

will give the required new money; it will keep our securities just as they are, and it will prevent the necessity of reducing our rate of interest. If the shareholders want \$14,000,000 more let them ask us for that money of theirs which the Government now holds. My view is that the company ought to apply to Parliament for what Parliament would, no doubt, willingly give them; that these shareholders should say: Gentlemen, we find that we miscalculated, that we took too much of our money as profits on our stock. We find that we want some of that money for the object to which it should be devoted, namely, to put it into the road which we were to build, and from the earnings of which we were to receive dividends; will you please hand it back to us, this \$14,000,000, so that we may put it into the road, that it may go to its proper destination and earn its appropriate dividend. Let the shareholders make that statement to us, and we will willingly comply with their request. We will say: That is where the money should always have gone, certainly where it ought to go now. I believe no ground whatever has been made out for granting the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the proposal of the Government, which is calculated to impose for all time to come a further charge of fifteen millions of dollars on the commerce and trade of this country, to exaggerate to that extent the rates and tolls required to make the Canadian Pacific Railway remunerative; and all this is to be done because the stockholders in this enterprise, having realised from \$60,000,000 of stock \$24,500,000, have chosen to appropriate \$24,500,000 to pay dividends upon their stock. I say they ought to be told: Gentlemen, you can have the \$14,000,000 when you desire to obtain it. Assemble in general meeting, and if you want that money, come and ask us for it, and it will be handed over; it is your money, deposited as a fund for you; but while it is there, it is nothing less than impudent for you to come to us and ask us for more money, ask us to impair our security, and ask us to allow you to make further permanent charges on the road, simply in order that your dividends may be assured beyond peradventure. Holding these views, I oppose and I protest against the passage of these resolutions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has succeeded, after the years that have elapsed since 1878, in getting up what might be called a rather hearty cheer.

Mr. DAVIES. The occasion called for it.

Mr. IVES. Yes, the occasion called for it, because it is the first time the leader of the Opposition ever announced a policy upon any subject, and having announced a policy on this subject, the occasion called for a cheer, which the hon. gentlemen gave him. I congratulate those hon. gentlemen upon having got up a hearty cheer, and it was a proper return for seven weeks of arduous labor on the part of the leader of the Opposition, and of eight hours labored speaking in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. IVES. You are showing your natural tendency by grunts, but you will not disturb me. There was a time, a few weeks ago, when Conservative papers intimated that the leader of the Opposition was not exactly in accord with those of his followers in this House who were obstructing the business of the country, week after week, in the discussion of the Franchise Bill; and it was said, as a reason why the leader of the Opposition was not in the House, that he was not in accord with the course which hon. gentlemen were taking. But after the evidences of labor which he has now given us, I think he deserves to be acquitted of that charge. I think it is a quite satisfactory explanation that during the

last seven weeks he has been preparing this long array of figures, which we have heard a dozen different times before, and which are served up to us in as many different forms as the hon. gentleman has made speeches. As it is nearly six o'clock, I propose, for the few moments remaining before that time, to deal with one of the matters which the hon. gentleman referred to, for the purpose of inspiring a joke, occasionally, in the somewhat dry details of his speech. The hon. gentleman referred to a number of matters beside the question, for the purpose of amusing us, but he only made one really successful hit and that was the reference to the Secretary of State crying "All aboard for the West." He asked at what point would the hon. the Secretary of State embark; would he embark at Montreal or at Quebec? He also referred to the Acting Minister of Railways as the conductor of that train, and he said the only difference between him, as conductor, and the Secretary of State, was that he would say, from Montreal: "All aboard for the East," and *sotto voce*—so low, in fact, that I could hardly hear him—he made a subsequent reference to the Acting Minister of Railways in connection with the proposed short line subsidy from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. I would ask the hon. gentleman what sort of conductor he would make for this train? Where would he get aboard? Would he get on board at Callander or in the prairie region? If he only built the prairie section of the road, as he has always advocated, I fancy he would have to use some of the water stretches of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to get there, and then taking his prairie road, he could not go to British Columbia. He could not get on board at Port Moody, at Calgary, or even at Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. McCALLUM. He would get on at the Fort Francis locks.

Mr. IVES. If he were there he would have a fine place to start from, as he would spend the night in the Neebing Hotel. I quite understood why the hon. gentleman spoke *sotto voce* about going away from Montreal, because I observe that it is necessary for the hon. gentleman in order that he may avoid wounding the feelings of some of his own supporters, to speak very delicately on that tender subject of the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Maritime Provinces; so delicately, in fact, that although so many days have elapsed since the resolutions were brought down, the *Globe* newspaper has not had a word to say with regard to building a railway from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. It was necessary for the hon. gentleman to speak low, more particularly on account of his hon. friend on his left (Mr. Laurier), who certainly must be pleased with the prospect of extending the railway from Montreal to his own constituency at the port of Quebec.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MACMASTER. I rise to ask the permission of the House to bring up a matter by way of privilege—to make an explanation personal to myself. In the *Montreal Witness* of the 16th of June there occurs the following article, under the heading of "Tampering with the *Hansard*:"

"After recess, Mr. Blake, on a question of privilege, pointed out an interpolation which had been inserted in the revised or permanent form of the *Hansard*, in a way which leaves little doubt that some one has been tampering with the official debates. The alteration is made in the debate in the *Hansard* of 8th June, in which Mr. Macmaster made his unfortunate statement that the Highlanders of 150 years ago were practically savages. In the first draft of the *Hansard*, which appeared on the day following the debate, there is no break in Mr. Macmaster's remarks, but in the permanent edition of the *Hansard*, after members have had an opportunity of correcting their speeches, there appears, just at this point, an interruption by Mr. Blake, to the effect that the ancient High-