

and yet nothing else can be inferred from what the hon. gentleman said. He said: "Where in Canada is there a man having a salary as large as Mr. Vanhorn is getting." Mr. Vanhorn gets \$15,000 a year, and is, perhaps, worth it in the position he occupies. Perhaps there is nobody else in Canada getting so much, but can no man in Canada discharge the duties so well as Mr. Vanhorn does?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think there is a man in Canada with the experience and ability necessary for that position, and that is the reason the authorities who required the services of such a man go to the United States and pay \$15,000 to secure the one they want.

Mr. ANGLIN. That is *prima facie* evidence that he is a good man in the position he occupies, but it does not prove that the people of Canada are different in experience, intelligence, education or energy, or any of the qualities that would fit a man to fill such a position as creditably as does Mr. Vanhorn, and the hon. Minister holding the position he does ought not to insinuate that it does. He talks about our being unpatriotic. If we object to a single statement made on the other side, we are unpatriotic; if we doubt that there were so many millions of acres of fertile land in the North-West, we are accused of being unpatriotic; if, while we admit that we have a vast and fertile region in the North-West, we fail to accept the same exaggerated statements made with regard to it, we are told that we are unpatriotic. Yet, at the same time that the hon. gentlemen were crying "Canada for the Canadians," they believed in no Canadians except themselves and that Canada was all for them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that he is very much mistaken if he supposes that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not been desirous of obtaining the services of Canadian engineers. I may say that there is not an engineer of ability in my service I have not found it difficult to retain, in consequence of the greater inducements offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Smellie, who was the chief in the office here, was receiving \$3,000; they gave him \$4,000. Mr. Duncan, the division engineer in one of the most important sections, has been taken out of my hands—a Nova Scotia engineer, a man of ability and standing—because they are able to give him a much higher salary than I could offer.

Mr. ANGLIN. I was not at all finding fault with the Company. They are doing what they think best in their own interests. They give high pay for the services of those men they believe will serve them most efficiently; but what I am finding fault with is the way the hon. Minister replied to the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), that on this work a very large proportion of Americans are being employed. The hon. gentleman quoted a telegraphic despatch, that a number of conductors had been dismissed lately. The hon. Minister surely does not imagine that we have not men in Canada fit to be conductors; that we have not men in Canada with enough of brains and experience to fit them for such positions; that we turned out of positions the conductors, and Americans were put in their places, and the hon. Minister at once jumped to his feet—to defend the action of the Company, by saying that they had to procure the services of the best men wherever they could be found.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that the gentleman whom Mr. Vanhorn succeeded when they gave him this inducement to leave a road in the United States was an American, Mr. Stickney.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. gentleman, I am glad to see, tries to recede a little from the position to which he was hurried by his zeal. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was pointing out the fact that under the control of the American influences that are paramount in the road

Mr. ANGLIN.

to-day Americans are being put into the places from which Canadians are removed, and he spoke in general terms of the principal positions being held by Americans, and the hon. Minister of Railways defended the conduct of the Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. ANGLIN. And more than that, he attributed to us Canadians the want of intelligence, ability and other qualities to fit men for these positions, and then he took the very extraordinary position that many of us are not Canadians at all, that those who have come here within five or ten or twenty or thirty years to throw in their lot with the people of this country, were no more Canadians than men who had crossed the line to accept employment and who would go back to the United States as soon as they could get better positions. He would have none Canadians except those who are born Canadians, and perhaps he would make it necessary that their parents should be Canadians also. It is not a matter of great importance, but I object to the statement made by the hon. Minister, after the long experience he has had in public life, after the experience he has had at the head of railway affairs in this country, that he is of opinion that we have not in Canada men to be trusted in such positions as that of Mr. Vanhorn. If he holds this opinion why does he not give this gentleman control of the very difficult portions of the road in his own hands. Why are Canadians put at the head of these most difficult parts of the road, if the plea is to be urged that we have no men to fill the easier ones under the Syndicate? He, as Minister of Railways, is carrying on the work in the infinitely more difficult portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I do not think that any one of us has ever asserted that he had not ability to fill the position which he holds, though a Canadian; and I do not know, Sir, that we are inclined to charge any gentleman employed under him with want of ability, though they are Canadians, one of them I believe, however, being an Englishman who came here ten or fifteen years ago, hoping to become a Canadian. The real hard part of the work, the contract through the Rocky Mountains and the Cascade Range, is entrusted to Canadians, but it seems that no one has the ability to carry on the work on the prairie section. We object also very strongly to the extraordinary power possessed by the Syndicate over the Government, and through the Government over the Parliament of this country. The complaint made by the hon. member for Wentworth was a well-founded one. The man who so misconducted himself here last night would never, twelve months or two years ago, no matter how full of wine, have displayed the gross malevolence which he did towards the leader of the Opposition. He was inflated, not merely with wine, but with his sense of power. He who had to convey the will of his masters to the Government on the opposite side, naturally thought, when he was a little elevated, that he was at liberty to come into this Parliament and attempt to browbeat the leader of the Opposition while engaged in the discharge of his duties to the people of this country. It was an exhibition that we all deplored, and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite deplored it as much as we did, but they did not resent it, not as servants against their masters, but as the manifestation of the power which to-day controls the legislation of this country. How does their Secretary, writing to the leader of the Government, express himself? He says:

"In the negotiations which preceded the contract, your Government at once conceded the principle that the same protection which it would have claimed for itself in respect of lines on the interest of United States railways, if it had built the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be granted to this Company."

He goes on to say, with reference to the railways which were chartered in Manitoba:

"They are directly in conflict with the declared policy of the Government, with the conditions of the contract of the Company with the