Listowel Standard.

VOL III.—NO. 51. LISTOWEL, CO. PERTH. DEC. 24, 1880. { A. ST. GEO. HAWKINS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE FISHERIES.

The Letter of Earl Granville to Mr. Lowell on the Subject.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 10.—The following is the text of the letter written by Lord Granville to United States Minister Lowell in London on the subject of the Newfoundland fisheries:

"FOREIGN Office, Oct. 27, 1880.

"SIR,—HER Majesty's Government have carefully considered the correspondence which has taken place between their predecessors and the Government of the United States respecting the disturbance which occured at Fortune Bay on the 6th of January, 1878, and they have approached this subject with a most earnest desire to arrive at an amicable solution of the differences which have unfortunately arisen between the two Governments on the construction of the provisions of the treaties which regulate the rights of United States fishermen on the coast of Newfoundland. In the first place I desire that there should be no possibility of misconception as to the views respecting the conduct of the Newfoundland fishermen in violently interfering with the United States fishermen and destroying or damaging some of their nets, Her Majesty's Government has no hesitation in admitting that this proceeding was quite indfensible, and is much to be regretted. No sense of injury to their rights, however well founded, could, under the circumstances, justify the British fishermen in taking the law into their own hands and committing acts of violence. But I will revert by-and-by to this feature in the case, and will now proceed to the important question raised in this controversy, whether, under the Treaty of Washington, United States fishermen are bound to observe the fishery regulations of Newfoundland in common with British subjects. Without entering into any lengthy discussion on this point, I feel bound to state that, in the opinion of her Majesty's Government, the clause of the Treaty of Washington which provides that citizens of the United States shall be entitled 'in common with British subjects,' to fish in Newfoundland waters within the limits of British sovereignty, means that American and British fishermen shall fish in these waters on terms of equality, and not that there shall be any exemption of American fishermen from any reasonable regulations to which British fishermen are subject. Her Majesty's Government entirely concurs in Mr. Marcy's circular of the 28th of March, 1856. The principle therein laid down appears to them perfectly sound, and as applicable to the fishery provisions of the Treaty of Washington as to those of the treaty which Mr. Marcy had in view. They cannot, therefore, admit the accuracy of the opinion expressed in Mr. Evarts' letter to Mr. Welsh of the 28th September, 1878, 'That the fishery rights of the United States conceded by the Treaty of Washington are to be exercised wholly free from the restraints and regulations of the statutes of Newfoundland,' if by that opinion anything inconsistent with Mr. Marcy's principle is really intended. Her Majesty's Government, however, fully admit that if any such local statutes could be shown to be inconsistent with the express stipulations, or even with the spirit, of the treaty, they would not be within the category of those reasonable regulations by which American (in common with British fishermen ought to be bound. And they observe on the other hand with much satisfaction that Mr. Evarts at the close of his letter to Mr. Welsh of the 1st of August, 1879, after expressing regret at the conflict of interests which the exercise of the treaty privileges enjoyed by the United States appears to have developed, expressed himself as follows: 'There is no intention on the part of this (the United States) Government that these privileges should be abused, and no desire that the full and free enjoyment should harm the colonial fishermen. While the differing interests and methods of shore fishery and vessel fishery making it impracticable that the regulation of the one should be entirely given to the other, yet if the mutual obligations of the treaty of 1871 are to be maintained the Government of the United States would gladly co-operate with the Government of her Britannic Majesty in any effort to make those regulations a matter of reciprocal convenience and rights, and a means of preserving the fisheries at their highest point of production, and conciliating the community interested by a just proportion of advantages and profits.' Her Majesty's Government do not interpret these expressions as in any sense derogatory to the sovereign authority of Great Britain in the territorial waters of Newfoundland, by which only regulations having the force of law within these waters can be made. So regarding the proposal, they are pleased not only to recognize in it any indication that the desire of her Majesty's Government to arrive at a friendly and speedy settlement of this question is fully reciprocated by the Government of the United States, but also to discern in it the basis of a practical settlement of the difficulty, and I have the honor to request that you would inform Mr. Evarts that her Majesty's Government, with a view to avoiding future discussion and future misunderstandings, are quite willing to confer with the Government of the United States respecting the establishment of regulations under which the subjects of both parties to the Treaty of Washington shall have full and equal enjoyment of any fishery which, under that treaty, is to be used in common. The duty of enacting and enforcing such regulations when agreed upon would, of course, rest with the power having the sovereignty of the shore and waters in each case. As regards the claim of the United States fishermen to compensation for injuries and losses which they are alleged to have sustained in consequence of the violent obstruction which they encountered from the British fishermen at Fortune Bay on the occasion referred to, I have to state that her Majesty's Government are quite willing that they should be indemnified for any injuries and losses which, upon joint enquiry, may be found to have been sustained by them and in respect of which they are reasonably entitled to compensation. But on this point I have to observe that the claim is pushed forward by them for the loss of fish which had been caught, or which but for the interference of the British fishermen might have been caught, by means of strand fishing, a mode of fishing to which under the Treaty of Washington they were not entitled to resort. The prosecution by them of strand fishing being clearly in excess of their treaty privileges, her Majesty' Government cannot doubt that on further consideration the United States Government will not be disposed to support a claim in respect of the loss of fish which they had caught or might have caught by that process.

