

in reference to the portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. As to the Victoria bridge, it is precisely the same, but as to the payment we have for improvements upon the terminals at Montreal, we only pay to the Grand Trunk Railway according to our user on a wheelage basis, and at the rate of 4 per cent a year, or we have the right of making the payment in cash. That is a distinction, and it makes an immense difference between the two contracts. Besides that we have the right, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the user—but whether we get it at all we do not know—of the connection between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me read the last agreement. I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to this, and the attention also of legal gentlemen of the House to this; I draw their attention to the wording and drafting of this arrangement:

Now this indenture witnesseth that the expression "Montreal joint section,"—

As I interpret this, it gives a meaning of what the Montreal joint section is:

—wherever used in this indenture, shall mean the company's line in connection at Ste. Rosalie and the whole line and branches and appurtenances hereby demised from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and the Victoria bridge, together with the terminals at Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and at Point St. Charles, St. Henri, and between Point St. Charles and the Bonaventure station, and also—

What does "also" mean?

—and also with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Jacques Cartier Junction; and the expression "Chaudière joint section" shall mean the Chaudière bridge and connections, except when the meaning shall conflict with the context or otherwise plainly expressed terms of the clause in which the same is used.

Look at the demise. In the demise there is not a single mention of this connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Jacques Cartier junction road.

That the said company, in consideration of the rents, covenants, conditions and agreements hereinafter contained and reserved, granted, demised and leased, and by these presents doth give, grant, demise and lease unto Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, all undivided one-half share, interest, right and title to all the company's line of railway, road-bed and property from and including Ste. Rosalie station, in the county of Bagot,—

See how plainly the section between Ste. Rosalie and the bridge is conveyed:

—in the province of Quebec, to the Victoria Bridge, and also the undivided one-half right, share, title or interest in the company's line of railway from a point on the western side of the Chaudière Bridge, at the proposed junction of the Drummond County Railway, with the company's line and including the Chaudière Bridge, and to and including the switch at the westerly side of the Chaudière Curve station,

being the said rights and privileges agreed to be leased to the Drummond County Railway by the company,—

There can be no doubt as to these two points.

—with the full and unlimited right and privileges, such as the company itself enjoys, of running the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains of the said Intercolonial Railway, either separately or combined, and as frequently and at such times as its business and traffic may require, and in both directions over any and every portion of the said company's railway between and including the said points aforesaid, and the use of the Victoria bridge across the River St. Lawrence, as it at present exists or as it may at any time during the subsistence of this lease be improved, reconstructed, enlarged or extended, and over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria bridge.

You see, it does not give them a half interest in it, but only gives them the right of passing over the company's line 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 hereinbefore more particularly described.

Where is the conveyance of that section of the road between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? If it is conveyed, or if it is included in the reference to "Montreal joint section," why does it not mention it? It does not refer to it at all. Where is the conveyance even of the terminals? There is not a word of conveyance. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) may laugh, but if it is not included in the word "connections," what are the connections and in what terms have you the right of user? Is it free or is it on terms arranged between the Grand Trunk Railway and you. The Canadian Pacific Railway has the right of user and a lease over that section of the road. I say that my interpretation of that clause is that there is no conveyance. I remember the definition given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) of the word "connection" in a former discussion, and I want to know if it means the same thing here. Does it mean a line of railway? Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) say in this House that that conveys the line of railway between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? I say it does not. If it refers to the section above, the most it conveys is a connection. I am glad that the Minister says that he is not responsible for this piece of drafting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not saying I am not responsible for it.

Mr. HAGGART. You said it was drawn over in the Justice Department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not misunderstand me on that point.