

for tenders. Now, no one would object to any small works being undertaken for which a necessity suddenly sprung up, without compliance with this condition. It is a different matter altogether from the present case. The hon. gentleman says also that we asked for tenders, and that the tender, as I understand him to say, from Messrs. Stephens & Co. might be called—he did not say it was—a response to that invitation for tenders. Now, Sir, we had named a period in our advertisement within which we would receive tenders, and I recollect asking the hon. gentleman after he came into office whether he had received any tenders after that time. His reply was that one tender had been received, but of such a nature that made its consideration useless or inadvisable. The asking for tenders was therefore entirely closed, and the policy was evidently reached by a more understanding, which the hon. gentleman afterwards followed out. In 1880, there was a policy laid down of setting aside 100,000,000 acres for that purpose. They went to England; they utterly failed to attract the least notice there. The hon. gentleman should have remembered that last night, when he spoke of our failure to obtain any notice to our advertisement in England, the hon. gentleman made quite as signal a failure. The fact is that the project is one which required a good deal of time and a great deal of advertising, to bring it fairly under the notice of the class of financial contractors who were likely to undertake a work of that kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite proceeded on precisely the same course. When they came back, after announcing their great success, they were obliged to confess an utter failure in 1880. In 1881, when the House met again, it turned out they had received some offers before leaving Canada, which they appeared to have rejected. That is my inference from what has been stated. After going too long, they failed to obtain any proposal good, bad or indifferent, or if they did they have denied it and hidden the fact from the public. On returning to Canada, hon. gentlemen opposite were obliged to throw themselves into the arms of those gentlemen called the Syndicate. If any gentlemen were to obtain a good thing at the hands of the Government, I have no objection to these gentlemen obtaining it. I am not like the hon. member for Ottawa who said the only thing he regretted was that such a good thing should have gone into the hands of gentlemen opposed to the Government. I have no feeling of that kind, I believe they are all good men and true, and I was delighted to hear the hon. the First Minister one night, and the hon. the Minister of Railways another night, pronouncing eulogisms upon Duncan McIntyre and Donald A. Smith. It shows the hon. gentlemen are of an appreciative and forgiving disposition. It is to be hoped that Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Smith will appreciate the kind references made to them. Time was when it was different, but perhaps it will be well that I should not further enter into this matter, because I desire to discuss the railway question on its merits. I cannot, however, avoid referring to those matters, because the hon. the Minister of Railways tempts me to do so by his declaration, last night, that everything done wisely and properly about the railway was done by himself, and everything done unwisely was done by his opponents. I might, although I do not intend to do so, discuss at very great length many matters connected with the history of the Pacific Railway. I have only to say this, and it is all I intend to say, that the past record and history of the Liberal party in connection with this great work is one to which we can refer with every feeling of satisfaction, for we tried to do our duty to the country, and if hon. gentlemen opposite can say as much respecting every step they have taken, I have nothing further to say. But I protest against the course that has been pursued by the hon. Minister of Railways in belittling the efforts of his political opponents, in a scheme which has given so much

Mr. MACKENZIE.

trouble and difficulty to the Government, abstractedly speaking, not to my own Government or Administration, but to any Government in prosecuting a work of this kind. I do not think in any of my annual statements when Minister, that I ever gave any occasion to the hon. gentleman to refer to myself as having taken credit for everything that had been rightly done, after denouncing everything that had been done by my opponents. If I had believed in such a course, I should have changed the whole course of proceeding the moment I took office; I should have adopted the hon. gentleman's plan in other respects, and have obtained men in whom I had more confidence to conduct the work connected with the railway, and to have proposed the changes which were inevitably to be made. The hon. Minister of Railways has stated that within a year, more than 900 miles of railway will be either built or nearly built, and that when he came into office not one mile was built. We had under contract at the time hon. gentlemen opposite acceded to office, 228 miles between Fort William and Selkirk, 83 miles were half or actually finished from there to Pembina, constituting together something over 311 miles. At the present time no more of the line is built, except 161 miles constructed by the Syndicate. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of our expenditure on location. We spent \$500,000 and every inch of the road was taken up and moved some miles to the south. On leaving office we had nearly half of the distance of which the hon. gentleman is now able to boast of now as being constructed or nearly constructed, and yet the hon. gentleman desires to take credit for the whole work. I intended to refer to some other matters, but with every desire to proceed, I find my voice has failed me, and I must defer any further observations to some future occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to a question asked by the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the sharpest curve is one of 700 feet radius, and that trains can travel over it at a speed of 40 miles per hour.

Mr. DAWSON. I think it will be generally admitted that it is highly desirable, if a shorter route can be found from Moose Jaw Creek to the Pacific coast, that it should be adopted. It is very much to be regretted that the energetic and practical men who now have the Canadian Pacific Railway in hand had not had control of it sooner. If such had been the case, a great saving in distance between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg would have been effected. A survey was made from Thunder Bay to Sturgeon Falls, at the head of Rainy Lake, and the line was favorably reported on by the engineers. As to the crossing of the Lake of the Woods it was quite practicable. It is true that in order to condemn that crossing several islands were spirited away, but even that was not enough. An engineer was set to draw a plan of a tremendous bridge which the opponents of the route said would be necessary at that place, and its cost was put at \$1,000,000, and in this way the line which should obviously have been followed was set aside. However, engineers quite as reliable as those who constructed that enormous bridge, drew a plan of another bridge, showing that this spot could have been bridged at a very moderate outlay, and the saving in distance from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, without going to Selkirk, would have been no less than thirty-five miles, making every allowance for curvatures. That is a very important saving in distance—a distance which would have been saved for all time; and I believe the original cost would have been reduced by millions, because, for one thing, the great swamp to which the hon. gentleman has alluded and in which a large amount of capital has been swallowed up, would have been avoided. I have no desire to reflect upon the management of previous days; I am perfectly willing to concede that everything was done with the best intention; but it is very much to be regretted