

security against anything of that kind. But I say the Union Pacific Railway, as constructed, must be the Union Pacific Railway which was accepted, and which received the guarantee. I presume the United States Government understood their business well enough to know that it was a road capable of being operated, and capable of performing the functions for which it was constituted, before they gave the subsidy to it which they agreed to give; and I presume the cases are parallel. But I wish to say that I think it will be found inconvenient to have discussions on the subject which is engrossing the attention of Parliament sprung upon us every day, and running in parallel lines, while the same subject is being discussed by the same persons upon the same question. While we shrink from no discussion of this matter, while we think, as the discussion goes on from day to day, that the contract will be strengthened in the estimation of the country, it is certainly desirable, in order that it should be discussed clearly, fairly and dispassionately, as I know hon. gentlemen on the other side are desirous of discussing it, that we should confine it to one single discussion. As a private supporter of the Government, I do not venture to make that suggestion in any other sense than as I think it will appeal to the general good sense of the House. We are here to do a very important work,—the most important, perhaps, that has been done in any Parliament of Canada,—and no gentleman wishes, I fancy, to introduce a double discussion merely in order to delay and hamper the public business, or distract the attention of the country. For my part, I am desirous that this question, exactly as it stands, on its own merits, should be submitted to the scrutiny of the people of this Dominion, and I have no doubt about the result. There may be clouds thrown about it, there may be dust thrown in the eyes of the people, special pleading may affect it, but in the end the good sense of the people of this Dominion, to whom we have not appealed in vain within the last three years, will triumph over any special pleadings and sophistries.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think it is not desirable, upon the present motion, to enter upon a full discussion of the terms of the contract, and I only rise to call attention to one fact that ought not to be lost sight of in reference to the standard of the Union Pacific Railroad. The words in the present contract, if I recollect rightly, are, "as originally constructed." It is possible that that expression is not sufficiently definite, but when we look at the history of the Union Pacific, and bear in mind one particular fact in reference to it, I think we will be justified in assuming that that expression must be read in this way—"at the time of its final completion." A railroad cannot be considered to be constructed until it is completed, and if it is constructed under an agreement whereby a company or a government must accept it, the date of that acceptance must be regarded as the date of its construction. For my part, if the present contract was susceptible of being interpreted in the sense in which the member for North Norfolk desired to interpret it, that we were to have a road such as the Union Pacific was when it was first laid with rails, and when it was first opened for traffic, we would have much reason to be dissatisfied. But this point having been discussed in Congress, an Act of Congress was passed under which a Commission was appointed for the purpose of ascertaining and defining when the Union Pacific Railroad was completed, and at what date it was to be accepted by the Government. That Commission made its report, which was adopted by Congress, and I find that the date which that Commission decided was the date of the completion of the road was the 1st of October, 1874. It seems to me that the proper interpretation of this contract is, therefore, that this road is to be constructed in such manner as the Union Pacific was

when it was accepted by the Government of the United States,—that is the 1st of October, 1874.

Mr. BLAKE. I may be permitted to observe, as several hon. gentlemen on the other side have stated that the discussion was inopportune, that in moving for this information I said not one word as to the character of the Union Pacific Railway. I simply pointed out that its character, as first constructed, was important to learn, because it was the standard to be adopted for the Canadian Pacific. It was the hon. Minister of Railways proceeding to discuss what the standard of the Union Pacific was which drew out this discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that he did not promote the original discussion, and I quite agree with my hon. friend from Niagara, and the hon. member for South Victoria, that it is desirable to confine the discussion within its natural boundaries on the main motion which invites the attention of the House. I simply say this—that the House, including my hon. friend who makes this motion, will find that there is full and ample security made for a good standard for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). My hon. friend from West Durham made simply an ordinary motion. That motion was met in a very peculiar way by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. Minister attempted to justify that particular term of the contract. He referred to the construction of the Union Pacific Railway, and pointed out that it was in all respects, if my memory serves me right, a good railway, that its standard was taken from the Ohio and Baltimore Railway, which was one of the best constructed railways in the United States, and that, therefore, the Union Pacific having been constructed after the model of the Ohio and Baltimore, and the latter being a first-class railway, the Union Pacific must, of course, be of an equally high standard; and consequently the Canadian Pacific Railway would have to be a first-class road as well. Now, hon. gentlemen on this side, were not satisfied with this statement. The hon. member for Niagara rose in his place to contradict the statements made by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as to the character of the Union Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman read from a report, a long, able and valuable report which had been presented to Congress, to show that the Union Pacific Railway, when first constructed, was an admirable road, and, therefore, that the statements of the hon. member for North Norfolk with respect to the road were altogether erroneous. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), particularly took the same ground, practically, he argued, that this road was not finally constructed until October, 1874. Nobody disputes that in October, 1874, the Union Pacific Railway was a tolerably good railway; and if we take the condition of the Union Pacific, in 1874, as a standard, then, perhaps, on that ground, one might assent to the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways. But the hon. member for Victoria forgot to state that 890 miles of the Union Pacific Railway, that portion of it extending from Omaha to the junction at Muddy Forks and Black's Forks, were completed and accepted by the United States Government in the end of 1868 or the beginning of 1869; and it was the balance of the road that was not accepted, and was not received until away on in the seventies, in 1873 or 1874. If that is the case, and that it is the case, the hon. gentleman will find, on reference to the reports presented to the Senate of the United States, then we are bound to take the condition of that road as it stood in the end of 1868 or beginning of 1869 as the standard of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On reference to the report founded on a joint resolution of both Houses on the 30th December, 1868, the hon. gentleman will