

ernment resigned, and they have not given a word about what has been done under this Government, though they did not hand in their report until 1914. This Government has had charge of the Trans-continental railway for more than two years; yet this commission, appointed by Order-in-Council to 'fully investigate' everything in connection with that road, has not investigated one thing that the present Government has done. Do the Government take the ground that the commission were appointed to investigate only what the Liberals did? They must think so if they think this commission carried out its instructions, or else they must say that everything has been so perfect since they came into office that there is nothing to investigate.

I submit in all seriousness that this commission has violated its instructions from the Government of Canada, and has not brought in a report covering all matters bearing on the actual construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific up to the day when they handed in their report, as they should have done. They have absolutely ignored their instructions, and have brought in a report concerning only what was done under the previous Government. Does that look like a partisan commission, or not?

Was the railway being constructed when this report was handed in? If so, then these words apply to that construction. Does the Order-in-Council authorize an investigation up to October, 1911? It states specifically 'all matter bearing on the actual construction,' and my hon. friend need not take refuge behind the thought which he has in mind simply because this commission did not carry out the instructions of the Government given to it before he became a member of this House.

### **The Winnipeg Terminals.**

I now wish to take up the entrance of the railway into Winnipeg. My hon. friend the acting Minister of Railways will note that I am dealing with a great many of the matters which he brought up, but not in their order. The entrance of the road into Winnipeg is one of the things discussed and criticised by these commissioners, and they charge that in this connection over \$3,000,000 were wasted. The Railway Commission had in their office Mr. Young, who carried on the negotiations for the securing of the land along the entrance into Winnipeg, and they dared not put him on the witness stand and take his evidence under oath. Why? Because they knew that if Mr. Young gave evidence under oath and that evidence was put on record, it would not harmonize with what they wanted to be their finding in connection with the expenditure entailed in getting into the city of Winnipeg. The commission, Mr. Staunton particularly, in order to produce evidence of extravagance, had it in mind to report that no plan for expropriation of land along this entrance had been filed. Mr. Young said: I know that those plans were registered; I know you have the acknowledgment of that registration in your office. Mr. Staunton said he had looked everywhere, and could not find it. Mr. Young gave him two dates between which he would find evidence of that registration, and, a clerk having been sent to