

ity for the Canadian Pacific Railway before reaching the eastern terminus, where it had been fixed by Parliament on the south and east of Lake Nipissing. He may say, "but this is all subject to the limitation that is provided for in this Bill, with reference to not increasing the then rate of taxation." Unfortunately for him, and unfortunately for the hon. gentleman who sits behind him—and who now seems—I will not say ready to repudiate the policy of his own leader—but to take a prominent part in a proposal that, I fear, will be regarded in the light of a repudiation by them of their obligations, and which will have the effect of sweeping from under their feet any standing ground. The hon. the then Minister of Finance submitted to Parliament a declaration to the effect that, in order to meet the expenditure he would have to ask Parliament to impose an additional taxation of \$3,000,000; and then and there the hon. gentleman did impose that additional taxation. When the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made his famous speech in Ontario, at a subsequent date, he said that British Columbia had nothing to complain of, as Parliament had not only pledged itself to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but had provided \$3,000,000, had levied \$3,000,000 additional taxation to meet their obligations, and notably for the Canadian Pacific Railway. When the hon. gentleman imposed that additional taxation, this Bill was, at the same time, placed upon the Statute-book, saying that the undertaking should not involve an increase in the existing rate of taxation. The hon. gentleman, therefore, stands in this position: either he must give up that clause as not having any binding obligation or effect, or stand before Parliament and the country in the position of having violated the law in the expenditure of every dollar spent from the first hour that he began to expend any money on the Pacific Railway, because there is clear and undeniable evidence that the rate of taxation was then increased. Every single dollar of the \$11,000,000 spent in the construction of the Railway so far had been spent by the hon. gentleman in the teeth of the Statute, and also the balance of the \$28,000,000 of money required to complete the expenditure he had begun—for,

without that completion, all the \$11,000,000 would be wasted—had been expended contrary to the declaration of that Act. The hon. gentleman, when in Opposition, had exhibited such a spirit of antagonism—as hon. gentlemen opposite are, I am afraid, inclined to exhibit—to the policy proposed on this side of the House.

MR. BLAKE: Which hon. gentleman?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: When I have the pleasure to look in the face at this moment of the hon. gentleman, and hold this friendly discussion on so very important a question, I am reminded that when he was before in Opposition; and when we then proposed a scheme for constructing the Pacific Railway, which we felt quite possible, and which we knew to be in the interest of the country to complete as quickly as possible, he and his colleagues derided that proposal or the advisability of going on with the work, but when brought into power, upon this side of the House they did not shrink back; they found that the dismal vista that they had seen before had vanished; and the hon. gentleman went to the extent of adding \$4,000,000 to the amount we proposed for the construction of the Pacific Railway at the eastern end of the line. But what did he do on the other end of the line? He went into a deliberate negotiation with British Columbia and the Imperial Government, and for fear that the hon. gentlemen may forget these little inconsistencies, I will ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to one of the most important state papers, one of the most important documents that forms a portion of the Archives of Canada, I mean the treaty made between the Government of Canada and British Columbia, and the Imperial Government. Although I would like to condense the passage I am going to read, I am afraid I shall have to read it at length. What I am going to read now will be found at page 511, of the *Hansard* of 1875. On that page will be found a *verbatim* statement of the treaty, showing the obligations imposed by the then First Minister now sitting on the other side of the House. Lord Carnarvon said:

"Adhering then to the same order in which, on the 16th August, I stated the principle points on which it appears to me that a better