

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the Minister of Justice will accept the responsibility for any such drafting as that. Whether it conveys the meaning the hon. gentleman intended it to convey or not, the drafting is a disgrace to any department. Look at it again and see where is the conveyance of the side track, and where is the conveyance of that portion of the road between Montreal and the station.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have made up your mind that it is not there.

Mr. HAGGART. It is very indefinite, to say the least of it. It appears from the deed that you can construct the stations, tracks and siding afterwards if they do not let you use them. Here is the conveyance :

And over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria bridge and into the Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the company.

Does that convey the right of the use of the siding? Does it convey that section of the road between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway?

Now, look at the benefit which accrues to the country from the change in the contract which the hon. gentleman made between 1897 and 1898. You have not to pay half the expenditures at the stations at Montreal. You have not to pay at the rate of 5 per cent per annum for these facilities. You got them on the user basis, and you have the use of that portion of the road between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That alone was sufficient justification for our refusing to pass the contract. The Minister comes with an entirely different contract, which is a complete justification of the Senate's action in throwing out the Bill. In order to make connection with the Jacques Cartier branch, you have to run eight or nine miles on the main line of the Grand Trunk above Montreal. Where is the conveyance of that, or the right to use it, to the Intercolonial Railway? The hon. gentleman's colleague in the Senate, Sir Oliver Mowat, when introducing the resolution there, said :

I believe the object is this, that hon. members having doubt, or more than doubt, whether the business to be done would warrant the expenditure, it was felt desirable that there should be an opportunity to all of us to know by actual experiment how that would be.

And yet what did the hon. Minister of Railways state in this House the other day? He made a statement which every man belonging to a railway company in this or any other country in the world knows cannot possibly be correct. He stated that the officers of the department were unable to furnish information as to the earnings of the railway, or as to the effect of extending it

Mr. HAGGART.

from Point Lévis to Montreal. Does he not know—and, if he does not, I will tell him; and, if his officers tell him anything different, they tell him what is untrue—that the accounts of every railway in the country are kept in such a fashion that, with very little trouble, the earnings of every section of the road can be stated? What is the reason he put that statement into the mouth of Sir Oliver Mowat, the leader of the Government in the Senate, unless he was aware of that? Sir Oliver Mowat, when he asked the Senate to pass the grant, said he would be able to give the House information which would justify the expenditure, or which might justify another bargain being made. Yet the hon. Minister of Railways is unable to furnish the information to this House. We are asked to pass these resolutions without the information, which he should be able to bring down at any moment, as to the amount of the expenditure in the improvement of the road, or as to the present state of the road. No Minister of the Crown ever before had the presumption or daring to introduce into this House a resolution of this kind without being prepared to lay on the Table of the House every necessary document and the fullest information, and without even an apology for the statement of his colleague in the Senate, that the earnings of the road would be made known. Have the members of the Ministry ever considered the amount they are giving for this Grand Trunk Railway connection? Do they know what \$140,000 a year means to the people of this country? It means a capital of over \$5,000,000. Do they know what \$5,000,000 would build? Did the hon. Minister of Railways ever inquire what the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge across the St. Lawrence cost? If not, I will tell him, that the whole bridge and its approaches were built for \$1,400,000; I got the information from the contractors. I have a letter from the parties who paid for the building of the bridge, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, stating that the bridge and its approaches were built for less than \$1,500,000. Have they ever calculated the distance between Chaudière Junction and St. Lambert? I will tell them: the distance is 147 miles. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), the other day, estimated that a new double-track railway could be built for \$30,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can build it a good deal cheaper on paper than you can after you get to work, judging from past experience.

Mr. FOSTER. According to who has charge of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, judging from the last fifteen or seventeen years.

Mr. FOSTER. We need not go further back than a year and a half.