

line, could be made part of the trunk line by the proprietors becoming stockholders in the great trunk line, and putting in their property as part of the stock. But the hon. gentleman thinks it is only by paying hard cash, which the company is to pay out of its own resources, or of some resources, that this thing can be accomplished; and I dare say this thing will grow. I should not be surprised, since we see that the subsidy for the Short Line is to be nearly doubled this Session, that a proposal should be made to buy the line of the Acting Minister of Railways, to buy the Townships lines, to provide public money to buy these lines, which are to be parts of, and greatly enhanced in value by the construction of, a through line; that they are to be enhanced in value by the transaction, and then we are to pay more money because of the enhancement of the value. That seems to me to follow, from the hon. gentleman's line of argument; that seems to me pretty clear from the hon. gentleman's speech. Then, the hon. gentleman says: The company had given much more than this; that they brought a railway to Montreal, 845 miles. I was surprised that the hon. gentleman did not proceed to give us the benefit of all he knows in that direction. How in the world did the hon. gentleman come to forget the Laurentian Railway? I thought he knew all about it. I really did think that that was one phase of the transaction with which the hon. gentleman was perfectly familiar. But when he was stating the eastern acquisitions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he did not tell us one word about the acquisition of the Laurentian Railway, for about \$300,000. At the same time that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company bought from the Government of Quebec, of which the hon. gentleman was First Minister, the line from Ottawa to Montreal, they also effected the purchase, under an Act passed under his auspices, of the little Laurentian Railway, which they wanted, to use a vulgar illustration, just as much as a toad wants a tail; and it was very handsomely paid for to the hon. gentleman's particular friends. Then the hon. gentleman pointed out that there was a new policy adopted in 1881. I have pointed out that when the present Government took office, in 1878, their Canadian Pacific Railway policy was, relatively speaking, a cautious policy. I could read you large extracts from speeches, showing the necessity of going slow, and of caution in the view of the Ministers at that time; but in 1881 they took the great step and decided upon a contract policy, a policy of rapid progress and of completion of the line by 1891; a contract policy of enormous money grants, if we include the works the Government was to construct as cash—because, if the Government did not build them, the company would have to build them; therefore it is the same thing as cash—of money grants far in excess of anything that had ever been contemplated in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That which had been talked of was \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000, but at one fell swoop it was proposed to give \$25,000,000 in cash and \$28,000,000 in work, and to pay the surveys, at least \$3,500,000. We now find the Government works have cost \$29,500,000, so that you approach \$33,500,000 in money, or \$58,500,000 altogether. I say they then proposed that policy, and to that is to be added the Canada Central Railway subsidy, which had been already made, and which will give you \$60,000,000 as their cash proposals. I say that was an entire reversal of all former policies, because \$30,000,000 had been talked of as the extreme amount of cash we were to give, and here was a policy to give double that amount of cash and about the same quantity of land, here was a policy of comparatively rapid progress, of completion by 1891, of great grants, pecuniary and otherwise, and a policy of great monopolies. We opposed that proposition, and we declared there ought to be no monopolies. We declared that the country ought not to be bound for twenty

years, as the hon. gentlemen opposite propose to bind it. We declared the future of the country ought not to be fettered, as they proposed to, and have, fettered it. We pointed out that the prairie country ought to be developed, and we were anxious to see it develop, but we said that many lines would be required for its proper development. We insisted that the ends of the road ought to be proceeded with more slowly, that more pains ought to be taken as to the route, that the progress ought to be slower than was proposed, that the grants should be less, and that the distribution of the grants should be such as to secure the completion of the work with those grants, instead of being made, in the way which was proposed, we insisted that the early and easy part of the work would be done first, and that we should be called on to fill up the gap afterwards. We insisted on those things. We said: There is no finality here, because we do not know how much the Government work will cost, because, in the mode in which you are locating these grants, there is no security for the road being built by means of the grants; you are not reserving enough for the heavy work. The Government promised finality. They declared that the aids were ample, were appropriately divided, for the thorough completion and adequate equipment of the railway, in the first place, while they declared that we would be entirely recouped out of the lands. They declared there would be no grievances whatever from the monopoly. They declared that the railway company itself would build plenty of branch lines. They declared that Manitoba could not and would not be checked, and that the proposed policy, therefore, would not apply to that Province. These were their statements in answer to our views. Now, Sir, as we have been called upon last year, and are called upon this year, to give further important aids, to alter seriously the position of the country, with reference to this railway, it becomes expedient to understand what the declarations and promises were upon which the original contract was entered into, so far as the hon. gentlemen are concerned. The First Minister declared that by the contractors taking up the enterprise "they relieved the country of immediate responsibility for building the road, in a great degree." But, I will prove that the contracted line has been built with our money, and that we have not been relieved from the responsibility of building the road in any sensible measure whatever. Sir Charles Tupper, estimating the amount of money for which Canada would get quit of its obligation to build and to work this railway, used these words:

"For the construction of the road from Lake Nipissing to Fort William, 650 miles, and from Selkirk to Kamloops, 1,350 miles—2,000 miles in all—the Government have agreed to pay, in addition to the \$28,000,000, \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres in land, making a total subsidy in cash of \$53,000,000, and in land—estimating the 25,000,000 acres at the same rate that I have estimated the land under the contract of 1873 and under the Act of 1874, \$1 an acre—of \$25,000,000; or a total sum to be expended by Canada for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway of \$78,000,000."

That was the declaration as to the terms upon which we were getting quit of our liability. Fifty-three millions in money is all that we were to spend, and twenty-five million acres of land was all we were to give. What we have in fact spent and what we are now asked to give I will investigate farther on. Then Sir Charles proceeds to say:

"We have reason to know that all that a command of capital can do they have the advantage of; we have reason to know that all that skill and energy and a knowledge of precisely such work will do, has been secured in order to make this a successful contract."

Then he makes a further unfavorable statement of what would happen if the English contractors, even of the greatest skill and capital, had undertaken the work. He points out that they probably would have failed, and predicts that horrible things would happen, many of which seem to have happened since. Then Sir Charles Tupper says, again:

"I have the satisfaction of knowing that throughout this intelligent country every man breathed more freely when he learned that the great, enormous undertaking of constructing and operating the railway was