

days, or, taking the season of navigation, 66½ years. And, to-day, the people of the North-West are crying out against the monopoly, and are saying that half-a-dozen other railways should be built instead of one. Yet the hon. gentleman, in the face of these facts, in the face of the enormous agricultural development of the North-West, and in the face of the magnificent crop which has over-taxed all our means of transport, ventures to get up and impugn the policy of the Government in building so speedily the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman is a French Canadian and of French descent, and if it were not that he is so solid a Liberal, I would almost call him a Bourbon who remembers nothing and forgets nothing. Well, Mr. Speaker, having made these few imperfect remarks in answer to the hon. gentleman, I would simply say that, as we are commencing pleasantly, I hope we shall address ourselves to the business of the country with the same disposition. I have no doubt with the energy, the zeal, and the ability of the gentlemen on that side of the House, we shall be criticised, and we invite criticism, and more than that, we challenge criticism, and our challenge I have no doubt will be accepted by the hon. gentlemen. I have only to say let us have a fair field, and let the best man win.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman had continued to confine himself to the tone with which he commenced his remarks, I do not know that a single word further would have been said on this side of the House; but so far from doing that, the hon. gentleman has, within the last few minutes, assumed to lay on the shoulders of the Opposition the charge that we, forsooth, are responsible for the fact that, to-day, as my hon. friend truly said, not by tens, nor by scores, nor by hundreds or thousands, but by millions, the people of Canada, to whom Canada belongs, have found it impossible to maintain a home in Canada. Sir, we accept the challenge of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, as we know, is much more prone to make calculations, such as those my hon. friend exposed a few minutes ago, than he is to state the real facts which he, as a prominent statesman of this country, ought to know. But if he wants to know what was the exact movement of population in the Province to which he and I belong, during the period from 1874 to 1879, when my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie was responsible for the administration of the business of this country, and its movement during the last six or eight years, for which he and his policy are answerable, I can tell him in a few words. During the four or five years when Mr. Mackenzie presided over the destinies of this country, the agricultural population of the great Province of Ontario, of which alone we possess accurate statistics, increased just six times as fast as the returns show it has increased during the seven or eight years the hon. member for Kingston has been responsible for our affairs. Now, Sir, I do not want at present to inflict on the House minute statistics showing the movement of population, but I can tell this House that of some 440 rural municipalities in the Province of Ontario, scarcely twenty can be found in which during the seven or eight years that have elapsed since the hon. gentleman's return to power the total growth has equalled the natural increase of the population. Such a statement as that alone far more than bears out the contention of my hon. friend that, from whatever cause it may arise, whether partly from natural causes or partly from misgovernment on the part of those entrusted with the affairs of Canada, we are in a situation which no man who regards the real welfare of Canada can consider to be wholesome or healthy. During that interval, in spite of our remonstrances, in spite of the protest of those who knew what was going on, the hon. gentleman has persisted in the mischievous policy of expending very large sums of public money to bring into the country immigrants whom, when

they do come, he cannot keep here. Our census returns show that of these immigrants who have been brought in at an enormous expense, three out of four have gone to the United States. I say that these things were not caused, and the proof I have given is ample to show that they were in no respect caused, by the policy of my hon. friend, who, I am sorry to say, is unable to be present to-day. They have resulted, to a very great extent, from the mischievous policy which my hon. friend has rightly denounced, a policy of enormously increasing the debt and taxes of the country, at the very moment when the great country to the south of us is enormously reducing both. Time and again I have shown on the floor—and no man has yet been able truthfully to contradict my statements—that whereas the hon. gentleman entered office under circumstances which gave us an enormous advantage over the United States, the position of things to-day is that in Canada we have totally, utterly, absolutely reversed those advantages; and we are to-day, relatively to the United States, in just the same disadvantageous position as that in which they were relatively to us some twenty years ago. That, I suppose, is to be advanced as a proof of the marvellous foresight the hon. gentleman has just claimed for himself. The hon. gentleman is good enough to tell us that this is a free country, that we are free to ruin ourselves if we like. Well, that is pretty nearly the only freedom of those we formerly enjoyed which the hon. gentleman has left us. Canada is not a country to-day in which a man is free to buy or sell where he pleases, or free to build a railroad out of his own money. Canada is not a country in which those constitutional rights for which our forefathers fought and bled are any longer respected; and I say my hon. friend is strictly right when he says that such a gross and infamous tyranny as that which the hon. gentleman has been perpetrating on the people of Manitoba, has never been and would not be tolerated in any other country in the world possessing representative institutions. I defy the hon. gentleman and his friends to point out to me in any country under heaven, having representative institutions, another instance in which the Government have given a monopoly extending over 2,000 miles to a private corporation, and have impudently disallowed, contrary to all constitutional usage and precedent, contrary to the spirit and essence of our constitution, the right of the people of that Province, at their own cost and charge, without appealing to us for one penny of subsidy, to build a railroad in order to relieve themselves from that intolerable oppression. I wonder that the hon. gentleman, knowing, as he must have known, the facts with respect to this harvest in Manitoba, has asked to receive with pleasure His Excellency's assurances that the harvest of Manitoba and the North-West has been one of remarkable abundance. I advise the hon. gentleman to read the report of the Board of Trade of the city of Winnipeg on that subject. If he will read that report, made by men of every conceivable shade of politics in the Province, he will learn that while Providence has blessed the country with a most abundant harvest, the dog-in-the-manger policy, sanctioned and enforced by the hon. gentleman, has had the result that at hundreds of stations throughout the country, tens of thousands of bushels of the finest grain in the world are to-day lying rotting in the streets, unable to find a market. That is the direct result of the policy of the hon. gentleman. And if, as the temper displayed in the recent elections in Manitoba goes to show, the people there have become convinced that their only chance of redress lies in asserting their rights at any cost; the hon. gentleman has incurred a great and grave responsibility by persisting in the disallowance which we, on this side, endeavored in vain to remove during the course of last Session. I was amused to hear the hon. gentleman enter into a computation, which I do not take the trouble to