

Company. That is something this country would like to know—what secret power they had over the Government, that compelled them to their terms, what power they have over them now that makes them, when the company come a second time to demand aid—what power they have over them that has compelled them to give notice, the third time asking that their demand is to be agreed to. The hon. gentleman could interest the country if he would let us into that secret, and if he would give us to understand how it is that when this Government, a few months before, asked Parliament to sanction a scheme whereby they would build all the roads that were to be built by this syndicate, and do it for \$48,500,000. The hon. gentleman is aware of that. The hon. gentleman knows that about eight months before Sir Charles Tupper, in the name of the Queen, signed the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that same Sir Charles Tupper rose in his place in the House, as Minister of Railways, and asked Parliament to sanction a scheme for the country to build that road as a Government work, and gave to us the estimate of the cost of the construction of a portion of the work the syndicate were bound to do as \$13,000,000 for the 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper, \$15,500,000 for the portion from Jasper to Kamloops, and \$20,000,000 for the portion from Selkirk to Lake Nipissing—\$48,500,000, the Minister of Railways told us, he could build these portions of the road for, and yet we have been told how that same Minister, who, eight months before, had stated that for \$48,500,000 we could build the portions of the work they were to build, entered into a contract whereby the country gave to the company \$25,000,000 in cash, 25,000,000 acres of land, agreed to finish 406 miles of road through a Rocky Mountain region, and that when built and handed over, it should be handed over to the company for ever. How the Government agreed further to build 90 miles, from Yale to Kamloops, the expense to be paid out of the public coffers, and when so built and paid for, to hand the work over as a free gift to the company. How they agreed, further, to build 125 miles, from Yale to Port Moody, to cost millions and millions more, to be paid out of the public treasury, and when built and completed, to be handed over for nothing to that company, to be theirs forever. How, in addition, the Government gave the company all those immunities and privileges they enjoy. How it was they placed on the Statute Book of Canada a clause which I venture to say has never before been found on a Statute Book of a free country, that the whole immense country lying in the North-West, the great heritage of the people of Canada, should be locked up and sealed for the use and benefit of that company for twenty years from the date of the contract. How, in addition, the company are exempted from taxation on their lands so long as they hold them, and are exempted, as regards the road bed and rolling stock, for all time, and have privileges and immunities which time would fail me to describe. The people would like to know what power the syndicate had over the Government to cause them to say that although they believed those portions of the road could be built for \$48,500,000 they gave them the contract, the details of which I have indicated, signed.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I should like to know what is the question before the House at the present time, and whether the remarks of the hon. gentleman are in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the discussion on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract is not in order.

Mr. PATERSON. Might I ask you, in common fairness, to say that if I have been out of order I have only been out of order in replying to arguments offered by the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER. This discussion has been going on for some time. It was a great pity it was started at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. PATERSON. I thought I was not to blame for that.

Mr. SPEAKER. There will be another opportunity.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a pity you were stopped in your insinuations. It would be much better for you to make what charges you have to make against the Administration in a bold and manly way, and not make insinuations which I do not think you dare state.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the hon. gentleman to order. The hon. gentleman for Brant has made no insinuations. If any hon. member could speak plainly and boldly, that hon. gentleman has done so.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what the Minister means by insinuations. What does he mean?

Mr. SPEAKER. Address the Chair.

Mr. PATERSON. He has no right to make any such charge. I do not propose to submit to anything of the kind from any Minister. He may be a Minister to-day and not a Minister to-morrow. Governments composed of stronger material have been ejected from office by the voice of the people, and the same thing may happen again. The hon. gentleman must not attempt anything in the way of insult. That will not do.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I consider it an insult. The answer will be given to him at another time. I cannot, I suppose, go on to speak with reference to what is termed the monopoly clause in that agreement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Discussion on the terms of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter is not strictly in order.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought that, probably, a reply would be allowed, and that I might allude to the matter as involved in a proposition to subsidise railways that will be feeders to the road that has absolute control of the outlet of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion commenced and proceeded for some time. My attention has now been called to it, and it is my duty to enforce the regulations and orders of the House. I cannot allow the discussion to go on. It is not a question of my permission. My attention having been called to it by a member, I have to enforce the rules.

Mr. POPE. I should like the hon. gentleman to go on to the full extent.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not on this question.

Mr. PATERSON. I recognise, Mr. Speaker, that you have a duty to discharge to the House. I was simply going on to deal with one point. There will be another opportunity to do so, of which I shall avail myself. My justification for trespassing on the rules of order is found in the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite had travelled outside the record, and in answering them I was led to speak as I have done.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman has referred to myself in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway as its defender on the floor of this House. I am not the defender of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I never have been the defender of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except so far as I felt that justice demanded. I have supported and defended the Canadian Pacific Railway when I felt it was unjustly assailed, and because I believe the company are entitled to the confidence of the country and are doing well the work they have undertaken. I have also been asked to give some information as to how the company did this and obtained the other from the Government. I, like the hon. gentleman, am not in the confidence of the Government, and therefore it is out of my