

pendence—there did not care to Stephen, on the with the com- he end of April, pril, come down it was plain and terest that these nment hesitated own. It is clear fore Parliament ing them ever ng failed to come ure of relief, the on the 18th of t did not think reasonably ask took six weeks inds to bring clear, therefore, osite this was a ns. We met on he close of the ight to have ben ure for the Cana- had been under commencement difficulty about on one side and as so clear and a opposite would ty if they had all? It is there- opposite felt that sition of great r they should ut other efforts myself, a little of resistance, deal of pressure and after what y came down, he pressure would nately yield. I t to be prepared ith full informa, Canadian Pacific ngs and working a, and as to esti- very early in on that subject, were based on e given on the n given under e House unani- unanimous com- ent, it was e in the public ed. This infor- w, having a large everal Addresses sion, have been ill say this, that e pointed out to mpany expected plication for aid Parliament for any, and to have , unaccompanied mously decided ned. That infor- o the working of

the road, as to what has been done with the public money and with the resources of the country, as to the results of operations, as to the expenditure and the fate of large sums of more or less questionable character which were in the accounts of last year—for example, the \$600,000 alleged to be due by the Northern American Contracting Company to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other sums—you find no information given at all, and a few of the less important papers are placed on the Table to-day, five minutes before this debate commences, by the Minister of Railways. Almost as a mockery, he says, I will give the papers just about when I am about to make the motion. I have not been able, of course, to investigate these papers; but, on glancing over them, I find they are not so full as they ought to be, and are not the papers of importance the House desires to possess. I ask, why should not these papers have been prepared by the company earlier, because they were asked for three or four months ago, many of them early in February last, why should they not have been brought down here in time for us to examine them in such a way that we might intelligently proceed to a discussion of the question. I say that the accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as they are submitted to Parliament and the public, are in a shape so condensed and contain figures that vary so that it is difficult in the slightest degree to analyse them. I think, that when information which would throw some light on this grant is asked for by Parliament, the company, which is demanding Parliament for further assistance, ought to comply with the demand of Parliament. Full information is a condition precedent to our acting. We are not, to use a vulgar phrase, to go it blind; we ought to get the information before being asked to vote the money. The Acting Minister of Railways, at an earlier period of the Session, also made a speech on this subject. He pointed out that he had visited the country, that he had gone over the railway, and he spoke in terms of enthusiasm of the railway itself, and of the Syndicate, and of the scenery of the Rocky Mountains. I was delighted to hear him, ordinarily some what unimpassioned, cool, and calculating, so exhilarated by that mountain air and those glorious prospects, that he indulged in these unwonted expressions of joy, and in such an appreciation of the picturesque. His railway journey reminded me a little of another railway journey that is memorialised in verse by Mr. Leland, and which I will take the liberty of paraphrasing:

"John Henry went to Stephen;
He dräfel fast und far;
He rided shoot drei dousand miles
All in von rail-roat car.
He knowed foot rate how far he goed—
He gounted all de vile,
Dere vach shoot von bottle of champagne,
Dat bopped at efery mile."

I have no doubt, in the hon. gentleman's case, it was Apollinaris water and not champagne, but that would not suit the metre, and so I am obliged to use the ordinary liquor. The hon. gentleman went in a railway car, as several of his colleagues have done, without seeing very much of the railway, and he declares that the company has done more than they agreed; but after all what they have done and propose to do is what is necessary in order to have a good road. If there be one thing more than another which, at the time of the contract, and since, has been impressed upon our mind, it is that the road was to be a first-class road. We objected to the standard of the Union Pacific, as the Government put it in the contract, because it was a very imperfect standard. "Oh, well," they said, "there is no use to talk about that, because the company is certain to build a first-class road in every way; it is in their own interest to do so." "Why then," we asked, "put in any standard?" "We must," they said, "put in some standard." We urged that they should not put in a low standard, and they actually got a letter from the contractors to say that they

consented to the standard of the Union Pacific, as it was at the time of the completion of the road in or about 1873, and not as it was at an earlier period; in fact, as it was when they had got it up to something like a first-class standard. Then, and every year since, whenever the Pacific Railway was touched, we were told that the road the company agreed to build was no mean, shabby, colonisation road, but a first-class railway; that the standard was a high standard, and that they were building a road as good or better than the standard. Now, the hon. gentleman says they have done more than they agreed to do; but what they have done it was necessary they should do in order to make the road a good one. Did they not agree to do all that was necessary in order to make the road a first-class one? Was it not to be a first-class road? If they are indulging in fancy expenditure more than is necessary for a good road, I do not see why we should furnish them with the money. By the agreement they are bound to do all that is necessary to have a first-class road. That was the interpretation of the contract forced upon us by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is what we have a right to expect. The hon. gentleman said we owed a great deal to the company. I thought, until he told us so, that it was the other way—that the company owed \$30,000,000 to us. But he said we owed them a great deal; and I suppose by these resolutions we are to pay them what we owe. His colleague joined, in a minor strain, in the same harmonious chorus. He said we owed a tribute to Mr. Stephen, and he proceeded to pay Mr. Stephen an oratorical tribute. I have no objection to his paying Mr. Stephen as many oratorical tributes as he pleases. No doubt Mr. Stephen deserves them, and I would be the last to say a word reflecting upon his title to the tribute; but while the hon. gentleman may pay his magnificent oratorical tributes to Mr. Stephen—and I am quite willing to give cordial assent to almost any tribute of that kind he may pay—I am opposed to the proposition to add to the oratorical tribute this other kind of tribute mentioned in the resolution. That is the sort of tribute people object to. They do not object to speeches lauding public men, but they do object to the hon. gentleman saying we owe the president a tribute, and moving a resolution declaring that we pay the company cash. We owe tribute to the president, therefore let us vote the money. It really becomes serious. I would like to know when we shall have done paying tribute to the company in the shape of money. I did suppose we had entered into a business transaction, in which we had given a particular price for the accomplishment of a particular object, and that there was no obligation on either side, except the obligation on our side to do our part as contracted, and on theirs to do theirs as contracted. Then the hon. gentleman said that they did a great deal more work than they were required to do, and they did this at this time, because they could do the work cheaper while the main work was going on; and he declared, in another part of his speech, or his colleague did, that the statements about extravagant expenditure duo to haste were entirely erroneous. I can hardly think that either of these gentlemen have read the papers which have been laid upon the Table on this subject. Will you believe it, Sir, that these hon. gentlemen, who declare that it was cheaper to do more work than the company were doing at the time, while they were pressing on construction, these hon. gentleman who declare that no increased cost was produced by speed, have laid upon the Table of this House papers with reference to the work through the Kicking Horse Pass, which are to the following effect: Mr. Van Horne declares, on behalf of the company, that in the estimate which the company made, with reference to the sum required to complete the railway last year, on the occasion of the loan, he included a sum for a temporary line round a portion of the Kicking Horse Pass, as well as for a permanent line at that part. I will not pledge myself to absolute accuracy, but my recollection is that the figure for the per-