

consequently that the Indians are better off now than formerly. If this be the case, then the statement put into the mouth of His Excellency is hardly warranted by the facts. However, it is very important that we should have the information sought for at as early a period in the Session as it would be possible for the right hon. gentleman to bring it before the House.

Motion agreed to.

#### DISMISSAL OF INDIAN AGENTS.

Mr. MILLS moved for the correspondence relating to the dismissal of any Indian Agent or other officers connected with the management of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

#### POST OFFICE AT DOMINION CITY.

Mr. SCHULTZ, in the absence of Mr. ROYAL, moved for a return of copies of all evidence taken before the Deputy Postmaster of Winnipeg, in the course of the present year, with reference to the grave complaints made against the management of the Post Office at Dominion City; also copy of the report of the said officer.

Motion agreed to.

#### GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. SCHULTZ moved for a return of all receipts from Government Railways in operation in the Province of Manitoba and the Territory of Kewadin during the months of September, October and November.

Motion agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS asked the hon. leader of the Government if he would bring without a motion all correspondence between this Government and the Government of Manitoba in reference to the enlargement of the boundaries of that Province. He also asked him whether the terms of the Bill which had been introduced into the Manitoba Legislature on the same subject had been agreed to by the Government here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not read the Bill. I received a draft of a bill from Mr. Norquay, the Premier of Manitoba, which I have not yet been able to read, but I have not had my attention particularly drawn to the Bill now before the Legislature of that Province, though I have seen it mentioned in the newspapers. I fancy the measure to be introduced here will not accord in all respects with that measure.

House adjourned at 5.35 p. m., to Tuesday the 4th day of January next.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 4th January, 1881.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SCOTT, member-elect for the Electoral District of Selkirk, having previously taken the oath according to law and subscribed the roll containing the same, was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Langevin, and took his seat.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House again resolved itself into Committee for the further consideration of certain proposed resolutions for granting and appropriating twenty-five millions of dollars and twenty-five millions of acres of land in the North-West Territories, according to the contract relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway transmitted to this House by His Excellency the Governor General by his Message dated December 10th.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to say a few words upon the important question before the Committee, and I shall endeavor to approach the question with all the earnestness that I can command. I listened to the speeches that were made upon both sides of the House with a good deal of attention, and especially to the speech made by the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolutions. I have also read the speeches which that hon. gentleman has made outside of the House, with an earnest desire to discover as far as possible the line of argument by which the Minister of Railways proposed to justify the contract for which he has invoked the sanction of Parliament. One is naturally curious to know what arguments can be brought forward in support of a contract containing such peculiar and extraordinary provisions, and granting such rights, privileges and franchises as the one now before the House. Before, however, endeavoring to analyze the arguments which have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, I must say that I believe the Minister of Railways has made the best of a very bad case. He made a speech extending over five hours, during three hours of which we were favored with quotations from the speeches of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), while only about an hour and a half was devoted to the hon. gentleman's own scheme. When we dissect the speech of the Minister of Railways, and sift the wheat from the chaff, when we analyze it fairly and honestly, we find that the hon. gentleman justifies this extraordinary contract on two grounds. He says, first, that the proposition he has submitted to Parliament is the best proposition that was ever submitted to Parliament—a proposition superior to the Allan contract, and to the proposition which was made by the hon. member for Lambton in 1874. Secondly, the hon. gentleman says that this bargain is the very best that the Government could make; and in order to show that the proposition of the Government is superior to the one submitted in 1873, or the one submitted by the hon. member for Lambton in 1874, the hon. gentleman undertakes to compare the present contract with those schemes respectively. But, Sir, it does not appear to me that this is a fair line of argument. What might be considered a fair bargain in 1873 or 1874, a bargain in the interests of the country, might not be so considered in the year 1880; and, at all events, we are not now discussing the terms either of the Allan contract of 1873, or the scheme proposed by the member for Lambton in 1874. Good or bad, the Allan contract failed; the members of the Company failed to carry out its terms, and we are not now called upon to discuss it. We are now called upon to deal with a living contract,—the Tupper contract, the one we are now discussing,—and to say whether that contract is one which Parliament should ratify. Nor are we now called on to determine whether or not the terms proposed by the hon. member for Lambton for the construction of a trans-continental railway were in the interests of the country—that is the proposition made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and sanctioned by Parliament; and in discussing the terms of this contract we must not only consider that time and circumstances are entirely changed, but that those propositions, whether good or bad, are not now open for discussion. The former propositions were never carried out, and what we have now to deal with is the vital and living question of