

produce, that you can only do that on estimate and conjecture largely; and I defy any hon. gentleman to get a responsible railway man to contradict my statement. If I come here with estimates, it is only another way of postponing the condemnation which these hon. gentlemen will pass. They will say, why did you not estimate a great deal more?

Mr. MONTAGUE. How about the statement made in the Senate?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not responsible for what was said in the Senate.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

#### QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before my hon. friend proceeds with his speech, I would like to have the attention of the House for one moment. The suggestion was made this afternoon that the House should adjourn from tomorrow evening till next Thursday. After considering it, we will agree to this. Therefore, to-morrow afternoon I will move that when the House adjourns to-morrow evening it shall stand adjourned until Thursday next, and then when it adjourns on the following Friday it shall stand adjourned until the following Saturday; so that we shall sit on Saturday.

#### I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock I had about concluded my remarks in reference to the resolutions at present under consideration. I had intended to summarize them, but I may have an opportunity to do so at another stage of the Bill. In the further remarks I have to make to-night, I will simply amplify some of my observations in reference to this contract with the Drummond County Railway Company. I stated that there was an option of \$500,000 given to Mr. Farwell of the Eastern Townships Bank, presented by Mr. Hugh Ryan. I forgot to mention that Mr. Greenshields in his evidence before the committee stated that there was a concurrent agreement in writing with Mr. Ryan. We asked him in whose possession that agreement was. He said it was in the possession of Mr. Farwell. Mr. Farwell, in his examination, stated that there was no agreement in writing, but that there was a verbal understanding with Mr. Hugh Ryan that certain other terms were to be entered into with the contractor and the Government under this option of \$500,000. Mr. Hugh Ryan, in his evidence before the committee, said he never heard of any such thing, that the only condition attached to the offer was the payment of

Mr. HAGGART.

the \$500,000 to the company. Certainly I never heard of the agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If my memory serves me, the line was to be built and completed.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Greenshields said that there was a concurrent agreement with Mr. Hugh Ryan, in which it was provided that the line should be completed and some other things besides the \$500,000 were to be given.

Mr. MORRISON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? In what part of Mr. Ryan's evidence does he state that which the hon. member now says?

Mr. HAGGART. On page 146:

Q. What was the price they were to sell the road for?—A. The price they talked about was this \$500,000; but I had never seen the road, and never was over it.

Then, in speaking of the last agreement with the Grand Trunk, I pointed out that under it the connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway were not conveyed. That is a question for the legal gentlemen; but I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is no connection conveyed to the Intercolonial Railway between the end of the bridge and the Canadian Pacific Railway, according to the most literal interpretation of the agreement. There is no conveyance of the main line to the Grand Trunk Railway from the end of Victoria bridge to this Government, and the whole document, if I am a judge of the matter, makes no conveyance at all of that right of connection between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

One of the principal reasons which the Minister gave for the purpose of showing that this was a far better agreement than the old one—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never said it was a far better agreement than the old one.

Mr. HAGGART. You will find by the evidence of Mr. Wainwright, before the committee, that one of the most strenuous objections of the Grand Trunk Railway was, that it was an important link in connection with their road, and they nearly split upon the conveyance to the Government of that connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought you were attributing a certain statement to me personally, but now, it appears, it was made by somebody else.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister said, before the committee, that the Government had not only made a satisfactory agreement,