RUSSIA AND CHINA.

No Peaceful Understanding Yet, and Both Countries Arming.

ST. PETERSBURG, Nov. 20.—"The interests and dignity of Russia urgently demand that the Chinese question shall be speedily brought to an end—to any end. Our situation is humiliating; our heathen neighbors, without much trouble to themselves compel us to spend scores of millions of roubles, and that at the time when we badly need every rouble for the support of our famine-stricken people."

In such harsh terms does the *Golos* speak of the undecided policy of the Czar's Government toward China, and the journal seems to have expressed the general opinion of the public. A mere glance at the conflict between Russia and China will suffice to show the immense superiority of the diplomatists of the Celestial Empire to those of the Czar. The Pekin Government, without declaring war against the St. Petersburg Government, adroitly managed to put its formidable enemy to endless trouble and to an expense almost equal to that of an actual war. The Kujdla troubles alone took out of the Czar's treasury over ten millions of roubles, and the Kujdia province is as far from being Russian as ever before; it continues to be an apple of discord between the two neighboring countries.

Again, nearly a car has passed since the Chinese Government refused to ratify the treaty of Livadia, concluded by the unhappy Tchun. How? During that period of time Russia has been in constant fear of war. She has been raising forts on her eastern frontier, sending out hazardous and costly editions, rn and transferring her men of-war to the Pacific Ocean. Now a considerable Russian army is concentrated not far from Pekin, under the command of Admiral Dessovsky, and, at a cost of millions of roubles, is constantly kept ready for battle. But the Chinese Government is as far from declaring war or concluding peace as ever. And the astute Chinese diplomat, Marquis Tzen, who spends his time for months in the capital on the Neva, manages to baffle all the efforts of the Czar's Government to come to any understanding. Such a state of affairs irritates the Russian people, and bitter complaints are heard on all sides.

The Russian Liberals are particularly angry with the Government for its gross neglect in allowing the foreign trade of China to slip out of the hands of Russia. They affirm that thirty years ago the Russians were the sole masters of the trade, and no nation in the world could get a single pound of the Chinese tea unless through the Russian merchants. Now Russia is compelled to buy a large part of her tea from the English merchants. According to the Chinese statistics for 1879, the Chinese foreign trade, both imports and exports, amounted to $347,500,000. Of all this the English vessels transported 73 per cent., the French 12 per cent., the Chinese 5 per cent., the Japanese 4 per cent., the Americans 3 per cent., the German 2 per cent., and only 1 per cent. remains for the vessels of all the other ecuntries, Russia included. If these figures can be believed, then it is evident that the complaints of the Russians against their government are well grounded. It is well known that Russia is the largest consumer of tea, and yet even that article she cannot get now but from the second hands.

Prof. Martens of St. Petersburg, in his pamphlet "Le Conflit entre la Russie et la Chine," recently published in Brussels, defends the Government. He argues that the Czar's policy toward China is, and has been for centuries, friendly and peaceful. If now a Chinese question has come up, the cause must be sought on the other side of the English Channel. The Professor tries to prove that the Chinaman is arming himself against Russia only because he is tired of the preaching of the English missionaries, and is afraid of being poisoned to death by the opium forced on him by the English merchants. We are told that the latter bring to China 80,000 boxes of opium a year, selling at $500 per box; that this poison had already put in misery over 8,000,000 of Chinamen of the best classes, and that the Chinese hatred for "the devils from beyond sea" (so the Chinese call the English) threatens a general massacre of the European residents in China. The Professor comes to the conclusion that Kuldja must on no account be surrendered to China.

It appears, then, that the Russian Government is not disposed to come to an understanding with her neighbor. On the other hand, China continues to arm herself. She, too, is building forts, buying men-of-war and drilling armies. When Prince Kung, the head of the peace party in Pekin, lost his power, the Pekin Government readily turned its ear to the assurances of Tso Tzung Ton, the victor of Cashgar, that he can easily disperse all the Russian armies at the first encounter. In fine, on the side of China, too, there are no signs of a peaceful disposition. But late events have taught us that not every demonstration means war

ACCIDENT OR MURDER?

The Story Told by a Man Condemned to Death.

