

about the character of these same new masters. Fortunately, Sir, that same volume of *Hansard*, to which I have referred, contains some means of information as to the opinion of gentlemen on the Treasury benches, of one at least of the most prominent and important of the gentlemen about to be charged with those great and extensive powers. It will be in the recollection of members that my esteemed friend, Mr. Donald A. Smith, having been very unfairly assailed in his absence, by gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, took, on the last day of the Session of 1878, the only opportunity in his power of vindicating himself. Let us see how that hon. gentleman who, we are now told is one of those honorable and able men—and I do not dispute the assertion for a moment—whose character, standing, experience and general ability are so great that the Government with a light heart are about to entrust to them the most extensive powers ever entrusted to any set of men within my experience, in this century—was described by members of the present Government. It will be interesting to know how some of those hon. gentlemen then regarded that hon. member to whom I have referred. He had been defending himself from a very unjust and very unfair attack made upon him. Here is what the present Premier of Canada was good enough to say of that hon. gentleman. I quote from page 2561 of the *Hansard*, 1878:

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is not one single word of truth in that statement—not one single word. The hon. gentleman is now stating what is a falsehood.

Mr. SMITH. These statements were true, as surely and certainly as the hon. gentleman and I are here.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order, and I want to ask you whether it is competent for any hon. gentleman to stand up in this House and detail what he himself admits are private conversations. Is it competent for a man to detail private conversations, while falsifying them?

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SMITH. I do not look upon them as private conversations, and I give the exact truth. I was sent for as a member of the House by the gentleman at that time the head of the Government, and he—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. The statement that he never sought a favor from the late Government—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. Is as false a statement—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. As ever issued from the mouth of any man, and he has continued—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. With a tissue—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. Sir, of as false statements as were ever uttered—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. By any man. That is what I will show him.

Mr. SMITH. I never asked, prayed for, desired, or got a favor from the last Government.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell a favor he asked for?

Then, apparently, the Sergeant-at-Arms makes his appearance. Mr. Smith proceeded with his defence, and the Minister of Railways interrupted him with the cry of "coward, coward, sit down." Mr. Smith again proceeded to justify himself when the Minister of Railways again assailed him with the cry "coward," "coward," "coward." Mr. Smith thus replied:

"You are the cowards."

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SMITH. Nay, further, there were two gentlemen, members of this House—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SMITH. The day after that 4th November—

Mr. TUPPER. Coward, coward.

Mr. SMITH. Who came to me with a proposition to throw over the right hon. gentleman and the present member for Charlevoix, if I would consent to give up the position I had deemed it my duty to take in the House the evening before, and would support the Government by voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. Mean, treacherous coward.

Mr. SMITH. Who is the coward, the House will decide—it is yourself.

Mr. TUPPER. Coward, treacherous.

Mr. SMITH. I could not support them—

Mr. SPEAKER. Admit the Messenger.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That fellow Smith is the greatest liar I ever listened to.

Now, Sir, I give these hon. gentlemen their choice of this dilemma. It is perfectly well known that one of the most prominent member of this St. Paul and Manitoba Railroad Company, and, by consequence, of the Syndicate, is that honorable gentleman, termed by Ministers, the late member for Selkirk. I entertain for him, as I always entertained of his friends with him in this contract, a very high opinion indeed. But I really think that unless the statements made last night by hon. gentlemen opposite are intended to be received as, perhaps, they will be received by that gentleman as a full and ample apology—considering that he and they are now to be entrusted with sovereign power—some formal apology ought to be made to them, or those pages should be expunged from the *Hansard* of 1878. The sins of hon. gentlemen opposite will find them out. Let this be a lesson to them to keep their tempers under control in this Chamber. This affords the very best proof of the substantial correctness of the contention of my hon. friend the member for West Durham. It is quite clear they have very imperfectly comprehended the remarkable strides and development of the American railroad system. When brought in contact with men of great practical experience and ability, who thoroughly understand all the workings and developments of that system, I am not astonished those hon. gentlemen proved quite unequal to the encounter. I think it is remarked by the late Mr. Kingsley, in one of his works, that where savages and civilized men come in contact, a very curious result ensues. The savages are apt to be overpowered and dazzled by the wonderful achievements of civilized men, and to fall into the not unnatural error of mistaking the very vices which are a blot on civilization for the things which give that civilization its strength. It appears to me the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are somewhat in the same position in dealing with the extraordinary development of the American railroad system. I admire, as much as any man can, the great enterprise, talent, inventiveness, and practical resources which the Americans have displayed in pushing and extending their railroad system; but I call attention to the fact that the great virtues of the American system are these, mainly: they have provided, to the utmost of their power, for unrestricted competition in railroads, and their policy is always liberal both as regards the general Government and the States in dealing with actual settlers. These hon. gentlemen deliberately turn their backs on these features of the American system which are good, and deliberately select those which are bad. They deliberately select or favor, so far as lies in their power, all those grinding monopolies which, in cases where competition is restrained, have proved detrimental to a very considerable portion of the United States. And they deliberately mould their land policy so as to discourage to the utmost the actual settlers. There is another aspect of the question. We are not giving to those hon. gentlemen of the Syndicate things that cost us nothing. I would like the House to reflect what is the sum total the North-West has cost Canada up to this time. I doubt very much whether it would be wise for us to take the latest standard of cost furnished to us by the Minister of Railways. I prefer to take the standard furnished to us a few months ago by Mr. Sandford Fleming, who, I suppose, it will be admitted by everyone, is at least as competent a judge as any other engineer; but, Sir, I will not insist on this, if the hon. gentleman objects, but will strike off two or three millions from that estimate. According to Mr. Fleming's previous estimate the railway we give would cost \$33,000,000. According to his later and revised estimate the amount is \$29,000,000. The surveys, purchase money, etc., may be put at \$5,000,000 more.