

mind; he was, if I were to use an unparliamentary expression, playing the political hypocrite. Perhaps it might offend the hon. gentleman, and therefore I would not like to say it; at the same time a person can almost say it, and in quoting the hon. gentleman's own language, one can almost make a person believe that he was such. We find him delivering this language in 1881, and I think that is one answer I can give to the challenge made by the hon. member for South Huron. I intend to take up that challenge, and I will satisfy the hon. gentleman that there is no necessity of making any more challenges. Well, Sir, this is what the hon. member for North Norfolk said, in 1881:

"In 1874, we estimated that the North-West was to a great extent worthless, and in 1880 this was proved incorrect. If, in consequences of the changed relations, we believe the country has a value which we believe it did not possess in 1874, we should all agree to rectify mistakes in the past."

Now, Sir, that is the position these gentlemen assume when their previous record is challenged. We find these hon. gentlemen to-day rising in their places in Parliament and giving their word that a certain statement of fact is correct. They make statements here that they will vouch for, and yet three or four years hence, on the floor of Parliament, they will say: "Oh! circumstances have changed. We thought differently at that time; we were misinformed; we had not the information necessary." That was the position of the hon. gentleman then. Then he went on to say:

"True, in the North-West we had, indeed, millions of acres of land. In the North-West we had lands which would give sufficient sustenance for from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000. Let them get inhabitants for it as soon as possible."

In 1880, while decrying the country and the 100,000,000 acres, to build the railway:

"And at the risk of being considered unpatriotic, I wish to place before the House some facts which have a very intimate bearing upon our own interests. I wish to make some comparison between the present condition of this country and the present condition of the United States. I wish to show to this House and to the country that we are at this moment in a critical condition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that if there was any argument wanting to show the necessity for making haste in the building of this railway, I have extracted that argument from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite and their leader. I would ask this House this question: If there is no haste in the building of that railway, if there is no desire to have a railway across the continent through Canadian territory, why was it that upon the eve of a general election the hon. member for East York advertised for tenders to build that road from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean? Why was it, Sir, that that hon. gentleman, on the eve of an election, sent to the Pacific coast 5,000 tons of steel rails, if there was no necessity for the building of that road? Now, Sir, in the face of these facts, is it possible for any person to come to any other conclusion than that there is a necessity for building that road, and that, too, as rapidly as possible? If those gentlemen would pursue a patriotic course, if they could for one moment, or for one Session of Parliament, lift themselves from the mire of party politics, if they could feel that they represent the people, that there is a great responsibility resting upon them as representatives of the people, I think, Sir, that in the language of the hon. member for West Durham, they would join hands with the Government and give their hearty consideration to a question of the importance of this railway to the interests of our country. Sir, the hon. gentlemen know what has been the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it does not lie in their mouths to say that we are going to increase the burdens of taxation. It is true they recognized years ago that it should not be pressed forward if it had a tendency to increase the taxation of the people. That is the cry they raise now. They say it is going to increase the burdens of the people. I would like to ask those gentlemen if they thought so in 1878, when they stood

helplessly in the face of the people, when they stood with their arms folded and said: "We are helpless; our credit is ruined; we have run the country into extravagance; we have not a dollar in our exchequer; our credit is irretrievably impaired." If they at that time made a proposition to build the railway, if they expended a large amount of money upon estimates to build that railway, surely, Sir, they are not the men now to cry out against the promotion of this enterprise on the ground of expense. Surely, if they could build the road then, we can do it now. Now, Mr. Speaker, in discussing this question there are certain things which we ought to consider. In my judgment, the first thing we have to consider is, whether the demand made by the Company is a just and reasonable demand; secondly, has the Company satisfactorily shown to this Parliament that they are not, at present, in a position to complete their road, and if so, then in what time can they do it? Has the Company shown satisfactorily the true state of affairs, and what has brought them about? Are they responsible for it? Has it arisen from circumstances over which they have no control? Will the country be benefitted by the granting of the concession? Has the Company offered satisfactory security? And can we assist them within the spirit of the Resolution of 1872, recognized by all Governments, that is of not increasing the burden of taxation? These are the questions I propose to consider briefly. I think these are the questions for the consideration of this House, and not the random statements of the hon. gentleman made here, that this Parliament and the other Parliament were in favour of one measure or another measure—not the Pacific Scandal that turned one Government out and may turn out another Government. These are not the questions for discussion, although the leader of the Opposition made a long and eloquent speech upon them; although, Sir, the hon. gentleman sailed about as close to the wind as any person possibly could sail in an argument; although he made a speech of three or four hours' duration on subjects that have nothing to do with the question before the House. Sir, I sat patiently listening to him and taking notes—I have a great volume of notes here—and I waited three mortal hours hoping he would come to the question. I took down twenty-six objections he had raised of a fanciful character, which I wish briefly to touch upon later on, and I suddenly heard him close with a peroration, but with not one single word against the resolution, not one single argument advanced against the security offered by the railway. Now, the hon. gentleman can make a speech, use highly polished language; but, Sir, he can plead a case upon one side or the other to suit his convenience. The hon. gentleman can make, I say, a polished speech, make an impressive speech; he can make a speech that the people who listen to him for the first time, but who do not closely scrutinize his arguments, will call a magnificent speech, but when it is stripped of its verbiage, you see what it is made of. Now, Sir, I propose briefly to give some reasons why, in my judgment, the Railway Company is justified in asking for this assistance from the Government, and why the Government is justified in granting their request. I propose briefly, even at the risk of being a little lengthy, to refute some of the arguments, or statements, made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, although it is putting the cart before the horse in every sense of the word, I will first take up the speech made by the hon. gentleman who last preceded me. It seemed to me, Sir, when the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) was making his quotations, it was very much like Satan quoting Scripture. I have heard speeches made in this Parliament, I have heard speeches made in other Parliaments, but I never yet heard a more vulgar, a more abusive speech. I never heard a speech abounding with such gross ignorance; and never