HALIFAX, N. S., Dec. 9,—Joseph N. Thibault, who was convicted at Annapolis of the murder of Charlotte Hill and sentenced to be hung on the 8th of next February, told the following story of the manner in which the young woman met her death to a reporter who visited him in his cell after judgment had been given. He admitted that he was the party who was seen on the road and that he did start out from home with the unfortunate girl, intending to take her to another post district where she could have better attention, as she was a constant source of trouble to him, frequently having fits of regret at her life, in which she would threaten to run away or kill herself. He started out before daylight in the morning in order to lose as little time as possible, as it was a busy time of the year, and took with him a sum of money to pay her expenses for a time. Soon after daylight they stopped to get breakfast, and as is usual on that road, where inns are few and travelers poor and saving they turned off the main road a few rods on to a meadow road instead of going to a house. He says they both got out of the wagon, and proceeded to unharness the horse. While he was doing so the woman walked on up the road so fast that he called after her to stop, and as she only walked faster he left the horse and went after her. She ran and got some distance away before he caught up to her. She then said that she was going to look out for a place to make a fire for their kettle, but suspecting her from previous threats he kept with her, and they went off the road to a place in a swamp where there was a sort of cavity in a large rock. Here she gathered stick s together, and as she seemed really only going to do as she said, to make a fire, he went back down the road to give the horse some hay. While he was doing this he heard the woman screaming, and at once ran to ascertain what was the matter. The place where the fire was was about a quarter of a mile from where he was with the horse and by the time he got there he saw the unfortunate woman lying upon the ground, writhing in the last agony of death. Her clothing which was all of cotton, was nearly burned off. He pulled the remains of the burned clothing off and rolled the quivering remains of the dying woman on the ground to endeavor to extinguish the flames, but she died almost at once, her body being roasted. Then the horrible nature of the situation flashed upon him—that if any one came that way, for he could see a hay field in the distance, they might think he murdered the girl. In the deadly panic of the moment he put the charrred remains into the only place available the hollow in the rock where the fire was, and covering it over with bushes and rocks, fled from the spot. When some distance on his homeward journey, and after he had met several persons, the mistake he had made dawned upon him, but he thought it was too late now to turn back, and he must account for the girl's absence as best he could. This story of a man who had given up all hope of mercy on earth, and who had no object then in lying, was told with a straightforward earnestness which seemed like truth. It may be asked why did not the prisoner tell this story at once and throw himself on the mercy of the court, but it must be remembered that to do so he must at once have admitted the truth at every link in that long and terrible chain of circumstantial evidence which has resulted in his death-sentence, and depend upon the jury believing his story, not sworn to and unsupported by any evidence. The deputy sheriff, who arrested Thibault, says he found in the pocket of a grey coat, which witnesses identified as that worn by the prisoner when been on the road, about $25, which in some measure corroborates part of Thibault's story.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A SOCIETY.

The mere gathering of individuals into a group does not constitute them a society. A society, in the sociological sense, is formed only when, besides juxtaposition, there is co-operation. So long as members of the group do not combine their energies to achieve some common end or ends, there is little to keep them together. They are prevented from separating only when the wants of each are better satisfied by uniting his efforts with those of others than they would be if he acted alone. Co operation, then, is at once that which can not exist without a society, and that for which a society exists. It may be a joining of many strengths to effect something which the strength of no single man can effect; or it may be an apportioning of different activities to different persons, who severally participate in the benefits of one another's activities. The motive for acting together, originally the dominant one, may be defense against enemies; or it may be the easier obtainment of food, by the chase or otherwise; or it may be, and commonly is, both of these. In any case, however, the units pass from the state of perfect independence to the state of mutual dependence; and as fast as they do this they become united into a society rightly so-called. But co-operation implies organization. If acts are to be effectually combined, there must be arrangements under which they are adjusted in their times, amounts and characters. This social organization, necessary as a means to concerted action, is of two kinds. Though these two kinds generally coexist, and are more or less interfused, yet they are distinct in their origins and natures. There is a spontaneous co-operation which grows up without thought during the pursuit of private ends; and there is a co-operation which, consciously devised, implies distinct recognition of public ends. The ways in which the two are respectively established and carried on present marked contrasts.—From "The Development of Political Institutions," by Herbert Spencer, in *Popular Science Monthly* for December.

—Capt. Taylor, of Kingston, is positive that there will be good marine weather before New Years.

DOMINION PARLIAMENT

The Canadian Pacific Railway Contract—Sir Charles Tupper's Speech.

OTTAWA, Dec. 14.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

After prayers and routine,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER rose to move his resolutions providing for the appropriation of $25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land for building the Pacific Railway.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE asked if the Government proposed to make any explanations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER said it had been considered best on this occasion that the discussion should take place in committee.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE expressed the opinion that the resolutions should be discussed with the Speaker in the chair. He thought it would be unwise to depart from the usual practice.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the practice was the other way. It would be much more satisfactory to have the discussion in the proper place, namely, in committee.

