

Policy that Canada has adopted, we must look forward not only to building up thriving centres of industries and enterprise all over this portion of the country, but to obtaining a market for those industries after they have been established; and I say where is there a greater market than that magnificent granary of the North-West, which, filled up with a thriving and prosperous population, will make its demands upon Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for these manufacturing products that we, for many years, will be so well able to supply? I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should have made this a battle ground of party. If there was a single question upon which the Government had a right to demand from hon. gentlemen opposite a hearty, cordial and unanimous support, it was on their endeavour to assume, and to deal with the responsibilities which they had placed upon the shoulders of the people of this country. I believe at the time they proposed their scheme they were doing an unwise and dangerous thing; but the improving times, the change that had come over the country, and the development of the North-West, had altered the position. At this moment the eyes of a large portion of the civilised world are centered upon the Great North-West of Canada, and hundreds of thousands of people in every foreign country, as well as the British Empire, are studying the question as to whether they shall come with their capital and industry and build up Canada into a great, prosperous and progressive country. Under these circumstances, hon. gentlemen opposite are unwise and unpatriotic in making this a battle ground of party. There was no necessity for it. I recognise, to the fullest extent, the advantage of having two great political parties grappling with each other, not on the low grounds of personal or party ambition, but on a great national question on which a broad line of demarcation can be made between them, and regarding which they can do battle for great principles on which they differ. We have such a question in the National Policy without dragging in the Pacific Railway. If we are defeated on that issue, hon. gentlemen opposite will take our places irrespective of the policy of the Pacific Railway. Having that line of

demarcation between us, let us, on the great national question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, unite as a band of brothers, irrespective of old parties, show not that we are Liberals or Conservatives, but that we are Canadians, and that in every word that is uttered, whether we sit on the Treasury Benches or on the Opposition side of the House, we feel we owe it to Canada, to ourselves and to our children, to do all that men can do to strengthen the hands of those who are engaged in a great national enterprise, upon the success of which the rapid progress and prosperity of our common country depends.

MR. BLAKE: I shall endeavour to bring forward the amendment of which I have given notice, in the spirit which my hon. friend opposite indicated as correct in the opening portion of his remarks notwithstanding his failure to show that spirit in the course of his speech. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in the view that this question is to be degraded by its discussion as a party question. We hear a good deal of that sort of thing when one party takes a line of argument inconvenient to the other party. Those who adopt that position, in effect condemn the institution of party altogether. They seem to argue that legitimate party questions are such only as are inferior, or of small magnitude; and that great questions should be handled on some other and higher principles. If so, what is the justification for party at all? But they do not carry out their view to its legitimate result in any aspect; for a moment later the hon. gentleman himself said that there was a most important, a most vital question—the so-called National Policy—which he rejoiced was made the battle ground of party. I do not know any reason why we who claim to be as true Canadians as the hon. gentleman—we who have just as great a stake in Canada as he has, we who have our interests here, we who are just as proud and just as hopeful and trustful of the future of this country, if only prudence shall guide her destinies, as the hon. gentleman can be—why we, the Liberal party, should not be free to express our united opinion as to what the interests of our country demand; and it is because, in our opinion, it is desirable that a postponement of the Western