

was not marketable, and the company, instead, found themselves in the position of having stripped themselves of all their available cash capital, which they had placed in the hands of the Government, and which had not enhanced the stock one dollar. Under those circumstances, they were obliged to come to the Government again, and say: "Under the circumstances of the company, under the course which hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have adopted, with reference to us and our undertaking, your guarantee is useless to us, and we must stop, or you must make us a loan." Under these circumstances, the loan of last Session was made. The company's available cash had been deposited with the Government. It was placed there, not for the purposes of speculation, not to enable these gentlemen to draw a large rate of interest, but because it was supposed that it would render it possible to sell the remaining block of stock, and that the company would thereby obtain the funds necessary for the completion of the undertaking, and the Government of the country would have, in this way, avoided the necessity of making the loan which they afterwards made. But the hon. gentleman says that only applies to 3 per cent. dividend on your stock; what about the other 3 per cent., which was paid for three several half years? Why was that paid? I can only say that under the original prospectus issued by the original promoters of the company when they sold the \$30,000,000 of stock, they promised that during the construction of the railway 6 per cent. would be paid on the stock. That was published in the prospectus, and the promoters of the enterprise could not, during the construction, refuse to pay it, without being guilty of a breach of good faith. The hon. gentleman has said that the terms made at that time were illegal, that it was paying a higher rate of dividend than the law admitted; but I have reason to know that when the directors asked for subscriptions to that stock they expected that the stock, with the guarantee, with the promise of 6 per cent., would bring an average of 75 or 80 cents on the dollar. If it had, the financing of the company would have been easy. It was under these circumstances that these dividends have been paid. The 3 per cent. paid by the company was paid under a promise put out in their prospectus. They have kept that promise, and continued to pay it until the current half year, when I noticed that the directors have asked the stockholders to forego that dividend. The other was paid under Act of Parliament, under a solemn arrangement made between the country and the company, and the people who took stock, and it cannot be avoided. And the hon. gentleman's policy, for which he was so loudly cheered, is repudiation and spoliation. After seven or eight weeks' study and after eight hours' speaking, the hon. gentleman arrives at a conclusion, and he says: I cannot support this proposition, but if you will ask the gentlemen who hold the \$40,000,000 of stock in Europe, and the gentlemen who hold the \$10,000,000 of stock in the United States, to consent to the Government handing over to the company the money thus deposited to secure the dividend, and will ask them to pay back the moneys that they have already received as dividends—

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. IVES.—I will approve of that proposition.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. IVES. And in the face of the House of Commons, in the face of this country, upon a solemn occasion of this kind, when an enterprise in which this country has invested millions of dollars comes before us, and says it needs our assistance, when we are solemnly proposing to assist it, that is the policy which the hon. gentleman proposes as an alternative for the resolutions before the Chair. He says these gentlemen, under Act of Parliament, promising a 3 per cent. dividend by the Government of this country, took

this stock and paid for it, in faith that the Government of Canada would implement its promise; but the Government of Canada has got hard up, says he; the company have got hard up, says he; they want more money, and you, widows and orphans, and others who have purchased this stock in the expectation of receiving that 3 per cent. interest, should come here and lay your money that you have already received upon the Table of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. IVES. You should consent to the repeal of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. IVES. You should change all you looked to when you purchased this stock, and should thus help us out of the difficulty.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. IVES. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to an expression of regret that the Government had made the arrangement, and of regret that he had not objected to it, and of regret that he had not proposed some resolution condemning it, when it would have been useful to have done it, if the hon. gentleman had said: I am sorry that you will not consent, at this late day, to give up your rights under Act of Parliament, I could have understood it; but, when this company, upon which we all look for the success and development of the North-West, comes before us for assistance, all he has to suggest, all he has to offer, all he has to declare as a policy, is that if the stockholders will return their dividends and consent to no longer claim the 3 per cent. interest promised them by Act of Parliament, he will support that, and he gravely suggests that, until such time comes round, the Parliament of Canada should take no action in the matter at all. I can only repeat the congratulation which I offered to the hon. gentlemen who sit behind that hon. gentleman for having very loudly cheered him when he resumed his seat, because that approaches more nearly to a pronouncement of a policy upon some question that interests the people than any statement that they have had the opportunity before of hearing from him. As I have said, it may be regrettable that this arrangement did not succeed, that it did not answer the purpose for which it was intended, that it did not afford the capital which was necessary. It may be regretted that it was afterwards necessary for the company to apply for the loan of last Session, but these facts exist, and we have to meet them as facts, and it seems to me perfectly childish that we should act in the hope that people who have purchased their stock upon the fact that the Government of Canada, sanctioned by the Parliament of Canada, had entered into an arrangement, would give up their rights and return the money they have received as dividends.

The hon. gentleman made one remark to-day which I heartily approve of. He said he was willing to be measured by the measure with which he measured others. I think, perhaps, it would be worth the attention of the House for a few moments to refer to a most remarkable extract from a most remarkable speech delivered by the hon. gentleman upon an important occasion. The speech which the hon. gentleman made on the occasion I refer to was made before he had been long in public life. I think it was made during the first Session that he had the honor of a seat in this House. It was made before he had become spoiled, I will suppose, by struggling and assisting others to struggle for power. It was made at a time when he was more accustomed to the practice of the legal profession, and when his opinions were certainly more judicial than, I am afraid, they have been on the occasion of the present debate. On the 1st April, 1871, the hon. gentleman made a very important