The motion carried, and the House went into committee, the Clerk, Mr. Patrick, in the chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER said it gave him great pleasure to submit to the House a motion in relation to one of the most important questions that ever came before the Parliament of Canada. The motion he had to submit pointed out means for carrying out that great national work, the Canadian Pacific Railway, both for the completion and operation of it, and the means provided were such as had more than once been approved of by this House and the people of this country, and they were more favorable than any that had ever before been offered to the House. He was pleased to have an opportunity of laying before the House the grounds on which these resolutions were moved—grounds which would be acceptable to the House, because the terms were more favorable than any ever before presented. He would ask the indulgence of the House while placing before it the opinions of men abler than himself. But for yesterday's proceedings he would have been warranted in expressing the opinion that the resolutions would receive the unanimous consent of Parliament. He would remind the House, first, that when his right hon. friend was leader of a former government, the policy submitted for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway received the approval of Parliament. A resolution was moved by the late Sir George E. Cartier providing in specific terms that the railway should be built by private enterprise, aided by the Government in such a manner and to such an extent as would not press too hardly on the resources of the country in the way of taxation. At that time, although the two great parties had differences of opinion with regard to the means of constructing the road, all were agreed that the work should be done by a private company, supplemented by Government aid in lands. Indeed, the Opposition of the day had gone so far as to move an amendment adding the words, "and not otherwise," and the whole Opposition had supported that amendment, thus affirming in the strongest terms their adherence to the principle of constructing the road by private enterprise, aided by Government, and in no other way. In 1872, it was necessary to state distinctly what aid Government would afford for the construction of the road, and Parliament placed at the service of the Government $30,000,000, and 50,000,000 acres of land for the main line. Besides this, 20,000 acres per mile were allowed for the Pembina and Nepigon branches. These terms caused considerable discussion, both in the House and outside, but the Government was sustained. The term of Parliament having expired shortly after, a general election took place, the Government going to the country with this great question as the most important, almost the only, issue. The result was that the Government was sustained by a good working majority. Under the authority of the House and country, a company was formed, of which Sir Hugh Allan was president, and which embraced a number of leading men in this country. They went to England, at that time the great money market of the world; they exhausted every means in their power to obtain assistance for the building of the road. The hon. leader of the late Government had often expressed the hope that they would be successful in their mission. But they did not succeed, and they were obliged to return and surrender the charter. An unpleasant result followed, which he would not discuss at length. The Government was defeated, having been forced to succumb to pressure from the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. He had said that Parliament had passed a resolution to have the road built by private enterprise and by such assistance from the Government as would not occasion an increase in taxation. Subsequently a serious deficiency arose in the revenue, and Mr. Mackenzie had been obliged to leave the question of building the Canadian Pacific Railway in abeyance. He would say that Mr. Mackenzie's policy was eminently patriotic, and that hon. gentleman had committed himself to the construction of the road. He, Mr. Mackenzie, had appealed to his constituents, and, indeed, to all Canada, by a manifesto issued over his own signature. That manifesto contained some important statements. It affirmed that "we, the Government, must meet difficulties imposed on Canada by the late Government to commence the construction of the road not later than July, 1873, and finish it not later than July, 1881," and urged that a speedy means of communication across the continent should be secured by means of the magnificent water stretches, thus avoiding the construction for a time of 1,300 miles and a cost of sixty to eighty million dollars. It also affirmed that the Government would endeavor to make this work auxiliary to immigration, as being a most important matter for the country. Again, Mr. Mackenzie, in a speech at Sarnia, had followed up this policy still more clearly, urging that the work should be commenced at once at the Pacific Ocean, and affirming that when we had a road in British Columbia and on this side, there would be no difficulty about building the prairie sections. There were other means of gathering the policy of administrations besides the declarations of its leading members—namely, through the leading organ of the party. He quoted from a *Globe* editorial, denying in emphatic terms that the Mackenzie Government had abandoned the Pacific Railway, affirming that the question was not, Shall the Canadian Pacific Railway be built or not? as that question had been settled irrevocably, and declaring that there were no two opinions in Canada on the subject and that the road must be built as early as possible. The House had decided to have the Pacific Railway, the country had endorsed hat decision, and also that it should be constructed as rapidly as possible. Mr. Mackenzie had stated on the floor of the House that he was in favor of building the road across the continent, but never believed it could be done in as short a time as claimed. He (Tupper) then proceeded to read from a speech of Mr. Mackenzie's as Premier in 1874. The hon. gentleman had introduced a bill for the construction of the Pacific Railway, stating that it was the duty of the Government to provide a scheme for the carrying out of the work, and declaring that the means Parliament had placed at the disposal of his predecessors, namely, thirty millions of dollars and fifty-four millions of acres, were utterly inadequate for the purpose. The hon. gentleman urged the building of the road because of the terms of the treaty of union with British Columbia. Lord Carnarvon's view of what should be done was that not less than two millions of dollars should be spent annually by the Government in British Columbia. The hon. gentleman had acceded to these terms, and urged that they should be carried out. They undertook to build the British Columbia section as fast as they could do it, under contracts to be submitted for the approval of Parliament. In 1875 the hon. gentleman again explained to Parliament that he proposed to ask, as he did ask and obtained power, to give $10,000 per mile and to give 20,000 acres for the entire line between Nipissing and the Pacific, with like allowance of land and money per mile for the Pembina branch and Georgian Bay branch. He (Tupper) would show the House at a later stage that these terms greatly exceeded any terms before offered for the construction of the work, and for the reason then stated by Mr. Mackenzie, that the terms proposed by his predecessors in 1872 were utterly inadequate, and the *Hansard* of that year showed that they had only let the grading of certain sections in order that they might, if opportunity offered, let out the entire work on a basis of land and money grant. British Columbia having naturally objected to the slow progress of the work, reference was made to