

long bourne realized that, to perfect this union, means of internal communication were essential through our own territory. Two leading men, Sir Hugh Allan and Sir David Macpherson, both aspired to undertake the task of forming a company to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, as the sequel proved, Sir Hugh Allan, after supplying the means to enable the Government to carry the elections, was constituted the head of a company whose component parts were to be drawn from all parts of the country. This bargain was exposed and condemned by the people, and the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was returned by an overwhelming majority. After five years, however, he failed to satisfy the people in their ambition to solidify Canada in his conception of the means necessary to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, and at the general election of 1878 the verdict of the people was reversed, and they again placed in power the man who alone conceived the possibilities of the country undertaking so vast a task with the difficulties facing it. He adopted a National Policy with the view of strengthening the revenues of the country, to enable the country to provide the means in the face of the falling revenues of the preceding five years. The means he took to secure the construction of the railway is fresh in the memory of everyone. At every step he was met by vigorous opposition. At the granting of the charter he nearly failed on account of the proposal of the Opposition to leave out the Lake Superior section. Again, when the fate of the railway hung in the balance, and a loan of \$30,000,000 was necessary to tide over a financial difficulty of the company, he had to throw the whole weight of his influence to secure this additional financial aid, additional to many generous concessions on the part of the country, and to an hon. member of this House (Hon. Frank Smith) is due, more than to any other, the credit for inducing the Government to take its fate in its hands and make that loan. It is not known to everyone, but we who lived in the interior at that time knew that the company was behind, that every storekeeper, every contractor, every station master, every labourer, were months behind in their pay; the company had pledged every public resource and every private resource; they were met with vigorous opposition by the other trans-continental companies in the money markets of the world, and in their straits they

came again to the Government to ask for more. The business experience of our hon. colleague in this House showed him that if the company were allowed to go down a financial crisis would fall upon the country greater far than befell the people of the United States upon the failure of the Northern Pacific in 1873, and the people of Canada would have had to confess failure in their ambitious undertaking and suffer the reverses consequent upon that failure. He was able to point out to the Government the full effect of the crises, and to persuade the Government to take its fate into its hands and stand or fall by the measure. This is an open secret, and I trust not out of place to put on record in discussing the momentous questions of the day. Is it any wonder that in the excitement of the fierce struggle of those days the statesman who has gone from our midst resorted to methods that were questionable to enable him to carry out the policy which his mind alone conceived possible? He did it for his country: *Requiescat in pace*. We are now called upon to deal with a new Government, with a new policy, and it is not desirable to perpetuate a system which the revelations of last session exposed, and it is not desirable to minimize their effect. The Government of Canada stands at the head of the various governments which our constitution has provided for the government of our people. Its example should be above suspicion, and we have to review causes and effects when we are called upon to give an allegiance to a new regime. How is it that Canadians have rather retrograded in a united nationality, composed as we are of two races and two religions, who have grown side by side, legislated together, owning the same alliance together for a century and a-half? It is because appeals are now being made to the lower elements of our nature. It is not that we are not capable of possessing a higher nature. Our churches, our schools, our social life, all contradict that assumption. Yet here we are to-day as far from merging our individuality in a pure national life, as far from according that mutual respect to one another in our different attributes as if we were two separate peoples. The day has come when those who live in Canada should speak out and condemn wrong-doing, in whatever sphere of our public life it may be found. I am not one of those who despair of establishing on this