

Then, the hon. gentleman was asked why did he not get back the subsidies we had paid, and he replied that he does. But he deducts from the \$2,000,000 only \$400,000, which is \$250,000 short of the actual subsidies received from the Dominion and provincial Governments. He says he doubts the logic of subtracting the subsidies from the amount of the real purchase. But what is the reason we give a subsidy? It is because, on account of a road being built in a new country, those who build it are not likely to get back the interest on the full amount expended. Therefore, we pay them a certain sum to enable them to do without that interest for a certain time, trusting that, in the course of years, the increase in immigration and trade will recoup them. But what kind of a road was this? It was a road built by a couple of lumber firms into a lumber section for the purpose of taking lumber out of a section of the country which is not settled at all—that portion between Moose Park and Chaudière Junction. The lumber became exhausted, and these parties found themselves with a useless undertaking on their hands. Owing to the political services which a certain party, who is closely connected with the hon. gentlemen opposite, who is a leader and organizer of his party, and in order to recoup him—for we can come to no other logical conclusion—this party received money for this road largely in excess of what it could be bought for by any person who wished to acquire it as a commercial undertaking. They ask us to make specific charges and prove them before the House. The chairman of the committee addressed me, and said: What charges do you make? I made no charges; the charges were ringing throughout the country, and these hon. gentlemen appointed a committee to clear them in the eyes of the country. That committee was presided over by a gentleman who, at the very moment, I believe, had the promise of a judgeship in his pocket. He received that judgeship, I believe, before the proceedings of the committee had terminated. I thought that the first thing we should have a discussion upon this session would be a motion for the adoption of the report of the committee, but no such motion has ever been made. The Premier and the members of the Government, last session were very anxious that that motion should be made. They were anxious to override the rules of the House in order to have such a motion brought forward—no doubt desiring the benefit of the extraordinary ability of the gentleman who had acted as chairman, to excuse and apologize for one of the most disgraceful transactions ever known in the history of this country.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the peculiarity of the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in introducing this resolution. He wandered off to a consideration of the Intercolonial Railway and took the opportunity of discussing my manage-

Mr. HAGGART.

ment of the road a number of years back. He said I had been living upon a reputation I had gained in the management of the road, but that the credit was not due to me, but to my predecessor, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who for a short time was acting Minister. I have no desire to detract from the ability displayed by that hon. gentleman in the management of the road. He was and is entitled to credit. I asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) who told him that, and he replied that it was a gentleman who had been in intimate communication with him for a number of years. Now, if a gentleman who had been in intimate communication with him for a number of years, informed him of that, he should be careful not to mention it. I know the relation of the permanent to the evanescent in this matter. And I will tell the hon. gentleman that when he departs from office—and I hope it will not be long before then, it will be pretty sure to follow an appeal to the people—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It looks very like it.

Mr. HAGGART. Very like it. I can tell the hon. Minister that when he has departed from office, these gentlemen who gave him the information will not offer him a word of consolation, but their whole time will be taken up with congratulation to his successor upon his appointment to office. They will congratulate that successor upon replacing a person who is little adapted to the work he undertook and they will enlarge upon the trouble they had in carrying on affairs under him. That is the air they assume over the evanescent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) the evanescent?

Mr. HAGGART. I was the evanescent, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is now. There is a distinction between those who are appointed permanently and who have a knowledge which permanency and experience give. The hon. gentleman, with all his assumption of knowledge, can be nothing but the political head of the department. It is impossible for him to have the technical knowledge for the management of a railway. And when he poses and assumes the role of a judge of locomotives and passenger cars and assumes to decide what is necessary for the Intercolonial Railway in regard to these matters, he is assuming a role which was never intended and which he cannot fill to advantage. That role he should leave to the permanent officials of the department. And he should be careful about taking evidence against his predecessor in office. The hon. gentleman says that the prosperity of the Intercolonial Railway was not due to myself. I never took the credit for it. I laid down a general political policy, and instructed the officers, within certain bounds, what they were to