

contract was being forced through this House. My hon. friend read resolution after resolution proposed in amendment to the contract. Will any hon. member opposite dare get up and say that, in a single particular, the Liberals were wrong? The Liberals in 1881 were twenty-three years in advance of the Conservatives of that day, just as they are to-day twenty-three years in advance of the opposition.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if it is not within his recollection that the Liberal leader denounced in the strongest terms the building of a railway to the Pacific coast? Did not Mr. Blake declare, and in this he was cheered by every gentleman who supported him, that it would never pay for the axle grease?

Mr. SCOTT. It is perfectly true that Mr. Blake, in the heat of debate, in the heat of his opposition to the monopolistic and other obnoxious features of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, did allow himself to go a little too far, and made the remark that the road would never pay for its axle grease, and the Liberals ever since have been sorry for it, and there are many Conservatives who for twenty-five years following this will be sorry for the disparaging remarks they have permitted themselves to make and for which they have not the justification or provocation which Mr. Blake had.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman cannot name one Conservative who made disparaging remarks concerning this country.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. member for Hamilton himself told the House that there was a big section up there which did not have a tree as big as a man's thigh.

Mr. BARKER. I never referred in that manner to the matter which Mr. Blake was discussing from first to last. I was discussing a different section altogether.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman has entirely misapprehended what I said. I said that Mr. Blake did go too far in his disparaging remarks, and the Liberals have regretted it ever since; and I repeat that my hon. friends will be sorry, just as the Liberals have been, for the disparaging remarks they have made; and in that connection I point to my hon. friend's remark that there is a big section of country north of here, in New Ontario or in New Quebec, where you could not find a tree bigger than a man's thigh.

Mr. BARKER. I said nothing of the kind. I said that the reports referred to by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side disclosed only the fact that there were certain timbers on the opposite side of the height of land; and they had no evidence to the contrary.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman should thank me very sincerely for calling his atten-

Mr. SCOTT.

tion to this remark and thus enabling him to make this explanation, because the impression has gone among the people that he said that the section of country through which it is proposed to run this road does not contain timber larger than a man's thigh. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and many others made equally disparaging remarks regarding New Ontario and New Quebec; and I am perfectly satisfied that in the years to come they will regret the disparaging remarks which they made and for which they had not the justification that Mr. Blake had for making the statement which Liberals have since regretted. But respecting the position taken by the Liberal party, as shown by the amendments they offered to the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, is there an hon. gentleman on the other side who dare get up and say that the Liberals were wrong in any particular? Am I not right therefore in declaring that the Conservative party themselves condemn the Canadian Pacific Railway contract? There is not a man among them who would get up and argue that the ten per cent monopoly clause given the Canadian Pacific Railway was a wise and judicious provision. If he should attempt to argue anything of the kind, he would be looked upon as a violent lunatic. But I have here now the exact words which the hon. member for Hamilton did use regarding a section of the country through which this proposed line is to pass. On page 8611 of the revised 'Hansard,' he is reported to have said:

There will be an enormous amount of the money, which the Finance Minister has not taken into his calculation with his actuary, to spend year after year in that way, while the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the west is enjoying the fat of the land, and the government is struggling to finish its 1,800 miles of railway through the muskegs.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman say that there are no muskegs?

Mr. WADE. You said 1,800 miles of muskegs.

Mr. BARKER. The Minister of the Interior is authority for four hundred of them at any rate.

Mr. SCOTT. I approve of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway contract because it does not contain any monopoly provisions; and I say again that another supremely important matter is that the government and parliament are going, for all time, to have absolute control over the rates. Have hon. gentlemen any idea of what the rate monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost the country? I would not venture myself to make an estimate of the weight of the burden, but we can get an inkling of it from the amount of saving effected by the contract put through this House three or four years ago for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, by which a re-