

partly for extending their line to the seaboard, but that is a transaction which they had a right to enter into. All we can properly ask of them is to demonstrate that the money which we gave them has been spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway and to finish that work, and that I submit to the House, with great confidence, has been shown by both the modes which I have adopted, the one by showing that they got no money from us, except by certificate, with the exception of \$7,500,000, and shown that that sum was spent on the main line, and the other by showing exactly what the cost of construction has been, and that it has exceeded considerably the amount they got from the country. So in both ways I think it is established that the company has kept faith with the country, and that it has expended all the money it got from us by subsidy or loan on the road itself.

Another argument which is made use of is that the company have not kept faith with the country in the character of the work which they have done on the road, and particularly as regards curves and gradients. Now, with reference to the character of the work, everyone who has gone over it speaks in strong terms of its character. Some of my hon. friends in this House have gone over it—I know the hon. member from Amherst has—and I have heard the Minister of Public Works and others, and I think I am right and justified in saying that the consensus of opinion of those who have gone over the road—those who are skilled and those who are not—is that the road has been well built and is an excellent road, a better road than the one which was taken as a pattern; a road which in all respects commends itself to engineers as a better road than any which crosses the continent, and a road which any engineer would pronounce as a first-class road. As regards the particular objection as to grades and curves, I will read to the House a very admirable and clear statement made by Mr. Van Horne, the vice-president of the road, which establishes to my mind that the road which has been constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. is a better line than the one which was taken as a pattern for it—that is the Union Pacific. I cannot possibly put the argument in clearer

terms than it is stated by Mr. Van Horne. He says:—

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, }
MONTREAL, 19th June, 1885. }

The contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company provides that the Union Pacific Railway shall be taken as an "approximate standard," whereby the quality and character of the railway, and of the materials used in construction thereof, and of the equipment thereof may be regulated; and this clause was interpreted by a subsequent letter as meaning the Union Pacific Railway as it was when accepted by the United States Government in 1873.

It is claimed by the parties to the contract on the part of the Company that in referring to the Union Pacific Railway, they, and the Government as well, had in mind the entire line between Omaha and San Francisco—the entire line being commonly known in Canada and the east as the Union Pacific, and the technical difference between the sections east and west of Ogden being little understood by the public.

However this may have been, the clause in the contract fixing the standard has always been understood by the company as referring to the general character of the railway in respect of gradients, curvature, track, bridges, rolling stock and appurtenances, but not as providing that the maximum grades or curves should in no cases, and under no circumstances exceed the maximum of the Union Pacific, and the Company confidently assert that in all respects the Canadian Pacific is superior to the standard named, and particularly in the matter of gradients.

While it is no doubt true that the maximum gradients on the Union Pacific Railway at the present time do not exceed 90 feet to the mile, it is also true that gradients of 116 feet to the mile were used in the original construction of that railway, and that curves of 10 degrees or more were also used.

To what extent these had been reduced in 1873, I have no data at hand to show, but for this comparison we are willing to take the Union Pacific as it exists to-day.

That railway from Omaha to Cheyenne, 515 miles, has light gradients, corresponding to those on our line for 957 miles west of Winnipeg. From Cheyenne to Ogden, the remaining 517 miles of the Union Pacific, or 50 per cent. of its entire length, gradients of 90 feet per mile are scattered throughout.

On that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed by the Company, the maximum permanent gradient from Callander to Port Arthur, 653 miles, and for 957 miles west from Winnipeg, is $52\frac{8}{10}$ feet to the mile. Then comes a section of 120 miles, with several permanent gradients of 116 feet to the mile; beyond this a section of 113 miles, with several gradients of 66 feet, and finally 65 miles, with the minimum gradients $52\frac{8}{10}$ feet to the mile.