England, and Lord Carnarvon decided that an annual expenditure of $2,000,000 should be made in that Province, and as much in excess of that sum as would be necessary to complete the road by the year 1890. This was a very considerable extension of time, but irrevocably committed the then Government to the construction of the entire road. The Government accepted these terms and the First Minister then pledged his Government to obtain connection with British Columbia as soon as possibly could be done without interfering with the march of prosperity. He (Tupper) was glad to be able to submit to-day the means for carrying out the plan to which the leader of the late Government had committed his party. He would quote also utterances of the present leader of the gentlemen opposite, reported in *Hansard*, that the country was committed to the principle of constructing the Pacific Railway. That policy had been submitted to the country and approved by it and could not now be reversed by Parliament. Thus both parties were submitted to the policy of constructing the entire road by a company on the basis of a land and money grant. The circumstances of the country were greatly changed since 1875, when the Finance Minister was asking Parliament year by year to largely increase the burdens of the people to provide for the annual deficit. In 1876, after longer experience and amid greater financial deficiency, the then First Minister again told Parliament that the good faith of the country was committed to carry forward the construction of the entire work, and proposed to invite tenders for the whole road on terms better than before proposed, and placed 5,000 tons of rails on Vancouver Island to show that he was sincere. In 1877 that honorable gentleman again stated to Parliament that the Government were bound to carry out the entire work and issued advertisements for tenders for the construction of the whole road; the portion under contract to be taken in part payment with land and money grant, so that down to 1878 the late Government adhered to the plan of completing the entire work by private contract on the basis of a land and money grant. He (Tupper) was glad to thus have the full confidence of the leader of the late Government and the leader of the Opposition in the present proposed plan of construction. The leader of the late Government had pointed out that the wealth of the country would rapidly increase by opening up the Northwest to settlement. A large population would be thrown into that vast region now unoccupied. He (Tupper) was now about to present means to do this and rapidly develop the immense fertile plains, soon to teem with prosperous settlers. The railway question was not at issue in the last election, but twice before had been submitted to the people and received their First Minister in 1872 and by the leader of the late Government in 1874, on both of which occasions it was approved of by overwhelming majorities. He quoted Mr. Mackenzie's remarks in Parliament, as leader of the Opposition in 1879, when he stated his Government had done everything they could, even risking their political position, to carry out the obligation of the country to complete the Pacific Railway. They had let the contract between Thunder Bay and Selkirk to open up the Northwest Territory, intending to let the balance of the entire road in the contract, giving the constructed line in part payment and land and money payments for the remainder. Mr. Mackenzie had never been called upon to lay those negotiations before the House, correspondence that would have embarrassed the parties interested and have been humiliating in consequence, and had led by Sir John Macdonald had never played such an unpatriotic part as had been taken by the member for Lambton yesterday. (Loud cheers from the Ministerial benches.) He (Sir Charles Tupper) had never known of a case where the Government of a country having entered into negotiations with some of the first capitalists of the world for the disposal of a great undertaking and the negotiations failed, being asked to make the names of the unsuccessful capitalists public, to be bandied about in a very humiliating manner. He believed Mr. Mackenzie's speeches, which he has so largely quoted, were honest and sincere. He (Sir Charles) was gratified to be able to present to the House terms for the completion of the road, which Mr. Mackenzie had failed to obtain. That hon. gentleman had stated that he would scorn to practice deception in this matter, and that he would give his honest and hearty support to advance the work. In 1878 there was a general election and a change of government. Sir John Macdonald, in resuming the administration of the country, was brought face to face with that great work, but they found that but little progress had been made during the *regime* of Mr. Mackenzie. It was true that vast sums of money had been expended during the five years of his administration, but that money was practically wasted. The present Government found that matters had gone too far for them then to undertake to change the policy of their predecessors, but they came to Parliament and reiterated their old policy, the policy of utilizing the lands of the great Northwest in order to complete the road. The development of that great country could only be brought about by the settlement of the land. The success of Canada was intimately bound up with the settlement of the Northwest and the completion of the transcontinental railway. Indeed, the country could only be truly developed by the completion of that road. When they came into power two years ago, they had to proceed with the work as they found it. Then they came to the House and asked Parliament to place at their disposal one hundred million acres of land, by the sale of which they could build the road and thus lift the burden off the shoulders of the country. It was also the policy of Sir John Macdonald to obtain the co-operation of the Imperial Government in building the road. Mr. Mackenzie often sneered at what he called the failure of the Ministers on their frequent trips to England. What were the facts? When Sir Leonard Tilley and himself first went to England in 1878, they found the press of England hostile to the interests of Canada, and, where not hostile, callously indifferent. The English press sneered at and misrepresented this Dominion. They spoke of it with contempt. But there came a sudden change—as striking as it was sudden and marked. That change dated from the moment that Earl Beaconsfield, in his place in the House of Lords, described the enormous value of the Canadian Northwest. That speech was published in all the leading papers in the British Empire and commented on in nearly every paper published in the old world and the new. It placed Canada in its true light before the people of Europe. That remarkable change the people of Canada owed to Sir John Macdonald's visit to Lord Beaconsfield. It was true that the Ministers did not then succeed in making suitable terms with any company for building the road, but they did succeed in making a favorable impression on the Imperial Government. They made progress which was manifested in a most marked manner to-day. Perhaps his hon. friend opposite had not heard the news to-day of the statement published in the London *Times* of to-day, that the British Colonial office had issued an authorized pamphlet recommending Canada to intending immigrants as the most suitable field for immigration. (Loud cheers.) This was something that the British Government had never before done, and showed that the visit of the Ministers had accomplished some good; moreover, the Imperial Government had decided to bring down a bill embodying a scheme of emigration to Canada, assisted by the Government of the Dominion. Thus his honorable friends opposite, with their well known patriotism, would give the Ministry credit for accomplishing some good by visiting England.

