

—on the ground that (and it must be remembered that the line went from one end of his constituency to the other) it was not worth while building a railway through that part of the country, as that part of the Province was no good. He now rises and states that the Opposition have decried the country, and that is one of the reasons why local companies could not build the roads. I have some knowledge of the reasons why the local companies have not been able to build the railways. The principle reason is that the Government have invariably disallowed charters granted by the Local Legislature. I also recollect that the hon. member for Provencher made statements with respect to the branch lines and the disallowance of local charters. The charter of the Emerson and North-Western Railway was disallowed by this Government, and that line was to run through the hon. gentleman's constituency. That company, which was building the road without a land grant, had graded 15 miles, but they were not allowed to put iron on it, because the charter was disallowed by this Government; and the reason given by the Minister of Justice was that it interfered with the spirit of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have been laboring under this difficulty in the North-West, that we have not known whether railway charters granted by the Local Legislature were within the spirit of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract or not. But when the contract was let the First Minister said that Manitoba would have a right to grant railway charters, that they could not check Manitoba, that the rights of the Province would not be interfered with. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) rose and explained different reasons why Manitoba could not be interfered with, and that this Parliament had no right to interfere, except in regard to the territory west of Manitoba. We find, later, that the reasons given for not granting that charter to the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway Company was because it would interfere with clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. So the people of Manitoba have, from time to time, been put off with different reasons why they should not build railways detrimental to one grand and great monopoly. I can give the reason why the companies were not able to build the railways with the land grant they were to receive, of 3,400 acres per mile, and why the lands have depreciated in value. It is on account of the monopoly maintained in that country in railways. There is no country, as has been truly said by the hon. member for Provencher, where the people care about building branch lines when those lines have to make terms with the main line, because there is not the same profit from carrying trade on branch lines as there is on through traffic. We all know that, from our experience with respect to railway company's. When the charter was granted by the Local Legislature to the Manitoba and North-Western, it was expected by the people of the Province and of the North-West that the road was to be continued from Portage la Prairie, in a south-easterly direction, and connect with the Emerson and North-Western, the charter for which is disallowed. The Manitoba and North-Western has had an up-hill experience in the building of the road they have built. I am not finding fault with the terms the Government propose to grant to those local roads. The country must have railways; it cannot be developed without them. I am only glad that the Government has seen fit to come down with this liberal proposition, while at the same time I am sorry that it should be necessary to do so to enable the railways to be built. I, with the leader of the Opposition, hold that in these resolutions there should be some mention made of the terms on which the land grants would be received. I believe those grants should be made on conditions of settlement, and only so. In each case it is a large grant, and it is a free grant of land. It can be sold at a price which, while it will amply repay the company, will

place it within the means of settlers to purchase. I suppose this question of disallowance will come up again, and so it is not necessary to occupy much time in discussing it now. As the hon. member for Provencher referred to the railway policy of the late Administration, I may say that they also had a monopoly, that they would not allow roads to be built within a certain distance of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government, however, had it in their power to change their policy at any time. The present Government has not the power, according to the interpretation of some members opposite, to change the policy; they are bound by a solemn contract not to change it for twenty years. At first it was claimed that the Dominion Government had not the power to disallow provincial railway charters; next, charters were disallowed because they were not in the spirit of the contract, and now it is claimed that those charters must be disallowed. If it was not for the disallowance of the local charters, and the fact that there would be no connection, except with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, railways would be built in Manitoba without receiving any land grants whatever. It will pay any company to build a line through a fertile country, such as is Manitoba, when the road can be cheaply built; but when local companies have to make terms with the company that possesses the only outlet, it is not possible that such lines would be built, even with land grants.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Provencher, in opening his remarks, criticising the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), took the ground that a great difference existed between the causes of the development of the country to the west of the Mississippi and the country in our own North-West, and he urged, as one of the principal differences, the fact that the people in the Western States enjoy independence.

Mr. ROYAL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I stated two causes, and I dwelt on the second cause—on the constitution and patriotism of the two parties in the States, compared with the constitution and patriotism of the two parties in this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman, however, distinctly alluded to the fact that the inhabitants of the Western States of the United States enjoyed independence. Well, Sir, they do not enjoy any greater degree of independence than we do in British North America, and so far as any difference in the two systems of Government exists, I do not believe the American people have any advantage over us. They have not, at any rate, a better Government than ours; it is not recognised by the people of the world, or by the American people themselves, as being in any material respect a better Government. The hon. gentleman went on to say that they had not only the advantage of an independent system of Government, but that the people of the United States had not decried their own country, or the Government, or the character of their country, as a field for immigration. Well, Sir, so far as my knowledge of the United States goes, the people of that country have, in all past times, criticised fully and keenly the policy of that Government. The policy of the Government of the United States, in relation to its public lands, with regard to every feature pertaining to its fiscal system and its land system, have been fully and freely criticised in that country—as fully and as freely as kindred topics have been in our own. Sir, there has been no attempt made by the Opposition in this country to decry the North-West. The advantages of the North-West have been more fully set before the people of Canada by the chief organ of the Opposition than by all the organs of the Government party. The *Globe* newspaper, two or three years ago, under the energetic action of its then news editor, sent to the North-West a correspondent, whose letters, giving a full and favorable description of the North-West, appeared in the columns of that journal from day to