

we know that good men are selected, and that, once they assume their duties, politics are not allowed to interfere with the manner in which they are carried out. We also know that all the appointees in the post office are named for political reasons, but I think it may well be said that the management of the post offices is very free from politics and conducted on an economical scale and as satisfactorily as it is possible for any class of business to be done. I think if a commission were appointed to manage the Intercolonial Railway, which would be as much beyond our control as the judges are, they could run the road as they pleased, and it would be very difficult for us to have grievances redressed. If the Minister of Railways or his department would give to Parliament the reasons, so far as they can be ascertained, for any deficit, Parliament would be able to enquire, from year to year, into the deficits, and remedy them, as far as they are capable of being remedied. That would be a step in advance, and all the information necessary might be got, as some gentlemen suggest, through the appointment of a parliamentary committee. Whilst it is recognized that this deficit is large, the Maritime Provinces are no more to be charged with it than the rest of the Dominion trading with these provinces, as the Intercolonial Railway must be considered as belonging to all parts of the Dominion. If to-morrow, since we have what is called the Short Line Railway, the Intercolonial Railway were stopped at some point at Lévis or south of Lévis, you would find the deficit would cease, but it would not be in the interests of the country to do that, as we would thereby fail to accommodate the various portions of Canada which are doing business along that line. The Intercolonial Railway has to contend against the water communication along the Gulf of St. Lawrence and with other railroads built in opposition to it, with the trunk lines that have their termini in the United States and do business with the Maritime Provinces through the United States ports; and, considering all the opposition it has to meet, the road is maintaining itself very well. Again, Canada imported a year or two ago about \$9,000,000 worth of goods through Portland and must have sent nearly as much in value through that port to the markets of Europe. If we can by any means develop our trade over the Intercolonial Railway through Canadian ports as against sending it to the maritime ports of the United States, we will soon reduce that deficit. Therefore, instead of considering the proposition to take the road out of the management of Parliament, if we would address ourselves, from time to time, through the Minister of Railways and his officials, to learning how the matter can be remedied, that would be better than giving up our control over this great work. I will not further trespass on the time of the House, but will conclude by stating that, representing a constituency more deeply interested in the road than any other, I am not prepared to give my adhesion to the principle of taking it out of our management.

Motion agreed to: and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—  
construction..... \$24,900. \$50,000

Resolution reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EDWARDS. Before the adjournment takes place, I desire to refer to a little matter, and in case there is any doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen as to whether I am paired or not, I desire to make a statement. I did pair with the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) dating from the 3rd August till the 10th August. In order that no mistake might be made, I got from the member for Lisgar a letter which I will read to the House:

"OTTAWA, 1st August, 1891.

"MY DEAR EDWARDS.—I accept your kind offer to pair with me for the whole of next week commencing August 3rd, excepting the vote on the amendment that may be moved by Mr. Desjardins of l'Islet, or a motion that he may bring in on the trade question. On all other questions we are paired for said week.

"Yours.

"A. W. ROSS."

My reason for asking for this letter was that on two previous occasions on which I obliged hon. gentlemen opposite I was very unfairly treated. Another reason was that I believed hon. gentlemen on this side of the House during this session had been unfairly treated in the same way. Not only have I that letter, but on Monday morning, August 3rd, when I returned to Ottawa, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked me if I was paired with the hon. member for Lisgar. I told him I was for that week, that the pair terminated at midnight at the end of that week, and not only did I tell him that I had a letter to that effect, but he came over to my desk and saw the letter. I also saw the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) who asked me the same question, and I gave him the same reply. Not only is this the case, but on the 3rd and 4th August the pairs given by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), those sheets do not include my name. Under these circumstances, though I might dwell longer on this subject, I think I am justified in saying that I have been very unfairly treated. Never have I asked an hon. gentleman on the other side to pair with me to oblige me, but whenever I have been asked I have endeavoured to oblige hon. gentlemen opposite. When I first came into this House, while being a Liberal and holding to Liberal principles, I had no other desire than to remain on friendly terms with hon. gentlemen on the other side, and my very first act was to oblige the late Premier Sir John Macdonald before the session had commenced by pairing with one of his supporters for two weeks. I held to that agreement, and I received nothing but abuse from the Conservative journals because I did so. Last session I was asked to pair with an hon. gentleman, and I said I would see whether I could do so or not. The member went away and gave the pair to the whip without my consent, because I never agreed to it, but I abstained for a week from voting in consequence of that. I think it was very unbecoming on the part of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to get up as he has done to-night and practically charge me with falsehood.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have listened attentively to the statement of the hon. gentleman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.