

to be lifted from the shoulders of the Government, and the liability the country were going to incur was to be brought within, not over, the limit which, in its present financial condition, it is prepared to meet; within such limits that the proceeds from the sale of the land to be granted by Parliament for the construction of the line would wipe out all liabilities at no distant day."

There was the pledge made when we were asked to make a contract. Our liabilities were \$53,000,000, and the proceeds of the land at no distant time were to wipe out every cent of that money and leave us free. Then the Minister of Public Works took up the cudgels, and he is generally rather cautious and precise in his statements. But influenced, I suppose, by that patriotic exuberance of spirit which his colleague, Sir Charles Tupper, sometimes showed signs, and with which, in his closing remarks, the Secretary of State also indicated he was occasionally afflicted, the Minister of Public Works made a very positive statement as to the result. He said:

"According to the contract the amount of money to be given to the Syndicate is \$25,000,000, and the amount of land 25,000,000 acres, worth, say, \$1 per acre. To these two sums you have to add the cost of the sections completed or now under construction, as far as Burrard Inlet, amounting to twenty-eight million dollars, so that the whole amount that will have to be expended by this country for completing the Pacific Railway is \$53,000,000, to which you must add the value of the land at a dollar an acre, making altogether \$78,000,000. Thus, according to our plan, we shall have the whole Pacific Railway completed for \$78,000,000, and with the guarantee that the company now to be inaugurated will work the road for all time to come."

At that time it was not deemed unpatriotic to insinuate a doubt that there might be difficulty about working the road. On the contrary, those hon. gentlemen who think it very unpatriotic that this matter should be questioned now, themselves took security in \$5,000,000 that the road would be operated. On the contrary, they told us that an enormous sum would have to be paid by the company during the earlier years to operate the road, and if we were paying large and liberal subsidies in money and land, it was to recompense the company and make them strong enough to operate the line. Then, the hon. gentleman, getting into that patriotic fervor to which I have referred, said:

"Does he (Blake) want to drive a hard bargain with these gentlemen? What reason could there be in attempting to cut them down to as small a figure as possible, in order to make the company a poor company? It is to our interest, and to the interest of the country, that the company should be able to construct the railway and work it afterwards, so that they shall not come back to us, year after year, and ask us for new terms. We want, once for all, to settle the whole question," etc.

Those were the opinions of the Minister of Public Works upon the question. Why should we cut the company down; let us deal with them liberally; let us not make them a poor company; let us make them a rich company, so strong that they will not come to us, year after year; that they will not come to us in 1884, for example, or in 1885, or in 1886; that they will not come to us, year after year, and ask for new terms. We want, once for all, to settle the whole question. Has the hon. gentleman, once for all, settled the whole question by the contract of 1881? Have they not come back, year after year; and who will say they will come back no more? Then the hon. gentleman said something which I thought was exceedingly sensible. I have heard something during the discussion to-day which was entirely opposed to the views of the hon. gentleman. I have heard it pointed out that we ought to regard ourselves as under a deep debt of gratitude to the contractors for and constructors of this road, and should deal with them in that spirit. What did the Minister of Public Works say:

"These men are not going to work that railway for the mere pleasure of doing so. They are not undertaking it for the sake of patriotism. They are undertaking it to make money, and they will make money, because they know that a railway through that beautiful country, settled with a large and thriving population, must give large returns."

That was the hon. gentleman's statement—a plain, business-like statement, such as the hon. gentleman knows how to make. We can see it all now. There is no longer a hazy atmosphere about it. It was the business, and not the patri-

otic motive; it was in order to make money out of the undertaking that the promoters undertook it; and the hon. gentleman said he was sorry if they did not make money. I hope they will make money; if they do not, it will not be for the fault of hesitating to come here. The hon. gentleman further said:

"The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has referred to the obligations and liabilities of Canada in connection with the railway. He says they are undetermined—that they have no finality."

How much are they nearer finality now?

"I generally find the hon. gentleman very logical, but I fail to see his logic in this case. I think our liabilities in the matter are as well determined as they could possibly be. Taking the land at \$1 per acre, we have a total of \$78,000,000 as the sum we have to pay. Surely there is sufficient determinativeness and finality in that calculation to suit hon. gentlemen."

The hon. gentleman was losing his temper; he ridiculed the idea of there being any want of finality and determinativeness in the calculation. What has happened since? We have altered the figures. We have given them \$29,500,000, or almost thirty millions since. We are to give them some more presently. The Secretary of State tells us to-day that although, when we gave them the loan, we took a mortgage, and were told we had absolute security under which we could get the road at figures appallingly small, dirt cheap, if they failed in fulfilling their bargain; still the Secretary of State tells us that was all a form, that we all understood it so; but the hon. gentleman was not here to understand it, and he did not hear the fervor and earnestness with which any such idea was repudiated by hon. gentlemen, his colleagues, or he would not have said what he did say. When that contingency was suggested, we were told that it was a fair and square bargain; that we were asked to advance money because it was clear we were going to get rid of paying so many millions if the company made default. The Secretary of State says we would have had to have bought up the stock. What is the use, then, of a mortgage, and of being on the top? The hon. gentleman makes a distinction, but it is entirely without a difference. He says it is an old loan; that it never was intended to deprive those people of their cottages; that, in fact, our bark was much worse than our bite. We took a very stringent mortgage, but we never intended to enforce it; it would not have been right to enforce it; it would have left a stain on the Government to enforce it; therefore, you are not to believe all you hear from us. That is the effect of the statement. For we certainly were told last year, when the bargain was made, that the mortgage was a good and valid mortgage, and was to be enforced. The Minister of Public Works said in 1881:

"I have shown, moreover, that not only will the railway be built by the Syndicate, but worked for all time to come; and that we have sufficient guarantees in our land to ensure both these objects."

That is quite true, if you make a little addition to it—if you pay the necessary further sum in order to accomplish that result. The Minister of Public Works further said:

"The leader of the Opposition asks why so monstrous a contract as this was brought down to Parliament. I tell him it was to secure our institutions, to increase our population, to enrich the country."

There was the object—it was to enrich the country. After another pause he goes on:

"Hon. gentlemen may or may not see that this is one of those great measures that a party, even in Opposition, should not hesitate to support. This is one of those rare opportunities that public men have to show how they can appreciate great measures and how they can foresee the future of their country. This is a measure which we, at all events, as public men, as the representatives of the people of this country, consider will be the crowning act of our lives."

Well, Sir, you may see that our appreciation of the results of the contract have been somewhat more accurate than that of hon. gentlemen. We declared that the bargain would not be observed; we declared that more concessions would be made, and these concessions have been made. They