

Government, and with the terms of the charter which had been granted to it."

Well, Sir, I find that after this letter goes through the ordinary routine of being reported upon by Mr. Schreiber, and in turn by the Minister of Railways, the charter is disallowed; but before it is disallowed, the question goes before the Minister of Justice, and I think the statement made by the Minister of Justice on behalf of the Government, should be held up as soon as possible and as strongly as possible to the reprobation of the people of this country. He says that in an Order in Council previously passed and forwarded to the Government of Manitoba, this extraordinary principle was propounded:

"The Government think it very desirable that all railway legislation shall originate here, and that no charter for a line exclusively within the Province of Manitoba should be granted by its Legislature, without the Dominion Government first assenting thereto."

If that is good doctrine for the Province of Manitoba, it is good constitutional doctrine for Ontario and Quebec, and it lays down the broad principle that we have seen so much of lately, in attempts to tighten the control of the Federal over the Provincial Governments. If this doctrine is laid down, then hereafter no Provincial Legislature must venture to legislate on any important railway matter without first obtaining the assent of the Dominion. This is almost equal to what was known in the old time as Poyning's Act—an Act which required that every Bill presented to the old Irish Parliament should emanate from the English Government, or first go to the English Government for its consent. Another letter from the Secretary of the Company has been placed in my hands, in which he requests the Government to consent to a change of the location of the line of railway from Portage la Prairie to the crossing of the Assiniboine River. They simply intimate to the Government that a particular change of location, made entirely for their own benefit, is necessary to be sanctioned, and forthwith the Government of this country ratify the decision of the Syndicate. Taking all these things into consideration, I do think, Sir, that we are placed in an extraordinary position; but I have this consolation, that I think the hon. Minister of Railways probably wishes in his heart by this time that he had confined himself to his statement with regard to the progress of the work on the Pacific Railway, and that he had not attempted to slash and cut down, right and left, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I wonder if he fancied that we were afraid to discuss this matter. I wonder if he thought that we would allow his criticisms of these resolutions to pass, so that by-and-bye he might stand up at public meetings and say: "I said so-and-so in the Parliament of Canada, before these hon. gentlemen, and they did not contradict me." If the hon. gentleman made any calculation of that kind, he finds himself greatly mistaken. We have dared to contradict him, and we tell him that we denounce this contract as injurious to Canada, subversive of the interests and the liberties of the people of Canada, and we will be delighted to go before the people of this country and ask them to condemn the men who imposed this bargain upon them. The people will condemn them, and hon. gentlemen know that amongst their own friends, who for other reasons support them, this charter is not approved of—that it was not approved of by many hon. gentlemen opposite who were induced to support it last year; but the remonstrances and the censures of the people of this country will not so easily be set aside or suppressed. I trust the people will soon speak, and speak loudly, plainly, intelligently and honestly—speak as people who love their country, who are true-hearted and truly intelligent—people who detest mismanagement and who will never be willing to become the tools of a policy which is calculated to involve their country in such difficulties and misfortunes. The country will speak, and we, on our side, have no doubt as

to what its utterance may be. Hon. gentlemen opposite may hope they will take the country by surprise and snatch a verdict in their favor. But I believe they will not be able to snatch a verdict or to come back and boast of a majority. Some of them will come back, but when they do we shall not hear any such boasting and glorification and great distortion of facts such as we have listened to last evening, and such as we were compelled to occupy nearly all this day in refuting and rebutting.

Mr. CASEY. I think, like the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that the Minister of Railways is perhaps rather sorry for having excited this discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How can you think he is sorry?

Mr. CASEY. Considering the amount of the hon. gentleman's shortcomings it would be hard to say when he could be sorry enough. The words, devilish ingenuity, was used by him in describing the manner in which this amendment was drawn, and that word may become after his use of it, a proper parliamentary expression, but I do not impute that phrase to the policy of the hon. member in challenging this discussion. But I think, on the other hand, his intention was excellent, perhaps, to carry off a triumph by challenging a discussion that he thought would not come on; but the contrary has been the result and his plan has miscarried. I think it was the duty of everyone who attached his name to any of the amendments of last year to meet the hon. gentleman's challenge, and show whether he held to his sentiments and was prepared to meet his constituents on the motion to which he set his name. During this discussion it has been plainly shown that many of the evils then foretold have come to pass. The hon. gentleman claims great credit, because some of these evils have not yet come to pass; but the fulness of time has not yet arrived for the culmination of those evils. He has not told us, however, that a single evil we then predicted has been shown to be impossible, or improbable. That being the case the balance of the whole discussion is in our favor and against the policy of the Minister of Railways. If part of our predictions have come true, the rest is likely to be realized, which casts the balance in our favor. Take the question of monopoly in the North-West; it has been clearly shown that monopoly has existed, and in a sense that nobody anticipated when the Syndicate contract was before the House, and which the leader of the Government said could not exist. In that respect our predictions of evil have been more than verified. The Minister of Railways attempted to do away with the force of an objection with regard to this monopoly by showing that the local rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway was in some cases the rates of other roads owned by private parties. He admitted, of course, that those rates were higher than they would have been if this had been a Government road. He let us take the case without considering the question of what the rates would have been on a Government road, and for the sake of his comparison with other railroads he gave us only local rates of roads whose length was only 145 miles, in other words, the whole completed line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Emerson to Brandon. But he forgot to tell us what is really the fact that while other railways give through invoices at vastly reduced rates, the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the simple reason that it has no competitor gives through rates very little less, if anything less, than local rates. The local rates are also the through rates and are vastly higher than those of any other railway of the same length. Of course through rates as a rule are very much lower than local rates, and for what reason? Simply because on through traffic railroads have competition. In this case the railway has no competition, and has no object in charging a lower rate for a car of wheat from Brandon for Montreal than