

to accede to that wish. In the speech to which I have referred he says:

"I dare say I will be told by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake): 'Granted that your figures are correct, assuming that you can build this railway for even less money than you have estimated, you have only encountered the first difficulty; you have then to operate the line, and the cost of that will be so greatly beyond anything you can hope to obtain from it, that you will place an intolerable burthen upon the people of this country.' I must address myself for a few moments to that question.

Then after giving a statement of the Pembina Branch he proceeds:

"By July, 1882, we will have about 700 miles of this road in operation; we will have 85 miles from Selkirk to Emerson or St. Vincent; we will have 200 miles in operation west of the Red River, which, with the branch of 16 miles to Winnipeg, will give us some 700 miles in operation, without reference at all to this section in British Columbia. I have every reason to believe that every mile of that road, from the day it is opened, will make an ample return for all the expenditure incurred in its operation. I think it is safe to say that in every succeeding year, as we extend gradually this road towards the Rocky Mountains, it will furnish such an additional volume of traffic from Red River to Thunder Bay, which will become the great *entrepot* of that country, as will prevent it from burthening the people, and give us some fair return for the interest on the money used in its construction."

There, Sir, is the declaration of the hon. Minister of Railways that every mile that was opened would pay the interest on the money expended. That is the road we have given away. It is no longer the heritage of the people of Canada. Paid for out of the people's money—\$50,000,000, and on top of that \$28,000,000 of finished road all going into their hands besides a dividend-earning road from the very moment it is built, if the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways is to be taken. Yet the hon. gentleman says that we will be afraid to call attention to this matter before the electors. Sir, there is only one thing that would make us hesitate to do so; if any one came before the electors and told them the real facts they would think that he was drawing upon his imagination and that what he said could not be true. Knowing that, Sir, I always appear before them with the official documents of the House in my hand, so that if any one is skeptical of the truth of what I say I invite him to the platform there to read of the business done in this House, as I invite now the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulthbee) to read that on the pages of Parliament which even a member with the audacity of the member for East York dare not contradict, and cannot successfully controvert. Well, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways did me the honor to allude to a motion of mine objecting to the bargain because it did not secure finality in the liability of the Government. I had a right to move that resolution. The Government came down to the House and put into the mouth of His Excellency a statement that they had made a contract for the construction, maintenance and working of that road with a body of capitalists, but when we opened the contract we found it was not so. There was no finality in the Government liability. Canada was to be burdened with the building of some of the most expensive portions of the work extending over a period of years. I declared the contract was objectionable on that ground. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) declared that it was peculiarly objectionable on that account, when addressing his constituents. The hon. gentleman knew it was objectionable, yet I secured only about fifty votes to my motion stating so. The hon. Minister of Railways succeeded in inducing his supporters to vote against it, but with all his persuasive powers he was unable to draw one of his supporters to his feet, to explain why he voted as he did. Another resolution was moved against the exemption from taxation of the lands of the Company. The hon. Minister of Railways referred to that very little. He referred to the exemption of stations and road-bed and buildings and grounds, but said nothing about the land. They told us that it was nothing, that the Syndicate should hold their lands free, while the settler on

the adjoining lot, with a Syndicate lot on either side, should have to pay for roads, for erecting school houses and all municipal expenses. Hon. gentlemen think that we will be afraid to mention that before the electors. The electors in many cases have read this contract, and others will hear of it when we have an opportunity to go to them with the official documents in our hands, and then we will be prepared to take the verdict of the people which we were anxious to secure before the contract was passed upon, and which the Government decided should not be appealed to, the Prime Minister stating that no more imperfect tribunal for the trial of such questions could be found than the people. The Reform party have faith in the intelligence of the people. They hold that the expenditure of the people's money is a thing that vitally concerns the people, and that it is a thing upon which the people ought to be consulted. It was denied to them at that time; but thanks to the constitutional safeguard which we enjoy, the people will yet have the opportunity, if they cannot prevent that bargain, at least to declare that the men who were instrumental in making that bargain shall no longer represent them. Sir, we shrink not from the conflict or from the presentation of this question as one of the main features of that conflict. Speaking for myself, one of the chief charges that I shall bring against the Government will be their having entered into this contract. Some constituencies in Ontario have had an opportunity to pronounce upon it, and the result has been a loss to the Government of 50 per cent. in those elections. This carried out in the next election will show the hon. gentlemen opposite, who in their mighty force thought they could bear down men struggling for the rights of the people, that the people are faithful and that they will support those who truly represent them in Parliament. Sir, if there be this great confidence that we hear so much of from hon. gentlemen opposite, in an appeal to the people, why all this talk about legislating us out of this House? Why all this talk about cutting up our counties in order that the verdict may not be given by the same people who gave it in 1878? How bold these hon. gentlemen are, who dare not take the verdict from the same constituencies that gave it in 1878, who dare not wait till another year shows more clearly the effect of their policy, but who wish to bring on their election now. But bring on your election when you like, and we can stand up in the consciousness of our integrity, and ask the people of this country to say whether we are right or wrong. Why, in the face of all these advantages, do we find the rumor in the papers that no less than nineteen hon. gentlemen, supporters of the Government in their Ontario contingent alone, decline to face the music at another contest? Why do we find them stepping aside that new men may take their places? Why, except perhaps that it may be alleged by them—as it was alleged by some of the new candidates in 1874, when a certain matter was under discussion that would not bear investigation—"I did not sanction that; I know that was wrong." So, perchance, we shall have new candidates who may say of the Pacific Railway contract: "I was not in the House when that was submitted, or I would have voted against it." But let the statements be what they may, the Minister of Railways has found out that no less than seven members of the Opposition have met his challenge, while not one of his own supporters has stood up yet; and he will find that seven members more, or three times seven are ready to take up this discussion and denounce that contract as soon as any of his supporters venture to defend it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always kind to me. They know that if I do have to find fault with their policy, that I do so with evident pain—that only the oath which I have taken as a true representative makes me mention some things which I would rather not mention. But I would say here, that while