

## APPENDIX.

*Speech of SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART., M.P., in the Canadian House of Commons at Ottawa, Monday, 9th March, 1896, on Second Reading of the Bill respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited:—*

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : I agree with one remark that has fallen from the hon. member (Mr. Welsh), and that remark was that this was a very important question. I do not intend to weary the House with this oft-told tale further than is necessary, but as briefly as possible to place the position of this question, as I understand it, before the House. In 1870 the Government of Canada appointed a royal commission to travel through the country, to take sworn testimony, and to form the best and most intelligent judgment that they could as to the canal expenditure that the Government ought to undertake. That commission was composed of the most eminent men that the country could produce. Sir Hugh Allan, a gentleman of great enterprise and of very high standing in connection with everything regarding navigation and the commerce of the country, was the president. Other gentlemen occupying very high positions in the commercial world, and eminent engineers, were appointed on that commission. They travelled through the country where canal expenditure was the subject of important consideration. They took the sworn testimony of the highest and best authorities, commercial men, sea captains, persons connected with navigation, and persons connected with trade, and they made their report. They divided their recommendations in that report into two classes. First, they put in No. 1 class the works that in their judgment the interests of Canada required should be undertaken so soon as the means could be provided to accomplish them, and in that category they placed a canal to connect the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with the waters of the Bay of Fundy. The Government adopted that report, Parliament adopted that report, and after surveys and examinations and estimates had been made, we had before us the opinions of eminent engineers that the construction of such a canal as was recommended would cost something over \$5,000,000. Parliament adopted that report, and it voted \$1,000,000 towards the commencement of the work, after giving the subject careful consideration. This scheme then had the imprimatur of Parliament. The Government went out of office shortly afterwards, in 1873—as I daresay some hon. gentlemen in this House may remember—and the duty of taking up this question devolved upon their successors in office. The Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie took this matter up, and they put a large sum of money in the Estimates for the purpose of promptly proceeding with the construction of this canal, at a time when it was estimated to cost something over \$5,000,000. Further examination and investigation in connection with the work led the Government of Mr. Mackenzie to doubt the accuracy of the estimated cost of that canal. The subject was referred to Mr. Page, a very eminent engineer, and the result of his investigation was that, in his judgment, the amount required for the construction of that canal would be nearer \$9,000,000 than \$5,000,000. Under those circumstances, that Administration submitted to Parliament the question : as to whether, although an expenditure of over \$5,000,000 would be justified, the work was one that ought to be proceeded with when there was reason to believe that the cost would be nearer \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 than \$5,000,000. Under these circumstances, there was, I believe, no person in the House who pressed the Government at that time to proceed with the work at so great a cost as was estimated by Mr. Page. Now, a gentleman who is well known as an engineer of very considerable ability, took this subject up, and he came to the Government with the proposal to substitute the somewhat novel undertaking of a ship railway instead of the canal. The increased cost connected with the canal arose from its having been discovered that there was a much larger amount of rock to be encountered than was originally supposed. Mr. Ketchum, the engineer who brought this subject under the consideration of the Government, submitted a proposal to construct a ship railway instead of a canal. If the ship railway were practicable, he showed that it would be of more value than a canal, because it would open earlier in the spring,