed by Mr. Currier and by Senators Flint and Skead, stating his services, but with no evidence to show that he had ever done anything, or that his services had ever been utilized by the Ontario and Quebec Company or by any of their officers. There was nothing to show, on which I could base any foundation to pay the claim. I wrote to the engineer of the road, asking him if he had ever got any information from Mr. Hubertus, or had ever seen any of his plans, and he replied that he did not know Hubertus, had never heard of his making a survey, did not believe that he ever had, but that he might have made an exploration, that he had never seen any of his plans and that he had certainly never utilized any plan or specification of his, or at all benefited by his experience. Although I had the greatest desire to do something for a person in his position, I could not find any foundation on which to pay his claim. At the time I felt sympathy for him; when he said that Sir Hugh Allan had not paid him, and I asked, Why do you not proceed against the estate, which is worth millions of dollars, and well able to pay all claims against it? Mr. Hubertus cannot pretend to say that the Ontario and Quebec Directors ought to pay him this claim, because they simply applied to this Parliament, years after Sir Hugh Allan purchased the charter and after it had expired, he having failed to float the bonds of the company. Years after that, when we applied to this Parliament to get a charter to build a road to open up communication between the east and west of this country, Mr. Hubertus comes, as a species of blackmailer, upon us and threatens, if you do not give me this compensation which I claim, I will come time after time to this Parliament—and he does come here time after time—and, endeavour, by opposing you, to force you into paying what I claim as compensation for services which may have been rendered to Sir Hugh Allan, but certainly have not been rendered to the Ontario and Quebec Company. Further than that, this claim came before the Committee of the Senate, and the Senate Committee, hearing Mr. Hubertus' statement, made a reference, as I told you, which was enquired into by Mr. Thibaudeau and myself, the board of the Ontario and Quebec, and our report was made in accordance with that, finding that we could find neither a just nor even an equitable claim for the payment of anything to Mr. Hubertus. But Mr. Hubertus appeared before this Committee of Railways and Canals within the last few days and his claim was discussed, and it was decided by a large majority of the Committee that he had no claim, and the Committee refused to recognize it. So that I cannot think that the House, without a tittle of evidence, without anything to support what is stated in this resolution before the House, will consent to engraft on to a Bill a resolution so unique in its character, one that I have never heard of

Mr. MITCHELL.

before in connection with any legislation passed by this House. If the House desires to deal with it, the proper course would be for the hon. gentleman to move that the Bill be recommitted back to the Committee on Railways and Canals for them to again consider any evidence which Mr. Hubertus might choose to supply, if he has any, and not to relegate it to a County Court or any other court for consideration. These are the facts, and I hope the House will not hesitate to pass the Bill, and to tell Mr. Hubertus, and others like him, who attempt to blackmail companies, that they cannot do it.

Mr. BLAKE. We have had the singular advantage of being able to hear, from a director of the Company, what the facts are, and, after hearing them, I really do not see that there is any ground for this motion.

Motion in amendment (Mr. Wallace, York) negatived.

Bill read the third time.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the Bill do pass.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it can pass in this shape. I would direct your attention to the first clause. It seems seriously to affect existing rights of the Crown, and no assent of the Crown has been given to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the point is a good one. The Bill had better be read a third time on Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the third reading be reconsidered?

Mr. BLAKE. That is not necessary, I think. It is only necessary to adjourn the motion that the Bill do pass, until Monday.

Motion allowed to stand.

WELLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. BERGIN, in the absence of Mr. RYKERT, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 44) to authorize the transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for other purposes.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think that second clause ought not to be finally passed, at all events by the House, until the Grand Trunk Bill is finally passed. I have no objection to its going through Committee, if it is understood that the third reading of the Bill shall not be had until the Grand Trunk Bill comes up for consideration. You will see that the second clause provides for the payment of the money to be taken in payment of the debt due to the Great Western Railway, to the Grand Trunk. Now, until the arrangements contemplated by the Act between the Grand Trunk and the Great Western are carried out, the passing of the present clause, in its present shape, finally seems to me to be premature. I understand that the hon. the Minister of Railways made a statement to-day in the Railway Committee, as to the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the fusion of the Grand Trunk and Great Western. So far as I have considered that subject, I am not prepared to assent to the correctness of that opinion, so while I do not object to the Bill passing through Committee, so that it may be advanced a stage, I only assent to it on the understanding that we shall not be called on to finally consider the matter until the Grand Trunk Bill is before us.

Bill amended and reported.

Mr. BERGIN moved the third reading of the Bill.