

extremely small sum of money to the capital stock of this company, but who have taken hold of that enterprise with the most unpatriotic motives, motives of personal gain and private interest, and by furthering their own views, their own motives and their own aims, have effectively been the cause of the very grave disaster which has befallen the enterprise and which will cause a great loss of money to this country, and will retard quite unduly and unnecessarily the completion of what was to be, not only a national work, but a work of very particular importance to the province and city of Quebec. I submit that a work which was to cost anywhere in the vicinity of \$10,000,000 should never have been undertaken by a private company. There is no doubt that in the beginning, long before 1903, the work was started by a company. It received encouragement from the city of Quebec and from the province of Quebec. We ourselves readily voted at the time a subsidy in support of that company, but at that time, as members who were here then will remember, we were given the assurance time and time again by the Minister of Finance that "his company would itself contribute a very much larger amount than it really did to the carrying on of this work.

Mr. FIELDING. No; I dissent from that

Mr. MONK. But my hon. friend has a way of interpreting the reports of 'Hansard' to which I cannot absolutely give my adhesion. When my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) referred to the debate in this House in 1903, which took place a few hours before prorogation, and says that I was the only one who on that occasion opposed this engaging of the responsibility of the country for such a large amount, he was mistaken, and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. FIELDING. Who else dissented?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend on my right, the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), expressed exactly the same views, and there are other members, if my hon. friend will refer to the debate, who followed the same course. The debate has almost a prophetic character. It was not necessary to be a seer or a prophet to see what was going to happen when these arrangements were made, and it was in our power only to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance and the government to the extreme danger of that undertaking, as we were entering into it. My hon. friend will find that Mr. Clancy, the leader of the opposition and other members, although the session was almost closed, said enough to intimate to the government that although it was impossible at that time to oppose the assistance being given to the company, because then conditions had changed, the Transcontinental Railway had

been decided on, and this work had to be constructed and would form part of the Transcontinental Railway itself, they disapproved of the government's action. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) admitted it himself in the speech he made on that occasion; and when asked, as he was, why, since it was a national work which we would have to assume sooner or later, which we must within three years take over or pay for, we did not at that time assume the responsibility of the work, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will see what an uncertain and unsatisfactory answer he gave.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will allow me, I have been looking over the record and I see that several questions were asked. One hon. gentleman did express his dissent, but I was speaking from the record that showed that no vote was taken. I had that in mind.

Mr. MONK. It is childish, Mr. Speaker. It resembles the speech which my hon. friend made on the address the other day when, instead of taking up seriously as Minister of Finance the present financial stringency and showing what steps the government has taken, if it had taken any, to meet that very difficult situation, he entertained us during half an hour on the doings of John Doe in the province of New Brunswick. An argument such as my hon. friend has made cannot be made seriously to any man who takes the trouble to look at the debate which took place on the 22nd of October, 1903. My hon. friend says that no vote was taken. There is enough time lost in this House, Mr. Speaker, without our calling for a vote under the circumstances shown by that debate. Now, what is the position? During the ten or twelve years that I have been in this House I have observed my hon. friend very closely. Even to-day he defends the government very lamely, but if hon. gentlemen will take up the record of 'Hansard' for that 22nd of October, 1903, they will see that my hon. friend very reluctantly brought those resolutions to the notice of the House. It is impossible to observe the manner of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the House and not to distinguish easily between those cases in which he is really enthusiastic and satisfied with his case and the speech he delivered when the House was in committee in 1903 on the resolutions guaranteeing those bonds. What was the reason? Sir, if we take up the record of that session we find some very strange things. It is not necessary to have the wisdom of a Nestor in order to read between the lines and see what took place in regard to the Quebec bridge during that year. In the very inception of the summer we had a Bill, which was sanctioned on the 10th of July, 1903, respecting the Quebec Bridge Company. The company at that time, as my hon. friend