

gentlemen proposed to construct, and as they proposed to construct it, that is what I referred to in my Budget Speech in 1874, and I now deliberately repeat the statement, that had that road been completed by 1881, I very greatly doubt whether \$150,000,000 would have covered the cost. I have very good reason to say so, because in making that statement I am giving the opinion of an eminent engineer on that subject who had occasion to study it, and because we have evidence even in so small detail as the transport of rails to that country before there was railway communication through the United States, that the present expenditure would have been necessarily most enormously increased. It is quite possible that before 1891, that road might be constructed, not to Esquimaux, but to its present terminus, for the sum of \$80,000,000 or \$84,000,000, but it was equally true that the road as it was originally designed and laid out by these hon. gentlemen would have cost \$150,000,000, and I say that obligation was wholly and entirely beyond the then resources of Canada. Then, Sir, as to the question of running that road, the hon. gentleman did not state, as he might have stated, and I think ought to have stated, that I did not presume to give my own estimate of what the cost of running such a road would be. If he chooses to look back to Mr. Sandford Fleming's report on the subject he will see that at that time that gentleman estimated, under the conditions which then existed, that it would no doubt be a very expensive thing to run and keep in running order if it were completed in 1881, as doubtless it would have been. Well, Sir, the late Government saw the absurdity of the position, they saw the utter impossibility of fulfilling the mad bargain these men had gone into, and they at once told British Columbia honestly, they told the British Government honestly, that the Government of which that hon. gentleman was a member had pledged Canada to an impossibility. We said: "We will do all that can fairly be done to redeem the honor of the country," and we did every thing that could be done at the time, more perhaps, than we ought to have done. If my hon. friend is liable to any charge it is this: That he felt himself, perhaps, a little too much bound by the action of the Government that had preceded him. But I do not admit he is liable, I take my full share, and always will take my full share, of the responsibility of the action of that Government, and I say that our action in going on with the Thunder Bay Branch was, as present events have now shown, wise and well considered. I say likewise that the action of this Government in making the arrangement they did, was most unwise and most foolish, and has been the source of great troubles, and that the present contract is equally unwise and foolish, and will be the cause of very great trouble and injury to this country in the future. That, Sir, is what I said, and I say that we were the men who obtained the indulgence, if indulgence it can be called—because it was after all a mere question of possibilities—to take twenty years which events have shown was absolutely required to construct the road. We stated the difficulties fairly and clearly, so much so that even British Columbia, loth as it was, had to acquiesce in the justice of the decision, that twenty years were required to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway to the sea. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman proceeded to accuse us of having, contrary to our declarations, contrary to our pledges and promises to the House and to the country, added \$3,000,000 to the taxation of the country in order to carry on the work. Well, Sir, what was it we did? We found that those hon. gentlemen, after they had entered into a bargain with British Columbia, had thrown off about \$1,250,000 of taxes. The hon. gentleman said \$2,000,000. I do not think it was as much, but I think they did remit about \$1,250,000 of taxation. We find also that they had deliberately, needlessly and wantonly added a

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

large amount to the annual expenditure of the country which they were not called upon to do, which had been done by them of their own proper notion, without any excuse or necessity so compelling them. We felt as honest men that we were bound not to add to the taxation of the country, but that we were bound to put British Columbia back in as good a position as she had been in 1871. That we did, and it was for that we added \$3,000,000 of taxation—although it did not produce quite \$3,000,000. In so doing, we did our duty and redeemed our pledges, did all that Canada was morally bound to do—although I do not say legally—and that is what the hon. gentleman complains of. Sir, I say that those hon. gentlemen added \$1,750,000, or thereabouts, needlessly to the expenditure of the country, and that they remitted \$1,225,000, and before we could go to British Columbia and fairly say to them: "We are willing to do what we engaged to do, we are willing to do what we are morally bound to do, that is, put you back in as good a position as you were in before." We were bound to see to it that we had tried to replace that amount, and that is the entire fact of the matter as far as regards the increased amount of taxation imposed. But the hon. gentleman tells us, in the teeth of the facts stated by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and of the knowledge of every member of this House who has attended to the debates, that the Government have provided against monopolies. Hon. members heard the hon. First Minister and his followers, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), tell the House and the people of Canada there was no fear of monopolies. Why? Because those clauses merely affected the land over which the Dominion Parliament had control, because we had no power and no right to check the Governments of Ontario and Manitoba, and I say there is scarcely parliamentary language which will enable me justly to characterize the conduct of men, especially of a Minister of the Crown, who will make such statements. I do not think the iniquity of the railway contract has a parallel in civilized times, and you cannot find a parallel to the statements made by Ministers, and by the First Minister of the Crown. I am aware that the truth and nothing but the truth is the last thing the hon. gentleman, who made many allusions to the power in the nether world in introducing the measure, likes to hear.

Mr. PLUMB. We do not often hear it from the other side of the House.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then you must stop your ears; you must be deaf as well as blind to the signs of the times. But if the rights of Manitoba are to be trampled on, if the rights of Ontario are to be trampled on, if warnings are to be allowed to pass by as the idle wind, we still, according to hon. gentleman opposite, have a remedy. By the construction of 600 miles of railway, to Hudson's Bay, those hon. gentlemen propose to relieve the monopoly they have wantonly and needlessly created. There is no man in the House and in the country who knows whether Hudson's Bay navigation is open for three or five months. I have pressed on the Government, and I take the opportunity of pressing again, the desirability of calling upon the British Government to aid them in settling the question, in obtaining information which they have not got, which nobody at the present moment has got, but which I admit, viewing the extraordinary state of things which the Government have brought about, it is of great importance to the people of Canada to obtain. Whether they will take my advice or not I do not know, but I again call attention to this, and especially after the declaration of the hon. Minister of Railways, who points to Hudson's Bay as the sole means of relieving the monopoly; and I tell the hon. gentleman that it is his duty and the duty