

The motion was a censure, not so much of the Government as of the Parliament which last year determined that this line should be built and this action taken. In the Commons last year the bill passed without any division, and in the Senate 55 or 58 members voted for the Act at a time when the House was thin, so that the motion was not only a censure of the whole House of Commons, but of a great majority of this House as well.

HON. MR. VIDAL said the motion did not declare that the Government had acted illegally, but unwisely and prematurely. The Act gave the Government power to construct the Canada Pacific Railway, and certain branch lines, and where they had acted unwisely was in expending \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000, not upon the main line or any portion of it, but upon a branch line which did not benefit and never could benefit the main line. They were not charging the Government with having violated the law; they were simply saying—and they said it advisedly and meant it—that they condemned the Government for an unwise expenditure, not upon the Pacific Railway—which we would have cordially approved—but upon a branch of the road which ought to have been left to be constructed at a later date.

HON. MR. BUREAU said the motion of censure was directed at the Act of Parliament passed last year, and not against any action of the Government in the interim. What would be the result of this motion if it was carried? Did the hon. gentlemen think they would then take the Treasury benches, or that the House of Commons, which had heretofore sustained the Government by so large a majority, would concur in the censure of the Senate? We knew that all the appointments to the Senate since Confederation to the advent of the present Government were hostile to the party now in power—(Cries of "Oh! oh!")—and this in spite of an agreement made before Confederation, that the appointments should be made equally from both sides. Supposing that in twenty years' time the majorities were reversed in this House, did his hon. friend opposite think it would be wise for the then majority to obstruct and embarrass the

Government as they were doing? He trusted the good sense of the hon. gentlemen opposite would answer this question in the negative.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST could not quite agree with what had just fallen from his hon. friend. Though the Senate was composed largely of gentlemen belonging to the Conservative party, the Government had not suffered much inconvenience from that fact. On the whole, the treatment which the Government had received from the majority in this House was not one of which they could complain.

HON. MR. DEVER rose to say he had the honour last year of voting and eulogizing the Government bill introduced for the construction of the Pacific Railway. He believed then that the Government had been actuated by prudence and wisdom, and only aimed at carrying out that great work in proportion to the ability and business of the country. He had no hesitation in stating now that he felt he had placed too much confidence in their honesty, and that he believed he had been deceived by them. He was one of those who would never consent to waste the public money of the country on an evident deviation of the powers given by the Act to carry out what he believed to be a "side show" work in the interest of private friends, and on what cannot be considered a portion of the Pacific Railway proper. He would again point out the fearful taxation this country was labouring under at present, but more especially the Lower Provinces of it, owing to the bad—he might say heartless—fiscal arrangement of the tariff, which was so constructed as to dishearten every thinking man who gave it his consideration. He would say he felt it to be his duty to protest against the action of the Government in thus wasting the public funds of the country on 40 miles of this road, which even the Government had to acknowledge were not authorized by the Act, but were simply a local or side line. The Maritime Provinces had no interest or sympathy with the American policy of the Government in this matter. If they had, they could have done better themselves direct with the States;