

I belong to place very considerable sums in the permanent expenditure which might have been, under other circumstances, charged to capital account and represented by debt. Some fifteen or twenty million dollars or more than that—I do not give the sum in exact figures—have been expended on works properly chargeable to capital account, and which do not appear in the public debt, and the public debt is so much better for that kind of expenditure. Every dollar, I venture to say, that has been legitimately expended on the Pacific Railway, if we never get a shilling of it back again, is of great value to this country, and is worth all that it cost; but I believe that the whole of the advances made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are perfectly safe, as a business operation, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why I believe it. It is because behind the debt of the company we find there are \$65,000,000 of stock held by over 1200 or 1500 subscribers, and that stock, which is now selling at 40 cents on the dollar, is not worth one shilling if the mortgage which stands behind it is not good for its face. That is the reason why I say the security is good here. The security has the backing of the \$65,000,000 of stock which is worth \$25,000,000 in the market to-day, besides the mortgage being a first lien on the road. The loan of \$5,000,000 which has been objected to is a perfectly legitimate thing, and the company have been forced to come here because their credit has been paralyzed by exactly such statements as those made by the hon. gentleman yesterday, that they have not paid their employees.

HON. MR. POWER—It is true.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman has no authority for it, and he has no right to make such a statement.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman has no right to make such an assertion. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman from Niagara said that I made a statement which was not true.

HON. MR. PLUMB—No, I said no such thing.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman said I had no authority for making

the statement, and I have the best of authority.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman was perfectly in order in saying that the hon. gentleman said it without authority.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman from Halifax also said—and I was surprised after the arguments that had been adduced upon that question that he would have ventured to refer to it—that the \$14,000,000 deposited with the Government as a security, for the payment of the dividends upon the Canadian Pacific Railway stock, should be given up to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or practically the same thing, that the \$5,000,000 which they asked for should be taken out of that money, a security deposit, a deposit held by the Government by the most solemn trust, held as a sub-trust by the Bank of Montreal, referring to 1,400 or 1,500 shareholders scattered all over Europe and America. The hon. gentleman proposes that we should break faith with those men. I have never known party animosity and party stress to carry any set of men so far as I have seen the Opposition carried in this case, when they propose that we shall repudiate a contract for the purpose of making a concession out of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Not only that, but it was first suggested by the leader of the Opposition in another place, then it was crystalized into a resolution and brought forward as a solemn motion, that \$5,000,000 of that money, which was held in trust, should be diverted from its trust and paid back to the company to do what they liked with it, that company which they have no confidence in and cannot depend on, that they should have that money handed over to them to waste it in bad locations or extravagant connections—money that belongs to the shareholders or has been pledged to them. The resolution did not carry, but it was not the fault of the hon. gentleman's friends that it failed, because it was voted for by a strict party vote under the direction of the leader of the Opposition. I have never known anything in the whole history of Parliament more monstrous than that deliberate attempt to repudiate a contract, and I can well understand how the public look upon