

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has endeavored, so far as in him lay, to destroy any possible claim that McLeod or Stewart might have on the Government, for if his statements are true I cannot see how the Government can possibly give it any consideration. The hon. gentleman says that he has private information to show that the evidence given was frightfully exaggerated, but I think he might at least have had the generosity, and the fairness to have given the name of his secret informer in order that we might ascertain whether his statements were true or false—whether he was credible or not. I think that he might have been generous enough to have taken this course instead of giving it to the House haphazard, without knowing whether the evidence was exaggerated or not. The hon. gentleman says that this question was made a political hue-and-cry in the Island, but he knows himself that I never opened my lips during the whole campaign about this question. He knows that in a thousand and one discussions which took place there, I might have made political capital of this matter, but as it was *sub judice* I never mentioned it.

Mr. BRECKEN. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had done so. I never uttered any such statement, because I do not know.

Mr. DAVIES. You were there every time I spoke.

Mr. BRECKEN. When the hon. gentleman speaks of my want of generosity he says nothing which surprises me, because I am so accustomed to hearing him speak in the same way. I have just as generous and disinterested feeling towards McLeod as he has, although he is politically opposed to me. But I repeat that political prejudice and political bias permeated the case, as it was managed by the Opposition outside the courts of justice, from beginning to end. With regard to the statement which I made before, I can only say as an honorable man and a gentleman, that if he doubts my word, let him come to me to-morrow and I will convince him of the truth of what I said, by a man who heard the statement from the lips of the man who gave the evidence, and I know the man's name. I said to my informant that that man was a Conservative. He said, you are wrong, Brecken, he is a renegade Conservative; he is no judge of railways. But I heard that man give a statement of the matter, and I heard his statement in court.

Mr. CASEY. I would just say that my knowledge of this case has been acquired chiefly, but I cannot help discussing a few of the points that have been raised. The hon. Minister of Railways has made a strong point of the agitation which existed in the Island on account of the state of the Railway. He said it went so far that, what he calls a brutal press, threatened to arraign Mr. McNab for murder if an accident occurred, and the hon. Minister of Railways asks us to believe that this tremendous agitation was got up about nothing. Why, Sir, he was too clever, when he made that statement; he proved a little too much when he talked about the agitation that existed in regard to the state of that road; he proved that there must have been cause for the excitement. If he expects us to believe that the press of Prince Edward Island were excited without cause, he wishes us to believe a statement that is "too thin," even from the Minister of Railways. Now, Sir, in opposition to the unsupported assertion of the Minister of Railways, that that road was in good order, we have the decision of a Court that the road was in bad order; and we are naturally inclined to believe the decision of these Judges, who heard the evidence, and who are better qualified to decide whether that evidence was perjured than the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who is an interested party. He says we should not believe the statements of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), because he was a hired advocate in the case; but if we are not to believe the statements of a hired advocate, what are we to think of the state-

ments of a principal? If the weight to be attached to his statements depended upon the loudness, the temper, the anger, the vehemence with which they were uttered, they would certainly bear great weight. We are asked to put out of sight the decision of a judicial tribunal and accept the frothy, vehement statements of one of the principals, who was interested in securing a verdict against the plaintiff, just as much as the plaintiff was interested in securing a verdict against the Government. Suppose we do accept the unsupported statements of the defendants in this case, and admit that Mr. McNab was as efficient a man as could be found; we have the fact that, with an efficient manager, an accident occurred on the road. Now, an accident does not occur without some reason; it does not occur if everything is in good order. The inference is perfectly clear that the road must have been out of order; and whose fault was it, if not the fault of the manager? It was the fault of the hon. Minister of Railways himself. He has described in touching terms, the state of mind of this poor Mr. McNab, when he thought that life was lost as the result of mismanagement. I can appreciate his feelings when he thought that the responsibility of this accident rested upon his shoulders, when the real responsibility rested on the shoulders of the hon. Minister of Railways, who, by his mean policy, was starving out the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, in order to produce a false appearance of economy. The hon. gentleman said that a political agitation arose out of this matter. I should not consider it unlikely that there would be a political feeling against the Government, which held the lives of the people so cheap, as to leave that road in the condition they did. That was bad enough; but when the Government descending to the meanness of refusing to acknowledge their responsibility for the accidents that occurred, there will be a political agitation, and I can assure the hon. Minister of Railways, that it will not be confined to Prince Edward Island, but will ring through the whole Dominion. He will find it even cheaper to have acquiesced in the judgment of the court and paid the damages than to bring such a hornet's nest about his ears as he will by the course he is now following. Since he has appealed to a technicality, and that appeal has been successful, there is no judge of what should be paid in cases of this kind except the hon. Minister himself. The hon. Minister of Railways is the judge of what is right; and what a judge! Have we not heard his judicial remarks here to-night? Have we not heard with what impartiality and fairness he has declared that witnesses had been got to perjure themselves in order that the case might go against the Government? He said that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had got a man to perjure himself. We can understand with what confidence the friends of those whose lives are lost or those whose limbs are broken on the Government railways will feel in a man, who speaking in his judicial capacity, can use language such as the hon. Minister of Railways has used to-night. Sir, if anything were needed to convince the House and the country that it was absolutely necessary to remove such obstacles as appear to exist to making the Government liable, as it is in justice and decency in matters of this kind, it would be the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, for they were remarks which no man, who wishes to act honestly and decently in matters of this kind, would have ventured to address to the House. I cannot conceive of any reason for those remarks except the reason he has imputed to his opponent. I cannot conceive that he has any spite against the poor people who have been injured on Government roads, but I imagine that he has some spite against those who have pleaded the cases of these people, and he has allowed political animosity to influence him in a matter of compensation for a hopeless case of disablement, caused by the carelessness and inefficiency of his own officers.

Mr. BRECKEN.