

railway. I desire that the whole country should understand the terms and the resolution which was moved by me and for which almost 60 members voted. Honorable gentlemen opposite will declare that the policy of the Opposition is to postpone the construction of the whole line, and they will prove it by the resolution as quoted by the hon. Minister of Railways and by his speech. I said last night that my only object was to have the resolution placed correctly on *Hansard*, and I would not accuse the Minister of Railways of deliberately mistating it. I presume he took it out of last year's *Hansard*, where it was incorrectly stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I read it out of the Journals of the House word for word.

Mr. BURPEE. It appears from *Hansard* that the hon. gentleman read it otherwise, as I have said he read it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I read it from the Journals of the House, and I read it twice.

Mr. BURPEE. It is my duty to correct that mistake. If the hon. gentleman read it from the Journals of the House his speech is all wrong, part of his argument being entirely out of place and falling to the ground. In fact the best and the most vigorous portion of his speech must be eliminated. As I stated at the time the policy of the late Government as indicated by this resolution was to have the prairie section built first by the Government, and to postpone the British Columbia end until after the prairie section was completed and the country settled, when the Dominion would be better prepared to build the British Columbia section of the road. I make these explanations in order to place myself and the country right in respect to this resolution which might otherwise place the Opposition in a position which they did not occupy.

Mr. DeCOSMOS. I presume this House is wearied of this subject, but notwithstanding that fact I ask its indulgence for a few moments. The remark made by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) just now brings forcibly before me the fact as to how generous a man may be with other people's property and rights. The hon. gentleman, in moving a resolution respecting the construction of the Pacific Railway, said the British Columbia portion should be postponed, that it was premature. Now, Sir, I deny that it is premature, and I maintain it is wrong that it should ever have been postponed. I will not, however, proceed to the discussion of that subject at the present moment. At a future time I will take up the whole subject of the railway in British Columbia, either in Committee when the appropriation comes down for that Province, or when the resolution comes up for concurrence, so that I may spread on the records of the House the true state of that question, and place it in such a way that it may be verified. I will make this brief statement to the House, a statement which may be verified and that cannot be refuted—that British Columbia has paid the average of the taxation of the Dominion during the whole period she has been a member of the Dominion. I make this further statement that British Columbia has not merely paid her proportion of the taxation of this Dominion, but that she has paid in excess of that \$1,700,000, a sum equal to the total interest upon the total amount of money expended on surveys and construction of the Pacific Railway from 1871 down to June 30th, 1880; but I say, in addition to all this, British Columbia had to pay up to June 30th over \$200,000 in excess of paying the interest on the capital borrowed for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and her proportionate rate of interest. I leave that statement for the House and country to consider. I will hereafter, as I remarked a few moments ago, take up this whole question. I will state further, for the information of this House, and particularly of my hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), that during

the last fiscal year the Province of British Columbia paid into the Consolidated Revenue of Canada \$685,000. After paying the ordinary and current expenditure of the Dominion in and for that Province it left \$116,000 surplus. The hon. Minister of Railways stated, in the early portion of this Session, that \$1,634,300 had been expended on the Onderdonk contract on construction, on which the interest was \$64,000, and this was not only paid but a balance of \$50,000 odd was paid to the Dominion Treasury and is there now. In other words, we paid all the money that was expended in the Province in that fiscal year; we paid the whole interest on the capital expended on the Onderdonk contract, and \$50,000 besides. I would draw the attention of the House to one fact farther. The hon. Minister of Railways told us that we would have on the 1st of August next 951 miles of railway in operation. Now, Sir, does it show honesty, fairness, or uprightness, on the part of either this House or the Government or the Opposition, that 951 miles of railway will be in operation in the eastern part of this Dominion on the 1st of August, when not a single mile is completed in British Columbia? Common fairness, common honesty, common justice, between man and man, must denounce such a state of things as dishonorable alike to the hon. members of this House and the Government of this country, as unworthy, in fact, of any person, whether in or out of this House. We entered the Dominion of Canada on the condition that the railway should progress simultaneously from each end, and here I repeat again before I sit down, we have 951 miles ready and in operation in the east, and not a single mile in British Columbia; yet we have paid, I repeat, the whole interest on railway expenditure up to June, 1880.

Mr. ROSS. I do not intend to prolong the discussion, but I wish to make a few remarks before the question is put. Those who remember the plain and businesslike statements of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was Minister of Railways, must have remarked the contrast between his statements and those of the present hon. Minister of Railways in moving the Bill which is now in your hands. We expected, Sir, that the hon. gentleman having charge of the Department since 1878, no doubt familiar with all its details, acting on the advice of engineers in whose ability he has the utmost confidence, when he made his statement to this House, would state the difficulties he encountered in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would present to the House such an explanation of the policy of the Government as would enable us fairly to understand what to expect in the future. True, Sir, he did for an hour or less, shall I say, entertain the House with an exposition of some of the difficulties he had to overcome, but it was evident throughout the whole prefatory part of his speech that he was preparing to indulge in one continual boast as to what the Minister of Railways had been able to accomplish compared with the late Minister of Railways. I cannot tell whether I was struck more with the difficulties the hon. gentleman had to encounter, or did encounter, in laying before the House the policy of the Government, or the ease with which the hon. gentleman indulged in those flights of imagination so peculiar to him. Sir, in dealing with the policy of the Government from the very inception of his remarks to the very close it was quite apparent the hon. gentleman had risen, not so much to explain the policy of the Government, as to boast of what the Government had done or was going to do. In the first place he dwelt very briefly, and I do not wonder that he dwelt so briefly, with the difficulties encountered in the eastern section of the road. We were told last year that the aim of the Government was to give Canada a great through route from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We were told that immigrants arriving at Quebec would be carried along the line north of Lake Superior all the way through on