

that appeared before the Railway Committee.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The whole agreement was before that committee.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is it now ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It was handed in to the committee.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. It has not been printed and distributed.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The hon. Minister said last session that the agreement had been put before the committee. It was to all intents and purposes. All the clauses which were necessary to include in the report were included.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that only a certain portion of the clauses of that contract were furnished to the committee last year.

Mr. **HAGGART**. No, what I said, or intended to say, was this, that a copy of the agreement was before the Committee of Inquiry last year ; and in the report of the evidence all the important clauses that were worth printing are printed. But the hon. gentleman, that same session, promised to lay the agreement upon the Table. We wanted to see the original, because when we saw the original of the agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway last year, we found that the hon. gentleman had made no agreement at all. He put in the word "east" instead of "west" and maintained in the House that that was correct ; but when he went back to the department he found he was entirely wrong. It has always hitherto been the custom of the House, when these matters are discussed, to have not copies of the agreements but the originals themselves on the Table. Let me, anyway, show the distinction and difference between the two contracts, in order to justify, from the hon. gentleman's own words and documents, the action of this House, not only with regard to this particular arrangement, but the more infamous arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway :

That Her Majesty shall and will ask Her Parliament of Canada, at the present session thereof, for an appropriation sufficient to enable Her Majesty to continue this lease for a year from the 30th day of June next, upon the same terms, provisos and conditions as are herein contained. That it is agreed by the said company that it shall be optional with Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, subject to the ratification of Parliament, at any time during the term hereby granted, or any renewal or continuation thereof, to purchase the said line and branch lines, and the said other rights, interests and property (not including rolling stock), absolutely and free from all incumbrance, at and for the price and sum of one million six hundred thousand dollars (\$1,600,000), from which sum is to be deducted all amounts

Mr. **HAGGART**.

paid or entitled to be paid under the Subsidy Act, 60-61 Vic., chap. 4, and all amounts remaining unexpended or unpaid by the company in improving the said railway upon the works hereafter specified.

The third clause states :

That the company shall and will immediately, as soon hereafter as the season will admit thereof, lay out and expend a sum of money amounting to not less than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) upon such portions of the said line of railway and upon such works.

Look at the difference between the two of these. Capitalize the payments which were to be made under the agreements of 1897, and they amount to nearly \$2,100,000, but under this agreement the hon. gentleman asks for \$1,600,000 and besides deducts from that amount the subsidies that he is paying to this road.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, in making the criticism he is now making, it is at all material to know that there was no subsidy promised, arranged or contemplated until after that agreement was defeated by Parliament ?

Mr. **HAGGART**. I do not know that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I know it.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I want to show the difference between the two. He was to complete the road for a certain annual allowance.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How could you deduct the subsidy when one was not promised ?

Mr. **HAGGART**. We had an agreement to give it anyway in 1897. It might have been afterwards that it was granted.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Certainly it was.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I think a subsidy was likewise granted for a portion before 1897. I am sure of it, because I read it in the Subsidy Act myself.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It was not in force. It had expired.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Then they only renewed the subsidy. There was also a subsidy granted by the local government, which had not expired, but which the local government had legislated itself out of. Not only does the hon. gentleman pay \$400,000 less under this agreement, but he deducts the subsidy and we cannot find out what amount of subsidy has been paid. He says it is all paid. Whether it is \$100,000 or \$123,000 I do not know. But the amount, whatever it is, is to be deducted, also the amount to be expended on the completed portion of the road, according to his engineer's estimates, in order to bring up the standard of the