Mr. BLAKE—My honorable friend has apparently lost sight of the important point that when they made favorable impressions on the Government, it was the Government of Lord Beaconsfield; but this is the Government of Mr. Gladstone, a Liberal Minister.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER thanked the leader of the Opposition for that gentle reminder, which had greatly strengthened his (Sir Charles') argument. The fact that a Liberal Ministry was doing this in England strengthened his point a hundred fold. (Loud cheers). Continuing, Sir Charles showed the immense advantage Canada would derive from the present action of Mr. Gladstone's Government. Sir Charles and his colleague had sown the seed. The fruit was being gathered to-day. The Minister of Agriculture, Hon. J. H. Pope, was a perfect genius. He had the happy faculty of doing the right thing at the right time. He went over to England, and the result was that a small army of representative English tenant farmers came out to this country, satisfied themselves of our wonderful resources, and on their return have given to the United Kingdom such reports of the adaptability of this country for immigration that they are to this country of inestimable value. The public feeling in England in reference to Canada has been revolutionized. When the Ministers again visited England in 1880 they found a change of public sentiment that was truly astonishing. Well, in 1879 they obtained from Parliament a grant of one hundred millions of acres of land, but the disposal of that land did not enable them to perfect any scheme for the rapid completion of the railway. Meanwhile they proceeded to carry on in good faith the work left them by their predecessors. They placed under contract the one hundred and twenty-seven miles for which Mr. Mackenzie had advertised for tenders. They did all in their power to push the work on to a successful completion. But they did not receive from the Opposition that aid and support they had a right to expect, seeing that they (the present Government) were carrying out in good faith the work to which Mr. Mackenzie had pledged the country when in power. There had been no change in the sentiment of Parliament or the country, but there had been in the sentiments of Mr. Mackenzie, for at the last session that gentleman made a motion the effect of which would have been to delay the construction of the works, to break faith with British Columbia, to set the Carnarvon terms at defiance and to give the lie direct to Lord Dufferin, who had pledged his honor as a man to proceed with the works as agreed upon by the Carnarvon terms. That is what Mr. Mackenzie practically proposed to do; but the Parliament of the country, by a vote of 131 to 54, declined to accede to Mr. Mackenzie's proposal. The Government therefore placed the British Columbia section under contract and the work proceeded. Had they not done that, he (Sir Charles) would not be able to day to lay before Parliament the best possible bargain they could make for the disposal of the road. He quoted Mr. Mackenzie's speeches at length, and showed conclusively that the Government was now following a policy advocated by the ex-leader of the Opposition himself. At the last session of Parliament, Mr. Mackenzie stated that if the Government received an offer to dispose of the 2,600 miles of road for $10,000 and 30,000 acres of land per mile they ought to accept it. He was now able to ask them to accept a much more favorable offer than that, and, therefore, he claimed for it the support of the hon. member for Lambton and his colleagues, for it could hardly be possible that Mr. Mackenzie would refuse to support the Government in accepting a better offer than he himself had recommended them to accept. He (Sir Charles) would quote the hon. gentleman's own words and ask him to "act up to practice any deception in this matter." The hon. gentleman had admitted that they had not received an offer which could be accepted, nor could they get any, owing to the circumstances to which he had already referred. But when the tone of the English press had changed, when the best class of emigrants were being excited about Canada in a way they had never been excited before, when capitalists were becoming interested in the country, as a good field for their investments, when under the prudent financial system of his friend, the Finance Minister, confidence in Canadian securities was being restored, when financial prosperity was again beginning to flow in upon us, when the Government of Canada did not show alarming deficits accumulated, not for public works, but to meet ordinary expenses, then the present Government felt that the time had come when a scheme might again be submitted with some better prospects of success. The late Government had not been able to obtain a single bid in answer to their advertisement, but when the policy of the Government had been changed and Parliament had authorized the setting apart of one hundred million acres of land for the purpose of building the road, he felt that they could appeal with confidence to the capitalists of the world, and they had done so successfully. He regretted that the gentlemen who had pledged the faith of the country in every way to build this road should have met the proposition he made to Parliament last year in the obstructive manner they had. He contended that the advertisement of the 29th May, 1876, for offers to be made on the 14th January, 1877, under the authority of the act of 1874, stipulated that the contractors were to receive lands or the proceeds of lands.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—No, no. If you will look at the act of 1874, you will see that the Government was to dispose of the lands and hand over the money as it was earned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—I am glad my honorable friend has mentioned that because it it reminds me that the Government undertook to dispose of the lands itself and thus save the contractors the expense of doing so. Continuing, he referred to the change in public opinion in England, and said it was largely the result of the syndicate which had purchased the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway, and who had not only shown with what rapidity and at what a moderate cost a railway could be built, but also the great value of the prairie lands through which the road ran. He would state that when it was decided to ask the capitalists on what terms they would complete and work in perpetuity the Canadian Pacific Railway the Government had placed itself in communication with all the parties they thought were likely to be able to carry out so vast a scheme. Some American and Canadian capitalists had made a proposal to complete the line, and he could say that it had always been intended by the Government to complete the British Columbia section to Pt. Moody because it would be ridiculous to terminate at Yale when there was only three feet of water. He was ready to give all the praise and credit to his predecessor for selecting the terminus he did, and which was a compliment to his wisdom and judgment.

