

made substantial improvements and had made homesteads for themselves turned off, because it was the sweet pleasure of the railway company and the Government combined to make a railway station, and consequently a village, where the men's property happened to be. But, after commencing with a great eulogy of this country, of the independent character and the excellence of its Government as compared with that on the other side of the line, the hon. gentleman drifted, as is his wont, into a statement of how much better the people are off on the other side, in Dakota and Minnesota, and how natural it was that people should prefer to be there rather than to remain with us. And he put it on two grounds; first, because of the terrible monopolies imposed upon the people of Manitoba and the North-West by this particular clause of the railway charter, which duty is called the monopoly clause; and secondly, because of the other impositions, referring particularly to the duty upon agricultural implements. As to the latter point, I find that at a meeting of the Board of Trade in the city of Montreal, Mr. Wolferstan Thomas, who will be recognised by hon. gentlemen opposite as a pronounced Liberal, though I will do him the justice to say that he is a gentleman who does not obtrude his politics upon people, who attends to his business as a banker, but who is a very pronounced Liberal, submitted a letter he had received from certain manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canada, in which they say:

"For your information we desire humbly to lay before you the following facts:—Immediately prior to raising the tariff, immense quantities of American implements were rushed into Manitoba, in some cases sufficient to supply the country for several years. We, as Canadian manufacturers, are suffering from the undue competition created by this surplus stock, for ever since the raising of the tariff farm implements are cheaper in Manitoba than they are in Ontario."

That is the practical result, and there is not a man who knows anything about Manitoba, who has examined the price list of implements in Manitoba, who does not know that the farmers there have had their implements just as cheap as before the tariff was introduced, in spite of the increase of the tariff, the difference being that the manufacturers of Ontario have been able to secure the market instead of the manufacturers of the Western States. Then the hon. gentleman tells us of the terrible burdens imposed upon the people of the North-West in consequence of the excessive charges of this terrible monopoly as compared with the charges in the United States. Does he know that last year the price of wheat along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was, on an average, 10 cents more than along the line of the Northern Pacific? Does he know that the tariff charges were very much less than they were on the Northern Pacific, and that farmers in Minnesota actually carried their wheat into Manitoba, paid the 15 cents a bushel, and went back with 4 cents a bushel more than they would have had if they had sold it on their own side of the line? Are these the burdens the hon. gentleman tells us the people of the North-West and of Manitoba are laboring under? No; he prefers to send forth from this Parliament, with the responsibility of his position as a member of this House, and with whatever authority may attach to an utterance of an hon. gentleman having a seat in Parliament, to send forth now, at the commencement of this immigration season, when people are coming into the country and when some are in the country, making up their minds whether they will go to our own North-West or to the American North-West, a statement that it is a natural thing for people to go to Minnesota and Dakota, because they were better off, and are under less burdens as to railway monopoly and competition than they are here. The hon. gentleman ought to know, if he does not, that so far as the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway, up to this time, is concerned, the people of the North-West have suffered nothing from that so-called monopoly

clause, while the people of Canada have gained, as the result of it, the construction of the line which to-day connects the Eastern Provinces with those western territories, within a period which, I venture to say, the most sanguine man in Canada, when that charter was given, did not hope would have been realised. We owe that to the wise policy of this Government in acting, not by the exact terms of the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but within the spirit of that charter, in disallowing Acts which, if they had gone into effect, though I doubt every much if the roads would ever have been built, might, at any rate, have jeopardised the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway in securing the trade of that country over their whole system. As the result of that wise policy we have secured the construction of that railway, and there is not a man in Canada to-day, who will for the moment sink his political feeling and remember only the interests of this great country, but will say that it is a matter of which Canadians from one end of the Dominion to the other should be proud, that to day, as the result of the policy of this Government, he can go from Halifax right into the Rocky Mountains, and, before this year is over, on to the Pacific coast, by a railway on Canadian territory, and with the assurance that we have one of the best railways on this North American continent. As to this policy to-day, it is a policy which will increase and develop the resources of the country in the North-West. One of the railways which is referred to here is the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. That is a railway which, if the statements of hon. gentleman were true, ought to have been built. It goes through what is really the very best part of that country. It goes along the line of the old trail, through increasing settlements, a line which was selected by hon. gentleman opposite for the Canadian Pacific Railway. And yet, with all the advantages of prosperous settlements to be reached by it, with all the advantage of its going through a country that is not excelled by any part of the North-West, and with a subsidy of 6,000 acres per mile, at \$1 per acre, the company have not been able to secure capital for the construction of that railway. Surely there has been no question of a monopoly clause to prevent that.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, there has. The Emerson and North-Western Railway was a connection of the Manitoba and North-Western at St. Vincent.

Mr. WHITE. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Emerson and North-Western Railway was a connection, possibly; but the hon. gentleman will not pretend to tell me that a road running through that country to Prince Albert, and ultimately farther westward, does not go through a country that ought to be able to sustain a railway. If the hon. gentleman pretends to say that that road could only be constructed on condition that the trade of that whole country should be made tributary to American railways, to American merchants, forwarders and business men, instead of being tributary to Canadian railways and Canadian business men, he will find no man in Canada, having business interests in the country, who will agree with him. That railway, if built, will develop the most important part of the country, and I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the policy which is now proposed, wisely supplementing, as it does, the policy by which the Canadian Pacific Railway has been so successfully carried almost to completion, will secure for that north-western country a prosperity such as none of us, a few years ago, ventured to hope would dawn upon it at so early a date.

Mr. MITCHELL. I regret I was not in the House at the commencement of the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I am not quite sure to what extent he challenged the statements which I appear to have made some years ago, in the discussion of his Bill. But I understood him to ask me, amongst other gentlemen who