

then find their lands given away. He wished to call attention to one or two sections of this Bill, which seemed to him as rather of an extraordinary character."

I then quoted the sections, and continued :

"That really provided for the giving away of the very lands required for the construction of the Pacific road, and that not more than nine-tenths—such was the enormous extent of the provision—should be paid out of the proceeds of land sales till the road was in operation. Now, what did that mean? It meant that those lands were considered of sufficient value to pay for the construction of these roads. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan), speaking of the progress made by railroads in Illinois, said that the road was finished and paid for while one-half of the lands were left to the credit of the road. Parliament ought not therefore, to give away that valuable land in Manitoba in so reckless a manner."

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan) corrected me, and I went on to explain :

"But, if this Bill came into operation, if the hon. gentleman was able to induce this House to pass it, and he (Mr. Mitchell) was afraid that he would, he had seen such a subservient following, all this would be changed. There was in that Bill the germs of the absorption of the whole North-West country, and they would not have a twentieth part left wherewith to build their Pacific Railway. The result would be, that the land having been absorbed, the railway would not be built. What would the Eastern Provinces say to such a measure? Would his hon. friends on the other side say they could justify such a course to their constituents; that their constituents would appreciate a measure like this, committing an act of spoliation over the entire country? Who had contributed to the purchase of that country; who had paid the Hudson Bay Company for it? The people. But they paid the money to have the country opened up and developed, and not to be given away in this wholesale manner. If the lands of the North-West were to be used in building railroads, and he approved of such a policy, then this section of Canada was entitled to a fair share thereof for their local railroads, such, for example, as the Miramichi Valley road. The people of old Canada bought the North-West and were taxed to pay to improve it, and they had a right to appropriate a share of the lands to promote the construction of roads in the East as well as in the West."

The hon. gentleman has challenged me in regard to the statements I made seven years ago, when speaking on the subject of North-West railways. He has asked me if I am still of the same opinion to-day as I was then, and he has challenged several other hon. gentlemen in like manner. They can speak for themselves. For myself, I tell the hon. gentleman that I am now, as I was then, in favor of the principles contained in this Bill, and for the reasons I gave on that occasion; that I am to-day in favor of granting all necessary aid to the development of the North-West; that I was an advocate of the purchase of the country, that I was one of those who aided in securing it, and I have always been ready to give my vote to projects for opening up the North-West. The hon. gentleman should not have challenged my opinion, as stated here, and not have attempted to convey the impression that the sentiments I expressed in that speech were sentiments which would tend to retard the progress of the country, or that I refused to give aid, such as is sought for by the Bill now under consideration. I think I have said sufficient on that point to satisfy the hon. gentleman. I did not intend to be drawn into any discussion on this matter to-night, nor would I have been drawn into it, except for the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell. But while the remarks of that hon. member were thoroughly respectful and proper, and such as any hon. member had a right to use, I must confess that the remarks of another hon. gentleman were not, in my opinion, exactly of the same character. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in dealing with this question, has chosen to drag into the discussion of it the whole policy and conduct of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He has chosen to speak of them in a manner—and it is not new to him—that is anything but creditable to a representative in Parliament. It is, perhaps, improper to refer to what took place on a former occasion, and I am precluded from doing so; but the hon. gentleman's remarks to-night, in regard to those gentlemen, were only a little less virulent and a little less reprehensible than were the remarks made by him on an occasion last Session. The hon. gentleman

has chosen to assail the conduct of the Government in granting the charter to the present Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He has ventured to assert that another company was prepared to have built the road for less money. Every man in this land knows how that second company was got up; that hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends outside of this House organised and got up that company. For what purpose? They would never have built a mile of the road, and when I challenged it as a bogus company—and I repeat that it was a bogus company—the hon. gentleman has cast in my teeth the fact that one of the men associated in that class of men came from my own county, and was, he said, a wealthy and respectable man. He referred to Mr. Alexander Gibson by name. Well, I have the greatest respect for that gentleman; he is one man—I do not know how many more were wealthy and respectable men—who would have tried to have carried out their engagements, but Mr. Gibson was a man of means and honesty, a man who would have tried to carry out any engagement into which he entered—and if they were all men of the energy and standing and means of Mr. Gibson, I would have had more faith in them. But I have reason to know more, perhaps, than hon. gentlemen think I know about it; and I have reason to know that that company was got up by that side of the House, and their friends outside of the House, for the very purpose of embarrassing the Government of the day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say, yes. When the hon. gentleman challenges the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a bogus company, he does not know that those gentlemen have spent millions of their own money.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is it?

Mr. MITCHELL. All over the line, extending from here to the Rocky Mountains. The hon. gentleman talks about them coming to this Parliament for aid. What is the cause of it? What has compelled them to come? Has it not been that they proceeded with the work in a manner far exceeding the expectations of gentlemen in this House or in the country, both in rapidity and character? Has it not been from the fact that the enterprise has been decried and run down, that their sincerity has been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite, by their friends outside and the press representing them. Is it not true that they have run down the credit of the country, that they have assailed the character of the North-West, that they have challenged its facilities for settlement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. That they have challenged the value of its lands?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. That they have challenged its future?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say, yes. I say that their organ, to which the hon. gentleman referred, which they say has done to promote the settlement of that country than all the more Government organs put together, has done so. I do not know how much the Government organs have done, but I can refer to one very recent authority from the *Globe*, to show how much it has done, not to promote the settlement and character of the North West, but to decry and damage and slander it, and I will read it.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he did not write a series of letters from Dakota, puffing the territory of Dakota as a place for settlement, quite equal and superior to the North-West.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not, and the hon. gentleman can take my letters, I made a visit to the North-West; I never