

some Grit, although we know it was the sentiment of an annexationist, who is fit to enter a Tory Ministry; but when I mentioned the name, hon. gentlemen ceased to cheer, and I thought they looked a little chop-fallen. Well, this was the criticism we met with; and I maintain that my hon. friend's policy in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the circumstances in which the country stood, was endorsed by the Parliament and the country. There was no issue on that subject, except the issue raised by Sir David Macpherson and his friends, through the circulation of this pamphlet. When hon. gentlemen opposite took office they did not depart so much at first from the policy of my hon. friend. In 1879 they proposed a policy of comparatively slow progress. They then thought British assistance was necessary; they thought we could not do this work alone, and they decided to apply for Imperial assistance. They declared that they would build a colonisation railway through the North-West, and they declared that they would make a commencement in British Columbia, but a commencement of a road in both cases of very inferior quality to that which had been before projected. To their proposition to build through the prairies, no dissent was offered; on the contrary, it was deemed a very good proposition. But, Sir, the eastern connection was at that time postponed. The hon. gentleman has shown the danger of getting out of one's depth. He has pointed out, amongst the evidences of incapacity shown by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), that there was 100 miles of railway which he had built and which the Canadian Pacific Railway was obliged to take up and remove. Now, I admit frankly that there was about 100 miles of railway built by the Government which the Canadian Pacific Railway found useless and removed, but it was not built by my hon. friend; it was built by this Government; it was built by hon. gentlemen opposite; it was built by Sir John A. Macdonald's Government; and therefore, if that be an evidence of incapacity, let the hon. gentleman take it to his own heart. The hon. gentleman then referred to my speech in 1880, and he read that portion of it which alludes to the view I expressed in 1874, with reference to these terms of building this railway within ten years. It is true that I entertained, rightly or wrongly—I thought then, in 1880, rightly, and I think now, in 1885, rightly—the view that it was not possible to comply with the terms of that bargain, and that it would be ruinous to this country to do so. I thought the country was deluded into that bargain, under the false pretence that it was possible to do it without creating an increase in taxation; whereas it was impossible to do it without increasing the rate of taxation; and I was disinclined to ruin my country, and British Columbia, as part of it, in the attempt to perform what I considered to be impossible. But I was not disposed, if British Columbia, after a frank, fair and loyal statement of that opinion, said: We insist upon the bargain being carried out; we will not relax the terms; we insist on the letter of the bond, and if you say you cannot do it, we wish to be released—I certainly was not disposed to hold British Columbia against her will; I was not disposed to say: Yes, we trapped you into a union with Canada upon a bargain we now find it impossible to fulfil, but we will not let you go, even if you want to; we will insist in holding you, though you wish to go. On the contrary, I was disposed to say to British Columbia: We are willing to go on and do our best to build this road as rapidly as the resources of the country, of which you form a part, will allow; if that will not suit you, if nothing but the letter of the bond will satisfy you, and if you wish to separate, we will not hold you against your will, on the terms of a bargain which we are unable to fulfil. I said that, and I do not think it was an unjust, a dishonorable thing to say. I think it was a fair, plain statement of what honesty and justice demanded of any man from the old Provinces of Canada to say to

Mr. BLAKE.

British Columbia. It was the least one could say to that Province, to tell it we would not hold it a slave and leave unperformed the terms of the bargain upon which it entered Confederation. Then the hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend made a proposal for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that it was a very expensive proposal, because, he said, my hon. friend, besides a subsidy in money and a subsidy in land, proposed a guarantee of 4 per cent. on a certain sum for twenty-five years. Now, a portion of this statement is true, but only a portion. It is not all founded on fact; for my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) did not state a sum; but the hon. gentleman himself stated a sum, the lowest he assumed it would be, and, therefore, he claims that the hon. member for East York made that offer. Now, what the hon. member for East York did was to advertise for offers to build the railway, stating, such a subsidy, in cash and in land, will be paid; if you want more, state for how much more of this guarantee of 4 per cent. will build the road. My hon. friend did not offer a particular sum; he did not say he would accept the tender; but he was determined to endeavor to secure an offer, to be submitted to Parliament with the advice of the Government, in accordance with the liberal policy which we insisted on while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. But the hon. gentleman, to make up a large sum of money, puts in this middle and unknown term. He assumes to be a tenderer, and he puts in a tender. I heard the words "bogus tenderer" applied a few days ago to a number of very respectable gentlemen; I will not insult the hon. gentleman by saying that he was a bogus tenderer, but certainly he comes late with his tender; and certainly, if he had come, in 1876 or 1877, and made that offer, he would have received the response that his proposal was too high. But there is another difficulty. The hon. gentleman names a sum, and he declares that a guarantee of 4 per cent. on that sum per annum for 25 years is equal to the capital. He declines the actuarial calculation. He declines to recognise the fact that a portion of this sum out-runs, in 25 years, a portion in 24 years, a portion in 23 years, and so on, and he actually multiplies 4 by 25, and says that is the proposal; and that is what he calls fair play and frank and loyal criticism. Then the hon. gentleman pointed out that there was a great difference in another point between this suggested offer of my hon. friend and the present position. He said the rolling stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway was nearly \$9,000,000, and would be \$10,000,000 very shortly. I do not so understand it. The term that is used in most communications that reach us upon the subject of that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's enterprise, is "equipment," and I do not understand the word "equipment," as they use it, signifies only rolling stock. I understand it to signify in part fixed equipment, and I base that understanding partly upon the report of the company, which appeared in yesterday's papers, under which, if I rightly recollect the figures, the company declared their rolling stock to be something like \$7,300,000, instead of \$9,000,000, so that the hon. gentleman, in that respect, also, has acted upon inaccurate information. The hon. gentleman then adverted to my speech in 1880, and pointed out the estimates that I had laid before the House of the cost of a first-rate road, which had been projected in former years, by the engineers, over the prairie country, and he declared that I had staked my reputation upon the fact that the cost of that road would be so much per mile, and that this was the same route as the Canadian Pacific Railway had followed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; the same route. Probably the hon. gentleman did not mean to say it.