

hands of the widows and orphans of England and Canada, and it would not be right or fair, after these people had taken their stock upon the faith of an Act of Parliament, to refund this to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to enable the company complete their road. Well, that is a matter between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government and the holders of this stock. It is no concern of the people of this country. That money was placed in the hands of this Government as part of the capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Government had no right to permit these men to draw extortionate dividends upon that capital, until, at all events, the final completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. We know, further, that according to the letter of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, transmitted to this Government during the sitting of this Parliament, bearing date 18th March, 1885, that this company had, on the 1st January, 1885, in the hands of the Government, \$14,288,288 to pay additional dividends upon their stock. The proposition of my hon. friend from West Durham is to appropriate a portion of that money to the completion of this road. They report to the Parliament of Canada that \$5,000,000 will complete and equip this road; they say they have \$14,288,000 in the hands of the Government to pay dividends to themselves. If this is so, why not appropriate this money, says my hon. friend, to the completion of this road? That proposition is wholly unanswerable; there has been no attempt to answer it by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and it cannot be answered successfully. It is no answer to say that many of these stockholders are in England. We know that in Canada there are enough stockholders to obtain from the Government upon their own stock enough to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. So much for the observations of my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe. I have only this further to say in respect to them. The hon. gentleman discussed a great many things, but he did not discuss the real question. He gave no reasons, that I am aware of, why the Parliament of Canada should come to the assistance of the Canadian Pacific Railway on this the third time of their demands. The hon. member, when discussing the proposition of 1884, stated that my hon. friend from West Durham, whose objections were strong and powerful then as they have been to-night, had not pointed out any alternative proposition. He said: The Canadian Pacific Railway Company say that they cannot build this road without disposing of and realising on their assets, and to do that now would be practically to sacrifice all their valuable assets; they say they cannot complete the road unless you lend them \$30,000,000, and if you are not willing to give this money, submit some alternative proposition, and, if it is reasonable, it will receive my assent. Well, my hon. friend from West Durham has to-night submitted an alternative proposition. He has said: Instead of saddling this country with an additional \$5,000,000 to be loaned to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company take out of the hands of the Government, the monies deposited there to secure them enormous, outrageous, extortionate dividends, the \$5,000,000 required, and apply that towards the completion of this railway. What will the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe do? Will he accept the alternative proposition? Verily, no. He will vote with the Government, and if my hon. friend from West Durham had submitted even a more plausible and reasonable proposition than that—and he could not well do it—my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, and other hon. gentlemen in this House, who are the unwavering supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, would not adopt any alternative proposition. We had a speech from my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and a speech from the hon. the Secretary of State. The Sec-

retary of State occupied five hours in the delivery of his speech. He discussed everything beneath the sun, except the proposition before the House. He steered clear of that. He told us something of the French Canadian voyageurs, of their indomitable energy and wonderful perseverance in exploring the great North-West; he quoted a little poetry and read a good deal of prose—he gave us what the First Minister would call a microscopical history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Adam down; he gave us a sketch of the Union Pacific Railway, the Central Pacific Railway, the Northern Pacific Railway, and all their branches, their bonded and other debts, and their exact financial position. The hon. gentleman approached dangerously near the resolution before the House, but he kept prudently clear of it in the five hours speech that he delivered to the House, and he assigned no reason whatever why the Parliament of Canada should give to the Canadian Pacific Railway—because I look upon it as giving this sum—an additional \$5,000,000, and change, in the most material parts, the security the country holds. The Acting Minister of Railways gave us a plain and business-like statement of the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from his own standpoint, but he had to admit the fact that on the 30th of April last the company had in its hands the sum of \$5,776,983 with which to complete this railway. If the company had this sum in their hands then, why are they here asking for five millions more? The Minister told us, further, that they had in the hands of the Government the sum of \$7,390,312 that might be used for the same purpose, or in all, the sum of \$13,167,295 which they then had at their disposal for the purpose of completing this railway. Sir, I ask again if they had that sum of money in their hands for the purpose of completing this railway why are they asking this Parliament to grant an additional sum of five millions and a change in the security? Now, Sir, I say that the whole course of the Government in relation to this railway is of the most extraordinary character, and it is worth while spending a few minutes in briefly reviewing the dealings of the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—not for the last fifteen or twenty years, but since the 1st of January, 1881, when the contract to build the Canadian Pacific Railway was ratified by this Parliament, and pointing out the shuffling and vacillating conduct of the Government; their unreliable and untruthful assurances given to the Parliament of this country when this contract was ratified; the misrepresentations that were made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the false pretences under which that contract was ratified by the Parliament of Canada, and the consistent attitude the Liberal party have occupied for the last ten years, with respect to the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the propositions of the then Minister of Railways, for the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway under the contract, were submitted to Parliament on the 13th December, 1880, on that day, Sir Charles Tupper moved that on the following Tuesday the House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient to grant and appropriate \$25,000,000, according to the terms of the contract relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, transmitted to this House by His Excellency the Governor General, by his Message, dated the 10th December, 1880.

“2 That it is expedient to grant and appropriate 5,000,000 acres of land in the North-West Territory, according to the terms of the contract so transmitted as aforesaid.”

The propositions then submitted by the Minister of Railways to Parliament were of the gravest possible consequence to the people of this country. They involved a grant of 25,000,000 acres of land to this company; they involved the grant of \$25,000,000 in money; they involved the grant of such portions of the railway as the Government of this country had constructed or had undertaken to construct under the terms of that contract; they involved, as we pointed out, a large increase in the national debt of this