

was doing that on account of his not having sufficient ability to give the necessary attention to the matter, or else that he had some motive in agreeing to those two amounts. The solicitor was Mr. Meredith, of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And Mr. Bernier, of Quebec.

Mr. REID: The admission was made by Mr. Meredith, the eminent counsel of Montreal, and he made it on his own responsibility and without any interference or suggestion from the Government. Mr. Meredith is one of the leading counsel in Montreal, and I do not think that the slightest reflection should be cast on him in connection with this or any other case. The Quebec and Montmorency is the road that has been built for many years and that is a good paying road.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then why do the owners not keep it if it is a paying concern?

Mr. REID: I will answer that point in a moment. This was protected by the judge of the Exchequer Court being directed to determine the value.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you help him to determine the value?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to say that whatever I said about counsel for the Government should not be taken as a reflection on Mr. Meredith or Mr. Alphonse Bernier. I simply quoted Mr. Justice Cassels. But the fact remains that the judge rejected two big items that they were ready to accept.

Mr. REID: There seems to be an insinuation that Mr. Meredith had some kind of hint or reason for deducting that amount.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope my hon. friend did not think I would be guilty of casting a reflection on Mr. Meredith.

Mr. REID: There were reasons for differences of opinion. I have not read any thing since the debate of last session. But, if I remember correctly, in that agreement or Bill of last year we inserted the provision that in purchasing each of these roads we would do so at the actual cost.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. REID: The word "actual" was put in, and there is a possibility that the judge of the Exchequer Court, in determining the value of the Quebec and Montmorency

road, took into consideration the actual cost of the road when it was originally built. These items—I am only saying that this may be a possibility—may have been for construction since that time, and the judge could not allow them on account of the word "actual" having been put in the agreement.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. gentleman has not read the judgment.

Mr. REID: I admit I have not read it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said: "Why do not the owners want to keep this road?" So far as these gentlemen are concerned, they want to keep it. The hon. gentleman made the suggestion that if the Government would let the parties keep the Quebec and Montmorency, and the Megantic and Lotbiniere roads, he would not object to the Government taking over the Quebec and Saguenay.

Mr. MACDONALD: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. REID: I am speaking of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The Minister of Railways and Canals made an arrangement with these owners to take over the Quebec and Saguenay roads, and if the Bill had been brought in as was intended this session, it would have provided only for the taking over of the Quebec and Saguenay, with running rights over the other roads. These owners were going to keep those two pieces of road, and they were only too willing to keep the Quebec and Montmorency. I have the feeling that the hon. gentleman knew exactly what these parties intended to ask for, and what had been arranged when he made that suggestion a few minutes ago. He knew that was going to be done, and he is willing to-night to agree that the part that he knew paid very well, which made \$100,000 last year, and has paid every year, should be abandoned. If the Bill had been introduced as intended it would have eliminated from the agreement of last year these two roads, just as the hon. gentleman suggested, and running rights would have been obtained over these roads that he knew paid so well. That would have been carrying, out exactly the hon. gentleman's suggestion. So far as the judgment of the judge of the Exchequer Court goes, the Minister of Railways has stated that the Government will stand by that judgment, and nothing else; in fact, it cannot do otherwise. The hon. gentleman from Rouville is a lawyer of suffi-