volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas. He should have said—we court the fullest inquiry, but instead of that he said—no, we will pass to the orders of the day. He (Mr. Christie) thought then, and he still was of the same opinion, that he was not respectful to the hon. gentleman (Macpherson) whose position in the country merited something better, nor was he respectful to the House or the country. The Government ought to have met every position in his resolutions in a frank and open spirit. That would have been right. They would have inspired confidence. What was the natural feeling at present? The country was suspicious—very suspicious as to the integrity of their conduct. The fullest discussion of the resolutions should not have been denied. He would just take up the articles of agreement. The Government stated in the 2nd paragraph they deemed it better a Company should be incorporated by charter. Now, we have heard no reason why it was not thought advisable to agree with either of the companies chartered. They were considered last session sufficiently important to justify their incorporation by Act of Parliament, and the Government in asking for the extraordinary powers, which on the part of Parliament was tantamount to an abdication of function, solicited these powers to charter an independent Company for the purpose of preventing monopoly. Although its intent might be gathered from the Act itself, statements in House, when the bill was under discussion, furnished a commentary on ministerial intentions in asking these extraordinary powers. The Minister of Justice declared that the object in inserting this clause was to prevent such a combination of companies as might create a monopoly. It was to keep these companies in order. The Government, it was said, did not ask for discretionary powers in regard to the money or land—although they had certainly taken them, but only powers requisite to decide what was the best line for the country, and who were the best capitalists. Yet the Government did not take tenders from either company, acting as if neither was to be trusted. The Government addressed communications exclusively to those two chartered companies, but why did it deem neither proper to be trusted? Their very first act was to bring about a combination—to induce a monopoly—the very condition of things to guard against which they asked extensive powers. That certainly was not in accordance with the declaration of the Minister of Justice and Sir Geo. Cartier, as quoted by Senator Macpherson. He (Mr. Christie) came now to the manner of payments as security to the Government. He maintained it was stated by the Finance Minister last session that payments should be made to the Receiver General. These were the words of the statute and the charter. Sir George Cartier stated that the Government would take care no arrangement was made but with a *bona fide* Company, composed of shareholders, etc., and would insist on payment of one million into the hands of the Receiver General; and as to expenditure or employment of the nine millions, that would be matter for arrangement between the Government and the Company. A deposit in one of the banks to the Receiver General's credit was not a payment according to the terms of the Statute. An election committee did not recognize even the payment of bank notes as a security, requiring either gold or Dominion notes. What did we find after all? A most remarkable statement in the receipt given by the Receiver General for the deposit to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, under certain conditions. Now, what were those conditions? We had not reached them. He had asked for the documents, and this point had not been answered. He understood the payment was to be in the words of the Statute, an unconditional payment, a *bona fide* real payment into the hands of the Receiver General. We were not told what those conditions were. He attached a condition which he (Mr. Christie) believed was not contemplated by the Statute, to the receipt or written notice sent the banks receiving payment, namely: "I have to state it is not the intention of the Government to remove any such deposits unless it is required to insure their safety." Could the Receiver General chacque out this money?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Statute said it was to remain there subject to order of Parliament. It was not to be received as ordinary Government money, not to be chequed out, but to remain subject to order of Parliament.

Mr. CHRISTIE complained that that did not answer his question. (Hear, hear.) The Government by their own conditions had divested themselves of control over the money deposited, except in case of real or supposed insolvency. This condition if not contrary to the Statute was incompatible with its words. He would notice some of the clauses which he believed were extremely loosely drawn. Keeping faith with British Columbia, upon which so much stress was laid, was not a point in dispute. It was the interest of British Columbia and all the provinces,