

The hon. gentlemen themselves have recognized this principle here. Let me take the case of M. Letellier. The hon. gentleman who leads the House at this time, the Prime Minister, moved, upon going into Supply, a motion condemning the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec. When hon. gentlemen came into power, there was a question of the disputed boundary of Ontario that was about to be raised in the House. It was a matter of arrangement between the two sides of the House that this motion should be moved from this side of the House upon going into Committee of Supply; but a friend of the hon. gentleman anticipated the action of this side of the House, and moved a resolution in reference to the boundaries of Ontario, on going into Committee of Supply. Did the Government vote against it; did they say "this is a motion moved at a time when we have no opportunity of accepting it or of expressing a proper opinion of it?" Not at all. They voted for the motion, which was moved upon going into Committee of Supply; and there is nothing improper in the course taken by my hon. friend. We know that practically there was no other opportunity, no other way of bringing this matter, under the circumstances, before the House, except by doing what the mover of this motion has done. It is a grievance of a large section of the people of this country, a serious grievance, and the proper and constitutional period for bringing that grievance before Parliament is when the Government of the day are asking for a subsidy—when they are asking for Supply. I did not think it was right to allow this question to be put until I had called the attention of the House to the statement that the hon. Minister had made, in replying to my hon. friend who made this motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but it is a parliamentary rule that no motion in amendment can be made to the amendment made on the motion to go into Committee of Supply. The object of that rule is to secure a vote upon the specific grievance that is brought up; otherwise it would be easy for a parliamentarian to avoid an expression of opinion on any subject whatever. This is the only occasion upon which an amendment can be moved which would secure an expression of opinion upon a distinct question. But the hon. gentleman opposite who leads the House to-night, is too intolerant of any expression of opinion at all, and he seeks by sheer abuse to put down every person who ventures in the least degree to differ from him. I rose simply, not only to say that much before going into Committee of Supply, but also to ask the Minister to bring down—and he will do it, I presume, without any notice—a copy of his advertisement calling for tenders, in the fall of 1878, for the section from English River to Keewatin, 185 miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I said was that the hon. gentleman had asked for tenders, but had subsequently stated that it was for the purpose of accurately informing himself as to what the expense would be, and that he did not decide to let either the portion that he had advertised for in British Columbia or that between lake Superior and the Red River, until he had learned from the result of the tenders what the expense would be. I said that the hon. gentleman had stated that tenders were all in waiting to be allotted when the change of Government took place. I have refreshed my memory by looking at the *Debates*, and I find I was strictly accurate in the statement I made. Specifications were prepared after I became Minister of Railways, on which these tenders were received, and not on the specifications of the hon. gentleman. I will bring down the advertisements ordered by myself, based on those the hon. gentleman had given for the work. I will also remind the hon. gentleman that he not only stated that he had not made up his mind, before a change of Government, to let that work at all, but I will show the hon. gentleman that what he said was that he had advertised for tenders for the whole work,

Mr. MILLS.

with a view to ascertain upon what terms he could let the entire line, from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, and that not a single tender was sent in.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; there was one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was an informal one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was formal, but not admissible. But, I asked the hon. gentleman specifically, did he say that these contracts were based upon tenders that he asked for, and he told me they were. Well, I was astounded at his statements, and I went out to get authorities. The hon. gentleman may not have meant to say it, but he did say it. The hon. gentleman proceeded to say, in the most extraordinary manner, that nothing had been done during my five years of office, and I was proceeding to show, by the question I put, that every part of that road that he alluded to was put under contract upon tenders that I had invited. I invited tenders for the entire work across the continent, based upon the well-known intention not to work the line ourselves, but to include in the contract so given the amount of work we had done as cash; and also anticipating the possibility of not getting a tender for the entire line, I asked tenders for the part of the work in British Columbia, the initial parts of the work, and that 181 miles between Keewatin and English River. I intended to proceed in the same way with the construction of the initial part. I always intended that, and I could not have said I had no intention of proceeding with that. Now, the hon. gentleman ventured to say that when he came into office not one mile of the road was constructed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I said in operation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then they were in operation. The road was built and completed, and all the payments made from the boundary to Selkirk.

An hon. MEMBER. It was not ballasted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was a large portion of it ballasted, and also trains were running and arrangements made for working the road, and I was accused by a colleague of the hon. gentleman of doing something very wrong in building that road at all—I was denounced by Mr. Macpherson for building the line at all. Now, Sir, besides that we had under contract from Selkirk eastward to Keewatin, 108 or 110 miles, and westward from Port William, 118 miles of it remained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One hundred and twelve.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, I am very near it, at any rate. That distance is mostly completed, as the papers will show. Now the hon. gentleman said that my five years of office was a blank, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway was concerned. But I say that more work was done every year than during the two years of incumbency of the hon. gentleman, when he ventured to lay down an air line and ultimately settled down a colonization road; after spending two years groping in the dark, he made up his mind to build a road that could not be called a trans-continental railway, but merely a colonization road. To use his own words, the hon. gentleman did nothing for two years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to remind him that he himself said that he had not decided to build any road on the prairie of any kind, not even a colonization road.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I had not decided in what way it should be built; but we decided it should be built on the prairie, and we brought down a Bill, as a mere speculative matter, for discussion. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman seems to think it was a crime in me not to build the road towards Winnipeg. I accepted the reports of the engineers, and adopted the line through Lake Manitoba, as being the shortest and best route to the Pacific, as being the route