

error of judgment on the part of the company and from that abuse of power and error of judgment on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, what followed? We met in the year 1884, and we were told that a loan was necessary, and a loan of \$22,500,000 was proposed, and a pledge of \$7,380,000 to meet the arrangements for the guarantee. We were told at that time that full investigation into all elements of the calculation was absolutely necessary, and that that full investigation had been made. Hon. gentlemen better their course with time. At that time they sent down two inspectors, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Miall, to the offices of the company, to inspect their books, to strike balances, and to make such a calculation as would be proper, in the event of a party being about to enter into partnership with, or to advance a large sum to, a respectable mercantile firm—I think that was the language of the late Minister of Railways. These gentlemen went down, and a few days before the final decision of Council was made, they sent in their report; I believe the decision had actually been made before the report was in. In point of form, only, hon. gentlemen opposite investigated the matter, but with reference to the engineering schemes of the company, with reference to the various sums they proposed to expend and the various purposes for which they proposed to expend them, there was the full report of the engineer on the letter of Mr. Stephen, in which he went into these matters, and staked his professional reputation as to the accuracy of the estimates and the propriety of the proposed expenditures. Then the proposal was brought up in Council; the Minister of Railways brought up these reports and laid them before the Council; the Council considered them, and they came to the conclusion to submit the matter to Parliament, and the Order in Council was brought down. Well, what is the action this time? The hon. gentleman lays a resolution on the Table, and about four days afterwards, speaking from memory, Mr. Miall makes the report. Did that inform the hon. gentleman's mind? He had decided his policy before Mr. Miall's report was made; everybody knew that he was going to lend the money, though not on the basis of Mr. Stephen's letter; the resolutions were laid on the Table, and after the Government had committed themselves to their policy, forsooth, they send down Mr. Miall to see whether they were right or not; and, strange to say, he finds they are quite right. Well, Mr. Miall sends down condensed balances—very condensed indeed. Twice I asked for the two large detailed balances from which Mr. Miall constructed his condensed balances, and hon. gentlemen have not thought proper to bring them down. They bring down the condensed balances, from which you cannot extract the true state of the question, and they decline to give up the detailed balances which would enable us to obtain some idea, even without the books, as to the state of the expenditure. Even as to the road, there are enormous expenditures proposed; there is a statement of a very large expenditure between Callander and Port Arthur; a large expenditure for snow sheds; \$910,000, or thereabouts, at Coal Harbor; in the works at Montreal, \$1,500,000, and large sums elsewhere; and on none of these has there been a single report. Neither the engineer nor the Minister has reported on one of them; and no evidence has been furnished to this House, even as to the propriety of one of these expenditures, at all. Even the form of an investigation has not been gone through, still less the substance. So far from that, when we met here, the Speech from the Throne contained no reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I called attention to this at once, and the First Minister said that the Speech contained no reference to the railway because it was not the intention of the Government to invite this House to legislate concerning the railway this Session. Another time I enquired whether he was going to bring down anything. He said it was not the present intention, and so forth. Then, had there been any

negotiations? There had been no correspondence—there had been verbal conversations, which he did not care to mention. Then comes the letter of Mr. Stephen, on the 18th of March; and then long negotiations with the company, stretching from that time till about the end of April, about six weeks; and then, at the end of April, come down these resolutions. Well, Sir, it is clear that if it was plain and obvious and reasonable, and in the public interest that these resolutions should be made, that the Government hesitated very much indeed about bringing them down. It is clear that the company were at their heels before Parliament met; it is clear that they have been dogging them ever since; it is clear that the Government having failed to come to any agreement to bring down any measure of relief, the company put their proposition on paper on the 18th of March; it is clear that the Government did not think that a proposition that they could reasonably ask Parliament to assent to. And they took six weeks more before they made up their minds to bring down any proposition at all. It is very clear, therefore, that in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite this was a matter involving very serious considerations. We met on the 29th of January, and it was not until the close of the normal period of the Session, when we ought to have been proroguing, that they brought down a measure for the Canadian Pacific Railway, although the subject had been under consideration from a time anterior to the commencement of the Session. Why this hesitation and difficulty about these negotiations? Why this pressure on one side and this resistance on the other, if the matter was so clear and straight and obvious—if hon. gentlemen opposite would have been so plainly recreant to their duty if they had neglected to bring down the measure at all? It is therefore very plain that hon. gentlemen opposite felt that they were in a painful position—a position of great difficulty and doubt as to whether they should bring down any measure at all. But other efforts were made to get information. I, myself, a little misdoubted the Government's power of resistance. I knew, of course, it would take a great deal of pressure, after what had happened in 1881, and after what had happened in 1884, before they came down, but I always was inclined to believe that the pressure would be applied, and that to it they would ultimately yield. I felt, it therefore, very important to attempt to be prepared and that this House should be prepared, with full information with reference to the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway, financially, and as to the earnings and working expenses of the road, and as to construction, and as to estimates from the period of the last loan; and very early in the Session I moved a series of motions on that subject, almost all of them being motions which were based on information given and thought proper to be given on the occasion of the last loan, or information given under Addresses granted by this House. The House unanimously adopted these motions; and by the unanimous consent of the Commons House of Parliament, it was indicated to His Excellency that it was in the public interest this information ought to be obtained. This information should be obtained. I shall not now, having a large area of ground to travel over, go over the several Addresses which, at a very early period of the Session, have been passed, asking for this information; but I will say this, that it was the duty of the Government to have pointed out to the Canadian Pacific Railway that if that company expected the Parliament of Canada to grant their application for aid they must comply with the demands of Parliament for information as to the operations of the company, and to have declined to bring forward measures for aid, unaccompanied by that information which Parliament unanimously decided it was in the public interest should be obtained. That information is a most important element. As to the working of