

Mr. HAGGART. The calculation of the officers of the department is, that that portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie towards Moose Park was built for between \$13,000 and \$14,000 a mile, and that the Grand Trunk Railway extension could be built for between \$11,000 and \$12,000 a mile. You have no faith in the officers of your own department; you have no faith in their calculations. I will take \$30,000 a mile as the cost of a double-track railway through a country the easiest on the continent of America to build a railway in, except, perhaps, a few portions of the prairie; and at \$30,000 a mile, you could build a double-track railway from Point Lévis to St. Lambert station for \$4,410,000, and you could build a bridge of your own across the St. Lawrence at the amount expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the building of their bridge. You could build it for \$200,000 less—yes, \$300,000 less—than the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost when it was built. But take the full amount which they state their bridge and its approaches cost—\$1,500,000—and that would make the cost of a double-track railway from Point Lévis to the end of the bridge and a bridge across the St. Lawrence, \$5,910,000. You would then have to expend on your terminals in Montreal, \$1,481,540. You would own the railway the whole way, you would own the bridge, you could build the terminals for half the amount, and you could double-track, because the Government have the best entrance to the city of Montreal possessed by any railway entering that city. They could come down along the bank of the Lachine Canal; for the right to do which, application after application has been made to the Department of Railways. They could go round their own property, and have \$1,500,000 for the purpose of erecting a station. That is the popular view of the question. Now, can the hon. gentleman blame the people of this country for suspecting the honesty of such a transaction? Can they blame the people or the Opposition for scenting corruption in it? Do they expect the people to believe that any set of men, honestly looking to the interest of the country, would be so neglectful of these interests as to expend an immense sum for the purpose of getting through a job of this kind?

The hon. gentleman compares the cost of this road with the building of the road at Point Lévis, but the construction of the road at Point Lévis was cheap enough. We, however, got into the courts with the owners of property, and the expenditure on this little line of road in consequence became an enormous amount. But the hon. gentleman and his friends could have looked to railway construction all over the continent of America, the cost of which can be now estimated to a fine point, and could have made calculations to show the cost of this road. They never, however, made a calculation,

and we have never had information whether the deputy head of the department went over the road or not to examine it. When he was before the committee, he had never seen the road, but he made a calculation. What a hurry they were in to build it. There seems to have been great necessity to hurry through this legislation.

Mr. BERGERON. The Quebec elections were to take place in May.

Mr. HAGGART. That, no doubt, was the reason. Why, it was necessary the arrangements should be completed in March. But the hon. Minister says that by the sworn evidence, the expenditure to complete this road was \$2,000,000. I have referred already to the extraordinary way in which the paid-up stock was subscribed by these three gentlemen I have mentioned to the extent of \$133,000 each. He says that we had the books of the company before the committee, and the right of thorough inquiry into them. I ventured to state, when he was making that assertion, that we had not the books. An hon. gentleman who was on the committee, rose and contradicted me, and said we had. Let me tell you what books were before the committee. We had a set of books, the first entry in which was a transfer from some other books of \$729,000. We had not the details of this expenditure, and we wanted to get the construction books which contained these details, but never could get them. The information never was before the department at all. What was this construction company? There was an arrangement entered into by these parties, who had secured subsidies from the Dominion and provincial Governments, with themselves for the purpose of carrying on the undertaking. The Minister of Railways told us that each of them paid in \$133,000 to this construction company, and then he argued that it was in the interests of those parties who owned the road to build it as cheaply as possible. Why, Mr. Speaker, their interest was to get as high a price as possible for the construction of the road, in order that this subscription of \$133,000 each would be swallowed and covered up. That never struck the Minister of Railways, but he contended the bargain he had made was a perfectly good one to pay this \$1,600,000 or \$2,000,000, because these gentlemen had expended \$2,000,000 on that road. Does he expect us to accept any such contention? The first item in the account is an entry of \$729,000, but we never could get the books of the construction company in order to ascertain whether any such amount had ever been expended or not, and there is not a man living in that section of the country, who knows the standing of the three parties, who were the proprietors and owners of that road, who would not scout as an absurdity the statement that they had ever made arrangements with any bank by which they could be advanced \$133,000 each to put into this company.