Mr. BLAKE—You said it was premature.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—We thought it was premature at that time because there were other routes which needed more thorough exploration, but after these explorations had been made it had been decided that Port Moody was the best terminus. When the question of the terminus had been decided a proposal had been made to certain parties to know on what terms they would complete the road from Winnipeg to Kamloops, the Government finishing the portions under construction.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—Will that document be laid on the table?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—There is no objection; but it will not afford much information.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—Will the names be given? It was not advertised, I suppose, as our scheme was?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—No. It was not advertised, because it was felt that after the announcement had been made in Parliament that no offer had been received in reply to that advertisement, it was not thought any replies would be received to a new advertisement. The parties most likely to undertake the work had been communicated with, and in response the offer had been received which had been laid before the House. That offer proposed to complete the railway and work it afterwards on the most favorable terms which had ever been offered to the House or made by any person in this country. He would first say that he had caused a statement to be made showing what it would cost to complete the part of road under construction, and the amount was shown to be $28,000,000.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE—Is that only for completing, or does that include the whole cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—That includes every dollar of the expense of completing the road and handing it over to the company. Referring to the estimate brought down by him last year, he said that the present one differed from it somewhat because, in preparing last year's statement, he was determined the estimates should not be exceeded. He repeated that the $28,000,000 included the completion of the Yale-Kamloops section, the Thunder Bay branch, and everything, except some $3,000,000 for surveys which had not been included last year. The contract, as laid on the table, provided for the building of 2,627 miles, and if the contractors changed the route so as to go north of Lake Nepigon it would increase the length fifty miles, but not increase the cost. Taking up the proposals in this order, he would say that the Act of 1872 authorized the giving of $30,000,000 in cash on 2,750 miles, and 50,000,000 acres of land. For purposes of comparison he would value the land at $1 per acre, which would place the cost of the road under that proposal at $84,708,000 for constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. A company was formed to build the road on these terms, but they had failed to interest capitalists, and had been obliged to surrender their charter. The honorable gentlemen opposite had always said the Government might as well expect to build the road for $10 as for $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres. He then referred to the proposal of 1874, by which the length of the road was proposed to be 2,797 miles, main road and branches, and it was proposed to give $10,000 per mile, which would make $27,970,000 in cash, and 20,000 acres per mile, which would make 55,940,000 acres. The act further provided for a guarantee of four per cent on such additional sums as should be agreed on by the contractor, and the only fair way to estimate what this would amount to, as the Government had not received an offer for the whole work, was to take the Georgian Bay branch of 88 miles, which he thought the honorable gentlemen opposite would not object to as a fair average.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—I do. (Laughter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—The honorable gentleman goes further than I expected he would, for when the first contract was abandoned he scouted the idea of its being a difficult section. He contended that the Georgian Bay branch was a fair average section, and said the lowest offer received for that was $7,500 per mile from a Mr. Munson, of Boston, Mr. Foster's own offer being $12,500 per mile. Afterwards Mr. Foster acquired Munson's contract, which was $10,000 per mile in cash, 20,000 acres of land per mile, and 4 per cent. on $7,500 per mile for twenty years, but Mr. Foster had to abandon his contract because he could not get a single capitalist to join him. He went on to show that in taking this offer as a basis the cost of the road under the scheme of 1874 would have been $104,887,500.

