

tion? When the delegates from British Columbia in 1870 returned home they carried with them simply the condition that the railway would be built from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific. No sooner had they returned than public opinion expressed itself in condemnation of the mission from the terms of Union of any provision that the chief port of British Columbia should be the terminus of the railway. Subsequently the predecessor of the hon. First Minister, the Hon. Mr. **LANGÉVIN**, visited British Columbia. That gentleman took a steamer and visited portions of the coast as well as the interior. The result was that one or two places were determined upon as suitable for the terminus, **Alverni** or **Esquimault**, or both. In 1871 the British Columbia members were chosen for the Dominion Parliament. Shortly after they arrived in Ottawa, Sir **GEORGE CARTIER** introduced his Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. After the Opposition members, some of whom were now members of the Government, had aired their eloquence regarding the eastern terminus of the railway, he (Mr. **DECOSMOS**) rose in his place and stated that they desired the terminus on the Pacific coast to be determined upon. Mr. **LANGÉVIN** on that occasion stated on behalf of the Government that they had decided to make **Esquimault** the terminus of the railway. That might not have been stated in any Act, but common sense was often found outside of an Act of Parliament. Lord **LISGAR**, in a despatch, had stated that the route of the Pacific Railway could only be settled after Confederation, and after explorations and surveys ordered by the Dominion Parliament in which British Columbia would be represented, and he directed the attention of the House to this fact that it was stated on the floor of the House that **Esquimault** should be the terminus of the railway. He read a copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by the GOVERNOR GENERAL in Council, dated the 7th June, 1873, which stated that a Committee of the Council having had before them the memorandum of the 29th May last of the Chief Engineer of the Canada Pacific Railway, and the Minute of Council dated the 30th of May—they recommend to HIS EXCELLENCY that **Esquimault** on **Vancouver Island** should be fixed as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway

—and that a line of railway should be built between the harbor of **Esquimault** and the **Seymour Narrows** on the same Island. The despatch of Lord **LISGAR** stated that the road would be settled upon after deliberation and survey. Who could be a better judge than the chief engineer of that railway who was the paid officer of the Government and who the First Minister had just stated to the House was the only person he had consulted. He denied the statement of the hon. member for **South Bruce** that it would have been well if the arrangement that **Esquimault** should be the terminus had been cancelled, and he was able to do so after spending 20 years on the Island. There was only one port he was sorry to say south of **British Columbia** until one got to **Santiago**, on the Mexican border, with the exception of **San Francisco**. When you pass the north-west point of **Washington territory** on the Pacific coast you have only one good available harbor within Canada, and that was **Esquimault**, which was the only port trans-Pacific steamships might approach at all seasons of the year, and at any hour of the day. If any other point had been decided upon it would have been unfair to that port. The hon. member for **South Bruce** had quoted from the report of the committee of the Privy Council dated 8th July, 1874, the following statement:—

“The propositions made by Mr. **EDGAR** involved an immediate heavy expenditure in **British Columbia** not contemplated by the terms of Union, namely the construction of a railway on **Vancouver’s Island**, from the Port of **Esquimault** to **Nanaimo**, as compensation to the most populous part of the Province for the requirement of a longer time for completing the line on the mainland. The proposals also embraced an obligation to construct a road or trail and telegraph line across the continent at once, and an expenditure of not less than a million and a half within the Province annually on the railway works on the mainland, irrespective of the amounts which might be spent east of the **Rocky Mountains**, being a half more than the entire sum **British Columbia** demanded in the first instance as the annual expenditure on the whole road.”

Now, perhaps, the hon. gentleman, who was in the cold shades of Opposition when the treaty was made with **British Columbia**, knew more about the country than any one who voted for the treaty, he (Mr. **BLAKE**) voting against it. But he (Mr. **DECOSMOS**) knew this, that when the **British Columbia** delegates returned from **Ottawa**