

March 29, 1871

to the representation. This view was not disputed by the hon. member for East Toronto, or by his hon. friend from Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS: I did dispute it.

Hon. Mr. GRAY would quote from the hon. member's own speech to show that he had not objected to it.

Mr. MILLS said he would not accept any report made last year as a correct one.

Hon. Mr. GRAY would quote from the *Globe* report, which the hon. member would hardly object to. The passage of the hon. member's speech referred to, contained the following: "The representation was based no doubt, on the expectation of an immediate increase of the inhabitants, but he contended that it would be better to give representation to the number of people, increasing the number if it was thought best, every two years, or leaving to the local legislature if they thought it better." Here was the expression of opinion from the hon. member, and thus, though the point was raised, there was no record on the journals of the House, no action taken, no resolution or amendment moved to show that the representation of Manitoba was unconstitutional. The objection that was taken in debate last session by the hon. gentleman was as to the power of the Parliament to give representation at all—not as to its numerical character.

Here then was a precedent for this case before the House—a precedent established by the House itself. He had no fear that the smaller Provinces would be overridden through this Act. If the representation were to be based strictly upon population according to the law as at present interpreted by the hon. member for Bothwell, British Columbia would have but one representative, if any. Now, in that colony there were two separate and distinct interests, the insular and continental. The country was divided into two sections, Vancouver Island and the main land. If the colony were permitted to send but one member to this House, which section would he represent? He could not represent both very well, and one of them would remain unrepresented. It was clear, therefore, that no other course could have been adopted with reference to this point, than that embodied in the measure before the House. The position he took with reference to this question was this, that until the Province became a member of the Federal compact, it would not be governed by the provisions of the British North America Act. That the terms and conditions on which British Columbia came in were to be agreed on, and if it as an independent province she chose to say her interests required our representatives in the House, she could, and there was nothing in the British North America Act to prevent our acceptance of such a proposition, but after she came in, her future representation must be governed by the 31st section of the British North America Act, and must revolve like that of the other Province, around the representation of Quebec as a pivot. In accepting her therefore,

as set forth in the resolutions in that respect there was no infringement of our Constitutional rights under the British North America Act, and thus the first point stated by the member from Sherbrooke was complied with. For it must be assumed that if there were other important constitutional objections they would not have escaped the acumen of the member for Durham West.

The next point was as to our capability to enter upon the contemplated arrangements respecting the Pacific Railway. The necessity, of course of communication with the Pacific was admitted by every hon. member who had spoken on this subject. The Government did not propose to build the railway themselves, but it would be done by companies, and if the land grants should prove nearly as valuable as it was alleged they would, the cry of one hundred millions which was used to create so much alarm would prove to be a mere bugbear. With regard to the part of the line falling in Ontario he was not prepared to speak, but with respect to the other portions he desired to say something. The hon. gentleman here described the mode and means by which the Pacific Railway from Omaha to Sacramento was built, shewing the companies, the land grants, and Government Bond subsidies in aid, describing the character of the country, and the difficulties which met the constructors of the road, the unstable nature of the soil about the Missouri River, the arid character of the American desert, and the Alkali plains, the elevation of the passes of the Rocky Mountains, and of the Sierra Nevada Range, and went on to explain how the Government Bond subsidies were divided, increasing proportionately with the cost of construction of different parts thus preventing the Government aid being entirely used on the easy gradient, and thereby obviating further calls on the Government. The American Government had divided the subsidy, giving one amount for the easy part of the line, and a larger amount for the difficult sections. The whole bond subsidy amounted to fifty-eight millions, and in addition a land grant was made of alternate lots of 20 miles along the route. The cost of the entire road had also been largely increased to the extent of twenty millions by a stipulation that no rails should be used except those of *home* make,—a limitation which would certainly not be imposed by us—as our rule was to buy in the cheapest market.

Hon. Mr. McDougall (Lanark North) said he supposed steel rails would be used.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER: The hon. gentleman knows better.

Hon. Mr. GRAY resumed his description of the construction of the American line, and the difficulties met with in that work. He quoted from a speech of the member for Lambton made last session during the Manitoba debate, shewing that the Canadian line would pass through an infinitely better country than that through which the American line had passed.