

VERY DARK AND TRICKY WAYS

of which he had had experience while a member of the Conservative party. Well, that is a characteristic, we know. You will always find when a man has not facts at hand and arguments which he can produce, he will always say that if he desired he could produce them, and if they were necessary they could be brought forth. Why did not the hon. gentleman in that long review of all the picnics which had taken place from the western coast of British Columbia to the furthest point of Cape Breton, give a single quotation from these speeches of my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), in which were uttered those damaging and damning statements with respect to this country, thereby displaying a terrible lack of patriotism? It is all very well to say, in general terms, that such and such a thing could have been done, or has been done. I have often had a man come to me and make a great, big, large, general assertion; but the only thing which was necessary to quiet and cow such a man was to take him by the button hole and say: "Sir, I want the bill of particulars," and you had him quite cowed when you made that demand. It is easy to deal in general assertions; any person can do that, but it is a difficult thing to bring things specifically to a point. There are not many men, comparatively, who can do it, and I am inclined to think my hon. friend from King's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) falls amongst the latter category. The hon. gentleman begged the indulgence of the House for reading from *Hansard*. I was glad that he did read from *Hansard*, and do not think he had any reason for begging pardon from members of this House for doing so; in fact, I came to the conclusion that if the larger portion of his speech had consisted of quotations from *Hansard*, it would have contributed quite as much to the edification of the House and very much more to his own reputation than it did. The hon. gentleman delighted in representing the Syndicate, or the Railway Company, as being on their knees before this House and before the country. Sir, that is not an honest way of putting the matter; it is not an ingenuous way of placing it. I do not know of any set of men who are

ON THEIR KNEES ABJECTLY BEGGING

before this Parliament. Let us take a parallel case. Let us suppose that the hon. gentleman who sits in his seat before me, smiling so complacently, should engage a contractor to build his house, that the contractor had started upon the house, that he had made his plans and calculations for raising the money, but found when the house was three-fourths completed, that his plans had somehow or other not turned out as he had anticipated. Suppose he came to the hon. gentleman and said: "Sir, you see the amount of material I have; the amount of property I possess; I want an advance of money from you, as a loan, of so many thousand dollars. I have property good and re-

alizable to the extent of five times the amount, and if you will give me that loan I will finish the contract in two months instead of eight, and I will pay you a percentage on your money as large as you can get elsewhere." Would the hon. gentleman be justified in stating to his neighbor that this contractor was down on his knees, before him, asking for money? I think not, and I take it that this is an exactly similar or nearly similar case in point. The hon. gentleman delights in representing this amount as a drain upon the treasury, and not having the fate of many hon. gentlemen on his side of the House in his eyes, he indulges in precise prophecies. Sir, the preciseness of Vennor's prophecies amounts to nothing beside his; Wiggins' snow storm fame has no chance of lighting a candle beside the hon. member for Queen's, comparing the preciseness, the earnestness, and the certainty which they respectively predict. As he is equally precise as to the time; he does not leave himself much of a margin. He does not say, at some future time, or in a number of years, but in two years. In two years he says the company will be where? They will be here; they will not be

IMPORTUNING THE GOVERNMENT

somewhere else, but before this House, this Parliament, and for what? Asking them for a sum of money. And with what delightful precision the hon. gentleman states that sum of money; it will be exactly twenty-two and a half millions, not a dollar less or a dollar more. Now, sir, let me hold up before the eyes of the gentlemen present this prophecy. Let me ask my hon. friend from Queen's, especially, to jot it down in his note book, for fear he may forget, and if he and I live just two years from this 12th of February, 1884, we will meet some place, and compare notes with reference to this prophecy. If I am not greatly mistaken, if I had a reputation to lose, I would not care to risk it in such a reckless way as the hon. gentleman has risked his reputation today. The hon. gentleman, like two or three others before me, attacked my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), on a point on which my hon. friend's words probably led him to be misunderstood as conveying an idea which he did not wish to convey. It was this: that the Conservative party would lose their prestige, or, in other words, that it would be bad for the Conservative party if these resolutions were not carried, and that, therefore, the Conservative party must vote for them, not because it was good and necessary for the country, but because it was good and necessary for the Conservative party, and thus party considerations were placed above patriotic considerations. Sir, that, I apprehend, was not the intention of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. What he meant to say was this: that the Conservative party in this railway policy had a record which had gone before the country, and that record