

September, 1873—he sold half that property for \$210,000, thus realizing twice the purchase money by the sale of only half the property. Now, in this speculation of the Lachine Canal the success was exactly the same. Six months before he paid for the property \$210,000, and sold a little more than half of it for about \$500,000. The public would therefore not be surprised at the success of this second speculation, as it was not better than the first one. In the opinion of every one in Montreal, this property on the Lachine Canal was in a much better situation, as property was more valuable at the west end than at the east end of the city. The accusations that had been brought against him as he had stated were resumed in the *Ottawa Citizen*. The first statement was that on the 17th of April the property was purchased; the second, that on the 18th of April the report was made by the Minister of Public Works foreshadowing the probability that some of these lands would be required by the Government. On these two points he did not believe that any evidence of the sincerity of his dealings with the Government need be offered. If the hon. gentleman who moved for these papers was not satisfied with his explanation, he might move for a committee to investigate the matter, and he (Mr. JETTE) would show that there was no foundation whatever for this accusation. The other charge was this:—That he gave afterwards public notice in the *Montreal Herald* of information that he had from the Government, and that this raised the price of the property to a fearful amount. The fact was that before receiving this answer from the Minister of Public Works to his letter he had published the conditions of the sale, and advertised the sale according to the information they had at the time. Having received no answer at that time they could not have informed the public as to what had been decided upon. But as soon as ever the information was received from the Government that a strip of land would be required, it was stated in the conditions of sale, which were as follows:—The proprietors of the land would not keep for themselves, but would keep for the purchasers the chance of any advantage to be derived by the expropriation. In the meantime in order to keep faith with the Government, and not to multiply the

cost of expropriation, he stipulated that although the purchasers would be entitled to any indemnity the Government should offer for the lots expropriated, we would remain proprietors of the land expropriated for the purpose of passing the title to the Government. The whole amount paid was to be for the benefit of the purchasers. The conditions were as follows:—

“10. The property is commuted.

“20. The land sold on the canal is bounded in front by a strip of ground from about 225 to 250 feet deep measured from the actual line of the Government Property, such reserve being made for the widening of the Lachine Canal. The precise depth of this reserve shall be determined by the vendors or by the Government before the passing of the deeds. Up to the date of expropriation the purchasers shall have the right of communication with the canal through this reserve. Nevertheless if the purchasers should prefer buying these lots in their full depth, they can do so, on giving their option at the time of the adjudication; however, even in such case, the vendors shall remain proprietors for the purpose of expropriation, in this sense that all proceedings for such purpose shall be made against them alone, but the indemnity granted shall be for the benefit of such purchasers.”

He believed the proprietors dealt fairly with the purchasers, who obtained the fullest information in the possession of the proprietors. There was no secret in regard to the matter. The public advertisements stated that the proprietors had received certain information which was afforded, and the purchasers ran the chance of appropriation taking place. The fourth charge contained in the newspaper article was that a public sale of the land in question had taken place, but no purchasers had registered their deeds. The gentleman who had written the article was evidently not well informed of the facts because if he remembered rightly four or five purchasers had registered their deeds, among whom was Mr. VICTOR HUDON, a well known merchant at Montreal, and a Conservative, whose purchase amounted to \$163,000, and who had passed his deed and made the first payment according to the terms of the sale. The last accusation was that the prices asked by the proprietors for their lands was afterwards arranged according to the auction sale tariff. He entirely denied that charge. There never was an application made by the Government to sell the land; he knew from the position he occupied that he