

and managing the company for the purpose of carrying out the enterprise of the shareholders. That was the whole object and purpose. The purposes of the stock were settled upon, and afterwards those who assigned it said: What we wish to be done with that stock in the future, is so and so; that is another matter altogether. But that is the object of the assignment of that stock, so that when I went to England or the United States I might make such a contract as could be carried out on the best terms possible. That is the only object I have had in this matter. I have had no object, but the usual business object of a personal character, contrary to any interest which has been committed to me in this matter. Now, I have only to reiterate what I have already said in reference to the allegations of the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), as to the arrangement said to be made with him. I can only say now, and I can say it anywhere and under any circumstances, that never was such an arrangement thought of, suggested, or agreed to, by him or me, and I have never had the matter presented to me in that light by him, until I read his letter of the 19th May, 1885. There was no arrangement as to the directors getting \$50,000, or any sum, nor myself getting \$50,000 or any sum. There was no such arrangement with any person, or with any director, or any shareholder, or any contractor. I have no interest with the present contract, not one dollar's worth. I have always repeated what I said in that letter I wrote to Mr. Eccles, who was recommended to me, in Toronto, as a person who could negotiate a contract of this kind. I wrote to him that I must stand on one side and the contractors on the other, and I have held that position from beginning to end, and that is the position in which the matter stands to-day. The arrangement, therefore, I simply say, never took place. There was no such understanding, no such agreement. The simple fact was that when that letter was read to a meeting of the shareholders, they dropped the hon. member for King's and elected another director. That is the whole story, and one must understand that they would do so under the circumstances. That he and I, if such were the fact, two against seven directors, that we should act so absurdly, so stupidly, and, if I could put it in any other way, I should say, so dishonestly, as to say that two directors could plunder the seven other directors, and all the shareholders. The thing is utterly absurd and never occurred. Now, I have also to refer to this matter of Mr. Macdonald, which has been referred to; that is a fact. Mr. Macdonald was the contractor of the old company, the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and did that grading, or whatever there was under his direction, at all events, from Melbourne to Rapid City, forty-three miles. That grading was done under the circumstances which have been generally stated, and pretty well understood, but I had then nothing to do with the company, or knew anything about it. I offered, when the matter was first presented to the Railway Committee, that the debts in respect to the work done, the material supplied and the money paid on that grading, should be paid by this company, and I have stuck to that ever since. And it is one of the greatest obstacles I have had to contend with in floating the matter, because the directors had to pay that in some form or another, and they felt that it was an obligation imposed upon them entirely outside, and which should never have been imposed upon them. The directors undertook the new enterprise, and it is a great difficulty, whatever any hon. gentleman may say of the ease of doing these things, and how they could manage it themselves, how they could build railways—it is the greatest difficulty in the world to get persons of railway skill and experience, of financial capacity and ability, to undertake a new enterprise under circumstances of this character. There is no doubt whatever about that. Until the fall of 1885, in November, we had the charge upon

Mr. BRATT.

that land of \$1.06 an acre, amounting to nearly \$7,000 which had to be paid by the contractors before that land would enure to their own benefit as a security. Now, I say, it was impossible, and I found it impossible, to contract for the purpose of building that road unless that was removed. It was removed, but it was not removed at our instance. It was simply a general, public, open policy. It went on step by step with the Manitoba and North-Western, with the Manitoba and South-Western, with the Long Lake Road, with the road known as Sir Alexander Galt's road. We went on step by step with those roads which had no relation to us. It was adopted, too, when I was in England, and I had no direct interference with it, though I made the application before I left, pressing the matter, and explaining that it was impossible to carry on those roads unless some such policy was adopted. There is no doubt about that; and my judgment has been fully established and confirmed by the fact that until this free grant was obtained, these roads could not be built successfully. It was not only the policy of this company, it was a policy for all companies, and it is a policy for any company who can build a road, that they should have this security for the purpose of floating their bonds. Now, this free grant was given, I think, in November, 1885. Up to that it was next to impossible to obtain the money to build the road. There is no great time lost since then. A few months have elapsed in which, I am perfectly satisfied now, we have obtained the men, a syndicate in New York city, who are competent to build this road, and if this Bill is passed this road will be built, fifty miles of it by the 1st December, 1886. There is no doubt about that, in my mind, at all events because the gentlemen who have undertaken this, after eight months from August, 1885, have given attention to this matter, have gone to the trouble and expended money for consulting their own engineers, have obtained their own information, and have enquired into every circumstance—gentlemen who have built the Chicago and Indianapolis Air Line Railway, who built railways in various parts of the United States, who are building a road now in connection with the Kansas Pacific, and who are men represented to me as worth not less than fifteen or twenty millions, and I believe that can be demonstrated, men who are in dead earnest in reference to this matter. They have proposed to build this road, and will construct it on the most reasonable terms possible. Under these circumstances I come to this House for the purpose of asking an extension of time. I think, therefore, that I have good grounds, I have solid grounds, for asking this House to sanction this measure so that all this labor, all this time, and all this work, shall not be lost, that this Parliament shall give to thousands of people in the North-West who have petitioned for the road, and the thousands interested in it from Halifax to Vancouver—certainly numbers of persons, representing hundreds, are writing to me wanting this road to go on, because of their interest in the great North-West country, and of the immense advantages the road will be to those pioneers who went in there from six to nine years ago, expecting the Canadian Pacific Railway would pass through those Territories and they have been disappointed ever since, and their hopes are well nigh crushed out now because of the insane opposition which has been offered to this scheme in connection with the allegations which have been made. I say, therefore, that this road ought to be built. Now in regard to the evidence, which is said to have been produced here? Has not every man in this House heard of Mr. Pew? In the late case of *Pew vs. Schultz*, eight men were brought from his own town of Welland, and every one of them swore that they would not believe him on his oath. A man named McConachie was represented to me as a millionaire, and that was the only reason in the world why I ever listened to him for a moment. This stranger, this traveller