

road, might have had their faith shaken, but no man, be he ever so simple, who is fit to be elected to this House, can read else on these papers than that it is a political trick, and a discreditable trick, as I said before, that will rebound permanently to the discredit and dishonor of all those who have concocted it, and of all those who have joined it. I do not believe that the hon. member for the West Riding of Durham will get up in his place and advise this Government or this House to accept the proposition of this second Syndicate. I say I defy him to get up and do so. I know he will not give such advice, I will not believe all he has said, and believe all that those who have spoken from that side of the House have urged respecting the first Syndicate, by advising this House to accept the responsibility of voting for the proposition which has been made by the second Syndicate. These hon. gentlemen cannot do it. What have they told us, Sir? That this proposition was illegal. The hon. member for Gloucester told us it was illegal and unconstitutional for the Government to have made this arrangement with the first Syndicate, and how can he vote to give the contract to this second Syndicate? The hon. member for North Norfolk has told us that some portions of this arrangement are a swindle. Yet those very clauses which he said were a swindle are incorporated in the proposals of the new Syndicate. Those very clauses which the hon. gentleman so eloquently, but rather unparliamentarily, denounced as a swindle and a fraud, he will find here, with the two exceptions. Let me first look over some of these clauses. In the first place our terms were said to be excessive. In comparison with the terms of the present bogus tender there might be a pretence for assuming that. In the next place it was said that we had no right to contract except upon tenders given in reply to an advertisement. But this is the point to which I will call the attention of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The manner of selecting the lands under our proposal was said by him to be a swindle, a fraud and a robbery. Yet these gentlemen, Sir W. P. Howland and Company, say that they must be allowed to perpetrate that swindle and carry out that fraud or they will not undertake the contract. Surely, this being the case, the hon. gentleman will not vote for the second Syndicate.

An Hon. MEMBER. He will do anything.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then it was said: "Oh, the Government is going to build the road from Thunder Bay to Red River; from Kamloops to Yale, and from Yale to Port Moody. Why the Government will become a partner with the Syndicate, that will never do." Gentlemen who used that argument cannot vote for the new Syndicate. Then there was an argument used that the scheme for issuing bonds was wrong, that the contractors would issue the bonds and leave the bondholders to whistle for their money, and the people of Canada to whistle for their road. Yet the general principle for the issue of bonds is adopted in the proposal of Sir W. P. Howland and Company. Then Mr. Speaker, there was a great grumble at the smallness of the deposit. The offer is a million of dollars. That is the offer made by the gentlemen of the new Syndicate. I have learned from my hon. friend since I came into the House that the new Syndicate gentlemen thought they could go one more—to use the language of my good friend Mr. H. H. Cook—and they have sent down certificates to the extent of twelve or thirteen hundred dollars.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon gentlemen opposite must not be unparliamentary. I am speaking at some disadvantage, because I am not well, but I will make myself heard. The proposition just laid on the Table of the House is that the members of the new Syndicate shall make a deposit of a million of dollars. I understand that they have

sent a communication by telegraph stating that they have deposited \$1,200,000 as security; that when the contract is signed they will deposit the million dollars permanently. Well, Sir, this is a small trick to put up \$200,000 over the million, and yet if you look at the contract lying on your Table you will see that the Syndicate have to put up the whole of \$5,000,000 by the 1st May, 1882.

Mr. ANGLIN. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg not to be interrupted again. I think that an old speaker ought to know something about decencies of debate.

An Hon. MEMBER. The 1st of December, 1882.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are to put \$1,000,000 to remain permanently in the hands of the Government. They are to put up the other \$4,000,000 by the 1st December, 1882—and that is a sufficient security to the country and to this House that the Syndicate will not find it to its advantage to sell the bonds and then abandon the work. The proposition that they would do so is so absurd, so discreditable to those who make it, that it is almost unworthy of notice. But, Sir, before I call the attention of the House to the new Syndicate, and show what a complete farce it is—and I do not use a word too strong when I describe it as farcical—I would say that when I intended to speak on Friday it was simply to state that the Government, as a Government, feels itself bound to carry out the contract it has entered into, in good faith, and that it has a right to challenge, and does challenge the vote of this House. They believe it is the best offer that has been made up to that time. They believe it is one which will be satisfactory to the country. We believe it is one that will not involve ultimately the expenditure of sixpence by the people of Canada. We believe it will carry out that for which it was intended; that we should carry out the early construction of the railway; and, we are bound to ask, on its own merits and without reference to any attempted obstruction at the eleventh hour, by the bringing out of bogus tenders—and I use the word bogus, notwithstanding the respectability of some of the gentlemen who have signed it—that the contract be adopted and the road built according to the wishes of the people and Parliament of Canada. It is not constitutional, and I would not say for a moment or hold any threatening language to the House, indicative of what course the Government ought to take, or would take in the matter, if, when they have submitted their best judgment, which becomes a portion of their policy, it were not adopted. But all I can say is, to use an expression which has been rather celebrated in Canada, that I think we should find and be told by hon. gentlemen opposite—and this document is probably prepared for the purpose of giving them the opportunity—that our usefulness was gone. The hon. gentlemen opposite have not hidden their lights under a bushel; their words have not been spoken in a corner. We knew the governing policy of the Opposition, enunciated on several occasions, and repeated in this House, during the present Session, by the leader of the Opposition. We know he is opposed to the building of the road through British Columbia; that he has, from the time the subject was brought before Parliament, protested against it, using such language to that Province as—erring sister depart in peace. We know he has ridiculed the idea of forcing a railroad through an inhospitable region, a sea of mountains, that would get no traffic, but be built at an enormous expense and be of no real value. The hon. gentleman has adhered to that policy. Last Session he moved that the further construction of the road through British Columbia, in allusion to the contract given out by the present Government under advertisements published by the late Government, and for the purpose of carrying out its policy, be postponed, as also all action with that object; and I express my regret at the unavoidable absence of my hon.