

Q. That was in November, 1889?—A. About that time; I don't remember the exact date; I think it was December, 1889.

Q. It was November, 1889.—A. May be, my impression is December.

Q. Now, do you remember the Act introduced at the last session of Parliament providing for the cancellation of the charter of a railway by Order in Council?—A. I do.

Q. Were you in Quebec at the time?—A. I was in Quebec several times during the session.

Hon. Mr. MILLAR.—You speak of the Legislature of Quebec?

THE COUNSEL.—Yes; I may say that the Act is Chapter 37 of the Statutes of 1890.

Q. You were busying yourself opposing the passing of the Act?—A. Excuse me; I was not.

Q. You didn't take any interest in the question of the passing of the Act?—A. I took an interest because I was interested in companies that have charters or interested in charters which would be affected by the Act.

Q. Did you endeavour to influence the Legislature, by laying your views before them, against the passing of the Act?—A. I do not remember laying my views before them.

Q. Did you lay your views before individual members?—A. I don't remember, I may have spoken to them.

Q. Did you prepare and distribute a memorandum stating your views against it?—A. I do not remember.

Q. If anyone should say that you did, would you deny it?—A. I think I didn't do it.

Q. The Act passed, then representations were made to the Dominion Government requesting the disallowance of the Act. Did you ever hear that before?—A. I have heard that representations were made; I have read it in the papers, and have been told so.

Q. By whom?—A. By Mr. Robitaille, when he was pushing matters on behalf of the company.

Q. Were you connected with it at that time?—A. As contractor, I never had any other connection.

Q. You understood from Mr. Robitaille that the Department of Justice had decided that that Act should not be disallowed?—A. I never heard that.

Q. Did you ever hear that the Department of Justice had given an opinion that it was needless to disallow that Act because the Baie des Chaleurs Railway was already a Dominion work under the terms of the Dominion Railway Act?—A. I never heard that.

Hon. Mr. POWER objected to this as hearsay evidence.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that there was no objection to the question.

Q. Do you remember an Order in Council forfeiting the charter of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company under that Act?—A. No, Sir.

Q. Have you any copies of these Orders in Council?—A. No.

Q. Have you seen them?—No, sir.

Q. Have you heard how many charters were cancelled?

COUNSEL FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.—I beg to object to that question. I take this position: The Quebec Government is responsible to the Legislature of Quebec, and not to what I may call a foreign Legislature. The Legislature of Quebec is independent of the Federal Parliament, as the Federal Parliament is independent of the Local Legislature, and I object to any evidence being gone into which may have for its object to prove anything done officially by the Government of the Province of Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that Mr. Barwick is not going into an investigation of what the Quebec Government has done. In the matter at issue between the parties before the Committee as to a railway Bill, he is entitled to obtain information as to the relations between the contractor, sub-contractor and the railway, and I think the questions are such as can be properly asked.