

I will read from the speech of the hon. gentleman, on page 1,905 of the *Hansard* :

“If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is proceeding on the hypothesis that in Canada alone is there any land available, he will find himself greatly mistaken. We have found it very difficult indeed, in Canada, to promote settlement, even where the land was given away by the Government. It is still more difficult to send settlers to the far-off western country, where they have the initial difficulties of a new country to contend with, not less in amount though different in kind, than the settlers of our own wooded districts.”

MR. MACKENZIE : Where is the place I said the land was worth nothing ?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : I said the hon. gentleman undervalued the character of our lands.

MR. MACKENZIE : I have taken down the hon. gentleman's words ; he stated I said the lands were good for nothing. Read the passage.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : I will tell him where I find it ; I find it in the statement that you cannot promote settlement where you give the lands away. If that does not sustain my assertion, then I know nothing about the meaning of the English language. But not content with saying that we could not promote settlement where the lands were given away, that in the North-West the difficulties are greater than in any other part of Canada, the hon. gentleman went on with this lugubrious account of our country :

“ They have a long winter, absence of lumber and building materials, and difficulties of transportation. We must, therefore, make up our minds, if we are to settle that country, that it will be done only at the expenditure of a large amount of money to aid settlers in going in and in giving them land free after they get in. That is my conviction.”

You not only cannot get them to go and settle the lands when you give them away, but if you do you have to pay them for doing it. If we did that where was the \$100,000,000 to come from on which we were asking the House to sustain us in the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway ? Suppose we had failed under these circumstances, would it have been very surprising ? As has been already stated by the hon. the First Minister, the communications with the Imperial Government were confidential, but I may say this, that after the most friendly and frank discussion of the sub-

ject with the Imperial Government, and especially with the Colonial Minister, concerning the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway—we found, and for reasons I think the hon. gentlemen opposite will quite appreciate, the time was not the most propitious for the purpose of pressing them for a definite answer—we came away with the impression that, at no distant day, we would be in a position to obtain from the Imperial Government the most favourable consideration of our proposals. That this is a question in which Lord Beaconsfield's Government felt the greatest interest, we can have no possible reason to doubt. If the hon. gentleman opposite was about making an appeal to the country he would not like to be handicapped any more heavily than was absolutely necessary for the time being ; but there is another reason why we did not think it necessary to press very strongly the Imperial Government in relation to that matter. It is this : after the discussion, not only with members of the Imperial Cabinet and with the Colonial Minister—after discussion with the first minds among the Opposition to the present Government in England—after having discussed this question exhaustively with the first capitalists in England, we found we were in a position, without any fear or doubt, to go steadily forward in the prosecution of this work—knowing that the funds required could be obtained on most favourable terms by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and would be forthcoming as fast as he would require them, independently of any guarantee. I may still add that our mission was not altogether fruitless from another point of view. If we were to go on with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was not desirable that we should lose the opportunity of obtaining, at a reduced rate, a quantity of steel rails for that Railway ; and I am able to tell the hon. gentleman that we were more fortunate than himself—we had the good fortune to be there just at the time when iron and freights had fallen to their lowest point, and we were successful in making a purchase of 50,000 tons of steel rails, at a million and a-half dollars less than the hon. gentleman paid for them, and at a million and a-half less than what they could be purchased for since.