It being 6 o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess

Sir CHARLES TUPPER resumed his speech. He said that when the House rose for recess he had been alluding to the Mackenzie estimate for building a portion of the Pacific Railway, and had taken the distance at 2,627 miles from Calendar Station to Burrard Inlet. He had made a slight mistake and would take the earliest opportunity of correcting it. To the number mentioned, 40 miles must be added, as the late Government had located the eastern terminus 40 miles south of Calendar Station, where their predecessors had placed it. This would add $1,500,000 to the estimate he had previously given in order to make it strictly correct. Coming down to the present contract, he said that the total amount which it would cost, counting 712 miles of road to be completed by the Government, would be, including everything, $28,000,000. This included the portion of the road already built. Then, for the 2,000 miles to be constructed by the syndicate the cost was to be $25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land. The total cost of the whole road, therefore, valuing the land at a dollar an acre, would be $78,000,000. These terms, he contended, were far below any previously obtained or sanctioned by Parliament for the construction of the road. In 1873 the amount estimated was $84,700,000; in 1874 it was $104,887,000, and $1,500,000 added for the extra forty miles before referred to; in 1880, by the terms of the present contract, it was $78,000,000. He next proceeded to consider the value of the land, taking the Foster contract as a basis of calculation. With reference to that portion of the road, Mr. Mackenzie had stated in 1876 that what had been said in certain newspapers regarding the engineering difficulties was entirely fallacious. The *Globe* declares now that it is idle to say that land is worth only a dollar an acre, affirming that it is worth two dollars, but the leader of the Opposition, or the leader of the late Government, would scarcely venture to meet him on that ground. On a former occasion, when he (Sir Charles Tupper) had valued the land at two dollars an acre, Mr. Blake had accused him of exaggerating, had denied that the House would accept the valuation of the hon. member for Cumberland and thought that one dollar an acre would be an excessive price. Mr. Mackenzie had declared that the land was not worth five dollars an acre, and wished he could say it was worth one dollar. As to the cost of work, assuming that land was worth $1.50 an acre, to meet in some degree the valuation made by the organ of the Opposition, a calculation would show that the estimated cost under the Allen charter would be $112,000,000; that of the late administration, in 1874, would be $132,887,500, while that of the present scheme would be $90,500,000. Going the whole length that the *Globe* goes, and assuming the land to be worth two dollars an acre, how would the account stand? In 1873, it was $139,400,000; in 1874, $160,827,500; and now, $103,000,000, or less than the amount placed at the disposal of the late Government, reckoning land at one dollar per acre. (Great applause.) The leader of the late Government did not appear to be satisfied yet that the present terms were better than ever before sanctioned by Parliament, and in order to satisfy him and the Opposition generally, he would quote from an authority for which they had great respect, and which they would be sure to accept, namely, their own statements. On May 12th, 1874, Mr. Mackenzie had stated, as reported in the *Hansard*, that the portion of the road in British Columbia alone would cost $35,000,000 to build, while the cost of the road from Lake Superior to the Pacific would not be less than $100,000,000. According to the present contract, the cost of the road from Nipissing to the Pacific would be only $78,000,000. Mr. Mackenzie had also said that the portion of the road in British Columbia would be built as rapidly as the surveys could be made and if necessary, the hundred millions would be spent to connect the waters of Lake Superior with the tidal waves of the Pacific. The hon. gentleman had also said that the proposed cost was $10,000 and 25,000 acres per mile, but that this would not build it from end to end. In proof of this he had referred to the cost of the building of the Intercolonial, $45,000 a mile, of the Northern Pacific Railway, as far as completed, $47,000 to $48,000 per mile, and of the Central Pacific, as too famous to be touched upon. With regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway the honorable gentleman had declared his opinion that the average cost would reach $40,000 per mile, and had also said he did not expect that any commercial advantages would arise from the building of the road for many years to come. He proceeded to quote Mr. Mackenzie's speech of 1874, that the road must be constructed with money furnished by the people, and would cost $100,000,000 and $8,000,000 to operate, and, in addition the cost of renewing the rails and sleepers every eight years, that the cost would double the country's debt, so that money could not be got for less than six per cent. The present leader of the Opposition was good enough also to give his estimate last year of the cost of constructing the work, and he (Sir Chas. Tupper