

need not be afraid that the monopoly of the freight of the products of that country creeping for 1000 or 1500 miles over a railway is going to destroy the power of the producer to carry them to the sea. Now we have heard a good deal about what these contractors might do. They might gobble up these lands, they might put them in their pockets, they might sell them and go to the world's end, and spend the money, and all this kind of thing. I am glad to say that in this contract I see the hand of my right hon. friend and his colleagues in their best form. They have dealt with this question in the true spirit of statesmanship. They have assumed that men would act fairly and honorably. They have assumed, that under ordinary circumstances or under extraordinary circumstances as the case may be, the interests of the contractors would keep them right in connection with this work, and that men, whoever they may be, who have the energy and the ability to carry on this work, will have wisdom enough to discover their great interest in acting in common with the interests of this country by which means alone their project can be made profitable to themselves as well as valuable to this country. I think it is to the credit of my right hon. friend that he has exhibited his practical knowledge of this method of dealing, that he has not distrusted or doubted, but has left the spitting of hairs to the dreamers and speculators who ascend to the clouds or descend to the depths. I have no doubt that the House will justify the course taken by my right hon. friend. I believe the contract has been made in the interests of Canada, and that it will secure the settlement and development of our great North-West, and that that achievement will be added to the many public services rendered to the country, by the leader of the present Government. I believe this so fully in every respect that, discarding all those little doubts and difficulties and fears, I have no hesitation in saying that I shall give the resolutions my firm support.

Mr. IVES. The Government having entered into a contract for the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway, have submitted that contract to the House for its approval or rejection. The question then, Sir, has become a matter of business rather than of politics, of patriotism rather than of party. And although I have not shared in those feelings of alarm to which such forcible expression was given during last Session of this House by the leader of the Opposition, and the member for Lambton, although I have not looked upon our North-West Territory as so worthless, comparatively speaking, as they depicted it, and although I have anticipated a larger return from the sales of the lands in the North-West than they expected, although I have not placed so high an estimate upon the cost of constructing and operating the Pacific Railway as they placed upon it, yet I am free to concede that this question is one of very great importance to the country, and that a mistake made at this point will result very disastrously and seriously for many years to come, to the future welfare of this country. But, although this is a question of business and not of politics, we find hon. gentlemen of the Opposition attempting to make it a question of politics. We find hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party undertaking to lay upon the Liberal-Conservative party of this country, the whole blame of the obligation to construct this railway, and we find among them a disposition to get up an excitement in the country against the contract which has been submitted to this House. And, although I regret that the question is not discussed purely and simply as one of business, yet, if hon. gentlemen will make a question of politics out of it, I think there is no difficulty in showing that both political parties are responsible for the obligation which rests upon this country to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, that both parties were united in determining that that railway shall be constructed by a company subsidized by the Government, and not by the Government directly, and that both parties have agreed, time after time, in declaring that that

Mr. McLennan.

obligation is an inviolable one, one which must be carried out. I shall endeavour, briefly, to demonstrate those three propositions. The policy of constructing a Canadian Pacific Railway had its origin as far back as the Quebec Conference, the time when our public men on both sides of politics met together to discuss a new departure. I do not mean to say that the agreement to construct the Pacific Railway was agreed upon in as binding a form as was the undertaking to construct the Intercolonial; but I do mean to say that both parties at that Conference settled upon the policy for the future: namely, one which looked to the acquisition of the North-West and British Columbia, and looked to the construction of this great railway. The Administration of the right hon. Leader of the present Government, which was in power in 1871, was only carrying into effect the policy of the new departure, the policy which was inaugurated at the time of Confederation, when he introduced into the Parliament of Canada the resolutions under which British Columbia was admitted into the Confederation. Now, the railway resolution, which was introduced by Sir George E. Cartier, on 28th March, 1871, was in these terms:

"The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously, within two years from the date of the Union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific to the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada, and further to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of the Union."

This resolution was introduced in presence of several hon. gentlemen who now occupy seats to the left of the Speaker, and who took part in the debate which followed. And, what do we find? Was there any concealment at that time of the opinion as to what the cost of the railway was likely to be? No. Sir George Cartier, in the opening sentences of his speech, estimated it would not be less than \$100,000,000. The hon. Finance Minister of that day, Sir Francis Hincks, also estimated the cost, would not be less. If there was ever going to be any opposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway, *per se*, to the acquisition of British Columbia, upon the terms of constructing it, that was the time to declare it, and to take ground against this resolution. But, what do we find? The first speaker who followed Sir George Cartier, was Sir A. T. Galt, who was then acting with the Opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; he never acts with the Opposition.

Mr. IVES. Well, he was certainly occupying a very independent position at the time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He was Independent till he went to London.

Mr. IVES. Sir A. T. Galt said the admission of British Columbia into the Union was desirable, but objected to the time fixed for the completion of the road. The hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Mackenzie, declared for his party its policy. He said, he believed it was essential to the future prosperity of the Dominion, that British Columbia should be admitted into the Union. What did he object to? He deprecated the violation, as he termed it, of the principle of representation by population. He claimed that too large a representation was given the new Province in this House. He objected also to the annual subsidy of \$100,000, given British Columbia under the resolution; but, as to the railway itself, and the admission of British Columbia on the condition of its construction, he offered no objection, except that he thought the undertaking of the Government to build it in ten years and commence it in two, was unwise and beyond their power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman's objections were not to the undertaking itself, but to the terms or details of the scheme and to the period within which the Government