

sistent efforts to ensure failure. Sir, let me review the course the hon. gentleman has taken with reference to the proposals of the Government to secure the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1880, if I mistake not, the Minister of Railways introduced a resolution setting aside 100,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of forming a fund to construct a Canadian Pacific Railway. What was the course of the hon. gentleman when that proposition came before the House? Sir, was the land worth \$2 an acre then? was it worth \$3 an acre then? was it worth \$4 an acre then? No, Sir; it was absolutely valueless for the purpose of constructing a Canadian Pacific Railway. Not the hon. gentleman, but his former leader, in my hearing stated that you could just as well expect to build the Canadian Pacific Railway with one acre of the North-West as you could with 100,000,000 of acres. That statement was made in my hearing and in the hearing of the hon. gentleman, and it was not rebuked by him. His cue then was to depreciate the value of the land. That was in 1880. In 1881, just one year afterwards, the Government came down with a proposition to take 25,000,000 of acres of those 100,000,000, which were set apart in 1880, and \$25,000,000, and give them to this company, which undertook to build the railway—mark you, a work, the cost of which the hon. gentleman had estimated as high as \$120,000,000. What did the hon. gentleman then do? Was the land worthless then? It had grown in value with extreme rapidity during that short year, from 1880 to 1881. He gave full play to his imagination, and it seemed as if he could not imagine a sum large enough to represent the value of 25,000,000 of acres of land, added to the enormous advantages which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, according to his view, received under that contract. The hon. gentleman then opposed the Government, not because the land was worthless as an asset for constructing a railway, but because they were giving too much, an unnecessary quantity, towards the construction of that road. That was the course of the hon. gentleman in 1881. What was his course next? The moment the contract had been signed, sealed and delivered, the moment the company went on the markets of the world to raise money on the land, and offer their capital stock for sale, there was another change. There was a relapse to the feelings of 1880. The land then became very greatly depreciated in value. The enormous advantages which the company had formerly possessed under the contract began to fade away. The operating expenses began to look very formidable. It began to be ascertained that it would be impossible to operate the road for anything like the gross earnings for years to come, and everything possible was said that could dissuade the public from purchasing the lands and investing in the stock of the company. That relapse was an unfortunate one for the hon. gentleman's sake, for the credit of assisting in any possible way in the performance of an obligation to which he says he, in common with all other Canadians, is bound by the highest sense of honor. The policy of the hon. gentleman has been too retrogressive, indefinite and halting for a live and enterprising young country, stimulated by and competing with the push and energy of our great neighbors to the south. The intelligent and progressive portion have decided that life is too short to wait for the hon. gentleman to decide upon a policy, and they have constantly preferred to entrust the destinies of their country to those who believe in its resources and its capabilities, and who have the courage of their convictions. The hon. gentleman shines as a Liberal when, in a prepared and set oration, redundant with long-drawn-out and well-rounded sentences, he deals with questions outside of living issues; but he is a veritable Bourbon when the progress and advancement of the country is proposed by the measures of his political opponents. His theatrical Liberalism and Bourbonism is

well described by language long ago used of another distinguished lawyer—Thurlow :

“ He saw nothing clear but the obstacles to any course ; was fertile only of doubts and expedients to escape deciding, and appeared never prompt to act, but ever ready to oppose whoever had anything to recommend.”

Nothing in the history of this country or of any country ever showed in a stronger light the evils of political partisanship and the evils of struggles for office than the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the connection of the Parliament of Canada with it. If it had not been for political partisanship, if it had not been for factious opposition in this House, in the press and in the country, if we, as Canadians, had worked shoulder to shoulder, as patriots should do, in the performance of a national obligation, we should have been spared the necessity of the loan of last Session, and of the application which is before us for an additional loan. As has been very well said, in matters of this kind, in which the interests of the country are bound up, we should take a leaf out of the book of the friends of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If we could forget party and think only of country when it came to questions of railway construction, of immigration and of the settlement and development of the country, it would not have been necessary for this application to be made or for the application which was made last Session. But, fortunately, the Government have been strong in the House and in the country. Fortunately, they have not only been strong, but they have been courageous. They have realised that the people have decided that this road shall be built and completed, and that the country shall be settled and developed, and their policy has been a settled and consistent one from first to last, and I trust, before the fall of the Administration, they will have the pleasure of seeing a completed enterprise. I remember last Session the hon. gentleman taunted the Government with being partners, sleeping partners, he said, with the Canadian Pacific Company. He never said a truer thing.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. You are entitled to all the pleasure you can get out of that statement. The Dominion of Canada is a partner with the Canadian Pacific Railway in this respect: they are jointly interested in the settlement and development of the North-West; they are jointly interested in the flow of immigration and the development of the wealth of the country. In that sense, in that most important sense, the people of the country at large are partners of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am very sorry to say they have received no assistance from members of the Opposition. Fortunately, in this discussion there are some objections upon which the hon. gentleman formerly consumed a great deal of time, but which are no longer heard. We hear nothing now about the people of the North-West being ground under the heel of a soulless monopoly. The experience of the people of Manitoba in the disposal of their wheat last fall, when the poor, down-trodden, ground-down people of Minnesota were obliged to haul their wheat over the international boundary and pay a duty on it, in order to bring it over the Canadian Pacific Railway, that put an end to the well-rounded phrases which the hon. gentleman on several occasions was wont to indulge in, that the people of Canada were being ground down under the heel of a soulless monopoly. The hon. gentleman used to doubt whether the road would be completed in its entirety. He believed that the prairie section only would be built; but we hear no more of that. He used to tell us that if the road was completed, it never would be completed in the time fixed by the contract, and it would be depreciated in character. We hear no more about the railway having depreciated below the character fixed in the contract. Everybody admits, the hon. gentleman himself does not dare