

traffic of the North-West should, as far as possible, be retained on the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Then he speaks of the state of things to which I have adverted, and he goes on to say:

"That while such was the view taken in 1880, the importance of this policy became doubly manifest in 1881, when arrangements were completed for the construction of the new line running to the north of Lake Superior, and the same policy was adhered to last Session."

But if it were doubly manifest in 1881, why did we not hear of it? Why was it not in the contract? Why was it not in the Act of Parliament? Why is it that we are told that the policy has been departed from: that Manitoba was free and had power to build lines which would be a check upon the monopoly.

"For the reason above stated, he is of opinion that the best interests of Canada would be imperilled by the construction of the proposed lines of rail communication, and, therefore, recommends that His Excellency the Governor General be advised to disallow the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba."

Well, of course, it is a large thing to do all at once, and the Government determines that they would dispose of the charters one by one, and they began with the Winnipeg and Great Eastern, and that one was referred, I presume, to the Minister of Justice. He reports with regard to the 20 year clause and he says that possibly railways might run through the new territory of Manitoba, and he proceeds to call attention to the Order in Council of the 18th April, 1879, which speaks of certain arrangements made by Mr. Norquay and Mr. Royal, who, I suppose, is the present member for Provencher. He says:

"The Government will oppose the granting of a charter for the present Session, at least, for any Railway in Manitoba other than the other recommended by them from Winnipeg, south-westerly towards Rock Lake. The Government think it very desirable that all railway legislation shall originate here, and that no charter for a line exclusively within the Province of Manitoba should be granted by its Legislature without the Dominion Government first assenting thereto."

These hon. gentlemen, the Prime Minister and a leading member of the Government of the Province of Manitoba, it is said, agreed in 1879 to this policy. But this was a policy ulterior to this contract at a time when the proposition was to construct the railway as a Government work. These two gentlemen agreed, as far as they were concerned, to abrogate the rights of their Province to independent legislation; they agreed that no railways should be authorized there, unless the Dominion Government assented to them. We do not hear, however, that that agreement was brought to the Legislature of that Province, that the people were told of it, but we found only that two Ministers of that Government assented to a suggestion of this description. The hon. gentleman proceeds to express a doubt

"which exists as to the power of a Provincial Legislature to authorize the construction of a railway, the manifest intention of which is to connect the Province with the United States, and practically to extend beyond the limits of the Province."

Now, you may talk of the manifest intention, but we are not going to disallow of a local legislation on account of what the hon. gentleman calls a manifest intention. The Local Legislature has only the undisputable powers of the Local Legislature to charter a railway, which shall extend from end to end of the Province, and if it proposes to run outside it proposes to exceed its powers. What did the Province of Ontario do? It authorized the construction of the Canada Southern Railway, extending from end to end of the Province, and, in the sense of the phrase of the Minister of Justice, it was manifestly intended to connect beyond, but the Local Legislature could not give it power to make that connection, but it has power to authorize the construction of any line which does not extend beyond the limits of the Province. I repudiate the doctrine that there is a doubt of the power of the Local Legislature to authorize the construction of a railway from

MR. BLAKE.

one end to the other of that Province. The hon. gentleman advises the disallowance of this Act:

"Because it conflicts with the settled policy of the Dominion, as evidenced by the clause in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company above set out, which was ratified and adopted by Parliament."

Who is right? The Minister of Justice, who says that the construction of a railway in Manitoba, which may go to the boundary line, conflicts with the clause, or the Prime Minister, who told us, when passing the Act, that this was not the construction of the clause. Is it to be borne that Parliament is to be induced to pass a contract on the statement of a Minister that such is the construction, and that we are to be told by a Minister, confirmed by the Privy Council, that it has a different construction entirely. The other Acts are left to be disposed of afterwards; and we hear from the ordinary sources of public information that some arrangement has been made as to one of these companies; that in order to avoid too much collision, too much friction, an arrangement has been made whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been good enough to undertake the construction within a portion of the sacred 15 mile belt, which by this construction is imported within the Province, though it was not there a little time before. The Pacific Railway Company want to keep control, and that arrangement, which I presume has been made after the charter was mutilated, it would not be necessary to disallow. There you have the plain fact that the Minister stated to his followers, stated to the House and to the country, and the country understood that by this clause there was a certain though inadequate relief from the monopoly in the undisputed, unfettered, unprejudiced rights of the Local Legislature, to charter railways. We were told that we were wrong in saying there could be no competition because these hon. gentlemen said Manitoba could charter railways and connect in this way. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) amplified his leader's declaration, and pointed out how railways might run through the railways and tap the traffic there. The Minister himself compared the railway to that magnificent river, the Rhine, which ends in bogs and silt, and he said this would be the condition of the Eastern section if other railways were allowed to bleed the traffic. Now it is perfectly clear that a construction is sought to be imported into the contract which is not a true construction, which we were told was not a true construction, and we have not to go on a principle which we were told was not the spirit of the contract. We are to go on the contract, and I maintain that the suggestions which have been offered to us to-night by the Minister of Railways, and not for the first time—his view as to the freedom from monopoly, his suggestion as to the Hudson's Bay being a source of relief is a suggestion which was not made by his leader, which was the one to which I have referred. Therefore the hon. gentleman carefully evaded the gist and force of the objection of my hon. friend from Bothwell, which was that there was a monopoly by reason of the 20 year clause, by reason of the 15 mile belt, by reason of the prohibition southerly and westerly, and that was an objection of the gravest possible character, which exists in all its force and integrity to-day, not weakened but strengthened by time, and infinitely strengthened by the action of hon. gentlemen who have sustained the proposition that private understandings reached between them and the Company antecedent to the contract are to govern their policy, that the old policy of the Government applicable to a Government railway is to be applied in favor of a private corporation now existing, that what they please to call the spirit of the contract is to prevail, and that Manitoba is to be placed practically in the same position as the other territories—practically so, because if the veto power is to be used on every occasion on which the intent of this clause is violated by the Local Legislature of Manitoba,