

for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, I was perfectly surprised and astounded at the statement of the Minister of Canals and Railways, and which is reported in the Debates of Parliament, as to the reason, or, rather, want of reason, upon which this term of this contract was based. The hon. gentleman did not appear to have a particle of testimony before him, when framing this clause as to condition of the Pacific Railway, seemed to be wholly ignorant of the condition of the Union Pacific Railway in 1869, and as to what these contractors, this powerful Syndicate were getting under this part of the contract; and when challenged by the member for West Durham, he stated that the terms of this contract were precisely the same as the Allan contract. When the member for West Durham pointed out the terms of the Allan contract, the hon. gentleman found he was mistaken. He then had to fall back on the statement that the Union Pacific was constructed after the model of the Baltimore and Ohio Railway, which, no doubt, has been for the last ten to fifteen years a first class road. But when first constructed it was no better than the Union Pacific Railway was in 1869, when 890 miles were completed. I do not wish the statement to go unanswered abroad that the Union Pacific was a first-class road when completed, when history shows it was anything but that. I wish the fact published to the country that Ministers, who should act with care, and manage the public affairs in a cautious, judicious way, and with all the necessary information before them, did not do so and did not know, notwithstanding the existence of those documents laid before the United States Legislature, that the very foundations on which they based this clause would not sustain them, or justify their position? For those reasons I have thought it right to trouble the House with the present remarks.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Two distinct points have been brought before the House with reference to this matter. As to the legal construction of that clause, I am not going to take upon me to pronounce; but what I want to call your attention to, is the fact that another point of very great importance was raised by this discussion. From the mouth of the Minister of Railways, we had the confession that the Government supposed they were adopting a totally different standard for this road from the standard defined in the terms of the agreement before us. If the terms are strictly insisted upon, it may involve an additional loss of several thousand dollars a mile, or several millions in the whole contract. The two sets of conditions differ very materially indeed; and, unless the Minister of the Interior is prepared to tell us that the attention of his Government having been now called for the first time—as appears from the statement of the Minister of Railways—to the very remarkable discrepancy between the contract made by Sir Hugh Allan, in 1873 and that made in 1880 with his successors in managing this Canadian Pacific contract—his Government are prepared to take measures to remedy it, or greatly to modify those clauses, so as to guard against dangers of a much greater description than those ordinary dangers in connection with the great transaction the country contemplates, there will be great uneasiness and anxiety in the public mind. We cannot call the attention of the country too strongly to the fact that Ministers had not even taken the trouble to compare the two contracts, to ascertain the character of the standard upon which they regulated this provision. It would be well for the right hon. gentleman to tell us whether the Government is, or is not, prepared, so to guard and modify that clause as to prevent the very dangers to which the member for West Durham has called attention.

Motion agreed to.

#### PACIFIC RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all papers shewing any modifications made under the provisions of any of the

contracts for the construction of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, prior to the 21st October last, and referred to in the contract brought down this Session; and of any estimates or statements made as to the result of such modifications on the character and expense of the work. He said: It will be observed, by the contract which has been laid on the Table, that the Government is bound to finish those portions of the railway which are mentioned as being under construction by the Government, according to the terms of the contracts made for the construction of those portions, subject, however, to any modifications which have been made by the Government in the provisions of these contracts before the 21st of October last, the date of the contract laid on the Table. It is important, therefore, that we should know before hand that on which depends the precise obligations of the Government, what the modifications are which were made in the terms of those contracts, before the great contract was signed. On this, as on other matters, I am desirous of getting such information as in my judgment the Government was bound to lay upon the Table of the House, before they asked us to discuss this matter at all. They bring down a contract without laying on the Table the information upon which they acted. They bring down a contract which shows certain obligations of theirs which were dependent upon certain other instruments containing the modifications, but which modifications they do not bring down. It is impossible for us, therefore, to know what are the precise obligations of the Government under this contract, and we cannot ascertain them until we see these modifications. I think it also was the duty of the Government to bring down any estimates or statements made as to the results of such modifications on the character and expense of the work. We have a general estimate made by Mr. Schreiber laid on the Table, of what the costs of those sections will be; but what I want is an estimate of the change made in the cost by the modifications which the contract indicates as having been made in these original contracts before the 24th October. I suppose there can be no possible objection to this motion. I will add that, inasmuch as it ought to be before us, in order that we may ascertain what the obligations are which we are asked to sanction, I think the answer ought to be, not merely that the address is agreed to, but that there should be an immediate response to that address.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is getting reasonable, and, therefore, I shall have no objection to this resolution, and we will see that the matter is attended to immediately.

Motion agreed to.

#### SURVEYS FROM SOUTH-EAST BAY TO SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of any reports or surveys made since last Session on the line from South-East Bay to the Sault Ste. Marie, or on the line between South-East Bay and Thunder Bay, said: As to the line between South East Bay and Sault Ste. Marie, there was a distinct pledge made by the Government in the other branch of the Legislature, that they would have further surveys made during recess, with a view of submitting a proposition to Parliament this Session to aid in some way in the construction of that railway. Sir Alexander Campbell, in the Senate, on the 21st of April last, in answer to a question, gave a formal pledge, on the part of the Government, that these surveys would be made with the view of those propositions being submitted. I presume they have been made, and I think it material to this discussion that we should have them, together with any reports upon the matter. During last Session the line on the north shore of Lake Superior remained in a very uncertain condition. The distance stated by the Engineer in his general report, and that stated by his letter