

running. I do not think any such legislation has been proposed before during my parliamentary career. Then, so far as the southern part of the county of Hastings is concerned, and especially the city of Belleville, I can assure this hon. Committee that the promoters of this Bill have no antipathy to that city and wish to place no obstacle in the way of her advancement. We have admired her enterprise for years; we have rejoiced at her successes, which have been many; we have regretted her failures, which have been few; but we are not prepared to admit that the vast wealth of our northern country shall remain undeveloped, as it has for centuries, simply because the abundant and valuable minerals of that region cannot find their way to market by way of Belleville. The promoters of this Bill have opened up a more direct route to market by way of Weller's Bay, where, at enormous expense, they have established one of the best shipping harbours in Canada. They have, already, by their own means, without a cent of public aid, constructed a railway through a difficult portion of the country, to within a few miles of the mines, and we now ask power from this Parliament to extend the line still further northward, in order to still further develop the resources of that almost unknown region; and if they, the promoters of this Bill, think that the better, and cheaper, and shorter route to the markets of the world is by way of Trenton, I do not think the city of Belleville has any right, nor do I think that city has any desire, to throw obstacles in their way.

Mr. BOWELL. We make no such claim.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the large amount of money expended by Belleville and the county of Hastings in unsuccessful efforts to bring the iron ore to the frontier at that city. Well, is that any reason why they should seek to recoup themselves for losses entailed by their dealings with others by imposing restrictions upon those who have never received and have never asked anything from them. I do not think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) made any threat when he spoke of withdrawing the Bill if the proposed amendments be attached to it. He merely expressed his opinions that with these restrictions the charter would be worthless. Such is my opinion, but I do not say the Bill will be withdrawn in consequence of such restrictions; but I do say, that I fear the imposition of those restrictions will have a tendency to leave the northern part of Hastings without those facilities for reaching the frontier markets, for which the city of Belleville, as well as the representatives of Hastings, have zealously laboured for years. I believe that if hon. gentlemen opposite thought that by their opposition to this Bill they were impeding the construction of the road they would be slow to take the steps they are taking to-day. I can readily understand their position, however, and having made a strong show of opposition, ostensibly in the interests of their constituents, I hope they will yield this point—that the trade of the country should not languish in order that certain localities, without geographical facilities, may live in the vain hope that fortune will some day favour them to the disadvantage of the country at large. I sincerely hope the House will reject the proposed amendments and leave the Company free to pursue their work untrammelled by unusual and unjust restrictions.

Mr. BOWELL. Allow me a word or two of explanation with reference to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). He said that in all my statements I had not shown that any arrangement had been made. I took it for granted that in all the negotiations with the president of the Company we should take his word, as a gentleman, and that I had done so; and I say more it is not a position we should take, either as the representatives of the people—a legislative body—or as individuals, when we solemnly agree to certain amendments to a Bill, that

certain arrangements should be carried out, that we should not keep faith one with the other. At least, if one party to an agreement thinks, in the interest of the Company he represents, he should withdraw from an agreement solemnly entered into, he should at least inform those with whom he is negotiating that he withdraws from the arrangements he has been making and not leave them in ignorance, and the Committee and the House without any knowledge of the repudiation which has taken place. I desire to say also, that neither I nor the hon. member for East Hastings, desired to take any step which might, unfortunately, be construed as an attempt to prevent the construction of a railway into that country. We have long advocated the extension of that road, and the best evidence of our interest in it is what we have voluntarily put into these enterprises, without expectation of receiving any reward therefor. I desire to say, that if these amendments, which were drawn up with a view of giving the same rates to the Central Ontario as to the other roads, do not carry out that agreement, I pledge my word that such alterations shall be made in the amendment, upon the third reading, as shall give fair and reciprocal rates to these companies. Further, I say to the hon. gentleman for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), on the authority of Mr. Rathbun, a gentleman whose word I am quite prepared to take—one who, I am satisfied, will never repudiate what he states—that he is prepared to enter into precisely the same arrangements with regard to his own road, the moment it touches the other system, for giving the same rates over his road as he asks from theirs.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Why did not you put that in the Napanee and Tamworth Bill? You take Mr. Rathbun's word, but you do not take Mr. Ritchie's.

Mr. BOWELL. We have no reason to take the word of the latter gentleman; and judging from what has taken place within the last fortnight, I do not think even the hon. gentleman would say that we should put in black and white what he agreed to, in order that that agreement may be carried out. I repeat that if there is the slightest privilege given to the Belleville and North Hastings which is not given also to the Central Ontario, I will agree—as I am sure the hon. gentleman behind me will agree—that the amendment shall be reconstructed at the third reading, in order to meet the view of my hon. friend from North Victoria, or the promoter of the Bill. A good deal has been said about the question of whose money this road is being built with. I know the parties connected with the road in the north are receiving great advantages from the Ontario Government, not given to others. I am glad to see that the Government of Ontario have extended aid in that way, that they have taken the position of extending these railways, more particularly into the back portions of Ontario, by which the resources of the country may be extended. I find, by a return brought down on the last day of the Session of the Ontario Legislature, that one gentleman connected with this road—not holding any stock in it, but who holds mines in that district, and is connected more or less, not only by the land company, but in the interests of the railway company—I mean Mr. Coe—has obtained 54,000 acres of land in the mineral regions of that country, at, as I am informed, 25 cents per acre less than it could be obtained by anybody else, with the additional privilege of utilizing all the wood upon it, less the pine; while any other gentleman here would have to pay 25 cents more per acre for it, reserving all the merchantable timber on the land. He has also the privilege of buying 46,000 acres more, and this is all in connection with railway enterprise. I am not at all finding fault with this, if it is given to place this Company on as good a financial basis as possible, and I hope it may succeed; but I ask for the county with which I am connected, that the agreement made by these gentlemen should be carried out in good faith. I cannot understand how the financial negotiations should be interfer-