

to which he has referred to-night. I remember his graphic description of that long night's sitting we had here; hon. gentlemen moved an amendment, affirming the principle that ought to be adopted; they made their speech upon it; no answer was vouchsafed; the members were called in and the large majority voted them down by brute force, and so the hon. gentleman went on with his description. Well, the hon. gentleman might, when he goes into the country next, at least tell the people that we had been discussing that question for six weeks on the floor of Parliament, that every single point in this series of amendments had been fully discussed, and that it was simply a question of whether there ever would be an end to the discussion in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the hon. gentleman made his statement, and what was the result? In that town where he made the statement 125 of a majority was recorded for the Government, and in the entire constituency, in other parts of which the hon. gentleman spoke, there was, with the exception of three polling sub-divisions, actually a larger Conservative vote polled than was polled in the election of 1878; and I think I may fairly say that what occurred in that constituency, in spite of the eloquence of the hon. gentleman, will occur in other places when the day of trial comes. Why, Mr. Speaker, the last subject which they care to discuss to-day before the people is the National Policy; my hon. friend knows, in his heart of hearts he knows, that he would give the best dollar he ever was worth—yea, more than that—he would give half his last year's business, if he could wipe the National Policy question out of existence altogether, if he could only close the mouths of the gentlemen who sit on the front benches before him from presenting this perpetual Free Trade view to the House and the country. He would give his best half-year's business if he only could by some method prevent them from ever proposing the Free Trade view of the Tariff. If stories be true—I am not given to repeating matters of that kind in Parliament—an effort was actually made to induce a constituency in this country to drop the ex-Finance Minister at the next elections. I know the hon. gentleman found it necessary to leave this House and go all the way to Centre Huron in order to be present at the convention, and with his gracious smile and pleasant face mesmerize it into negativing the suggestion made in other quarters that he should be left at home that they might rid themselves of his influence on the subject of a National Policy.

Mr. PATERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman does not mean that I made an attempt of that kind; I have not heard of such an attempt being made.

Mr. WHITE. I have too much respect for the hon. member for South Brant to think he would do that secretly that he would not do openly. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, would be glad to get rid of this question. In their heart of hearts, if we leave out doctrinaires like the hon. members for Bothwell and Centre Huron and the hon. member for Charlotte, there is not a member who would not give his best half-year's income to get rid of the National Policy as an issue. But I tell them this now, that when the trial comes they will be just as anxious to get rid of the Pacific Railway contract. There is no subject I know of that has been a subject of controversy between political parties in this country, where the argument is so overwhelmingly on one side, and where, what is very much better, the facts are so much on one side as that in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We shall probably have an opportunity of discussing it before the Session closes, because, if what I hear be true, hon. gentlemen opposite are going to move amendments to almost every motion to go into Committee of Supply. I shall not object; it is a fair and legitimate course for the Opposition if they think fit to adopt, but when the time to discuss it comes there will be no difficulty whatever in dealing

with it. Then as to this question of locking up lands in the North-West, what do we find? If we wanted any evidence that those hon. gentlemen do not believe—I use the word in a parliamentary sense—the arguments which they are using in respect to the influence of the Pacific Railway, we would have it in the fact that a number of them are now risking their whole fortunes almost in land investments in that country, which if all that was said last Session be true is going to be utterly paralyzed by the influence of the enormous monopoly imposed on it. What is the position of the country to-day compared with what it was in 1878? When hon. gentlemen went out of office what was its condition? Its industries were paralyzed, its commerce was almost at a standstill. There was scarcely a merchant or a man who had a dollar to invest in any enterprise in Canadian industries, but looked with anxiety to see whether the same insane policy—and insane it was, in view of what was taking place on the other side of the line—was to be continued or not. The hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side, before the last election, and referred to a statement made by the hon. First Minister, that the very moment the elections took place and the Conservative party were returned there would be a revival of hope in the country. I say, there was a revival of hope in the country. That the mere passing of an Act was to operate as if by magic, without the influence of the operation of that Act on the country, nobody for a moment could believe; but what they would and do believe is this, because it is true and they had a right to believe it, that the fact of placing that Act on the Statute-book had this effect: more men at once looked forward to see where to invest their money in the industries of the country with a fair opportunity of receiving a profitable return. The attempt of the hon. gentleman opposite to contrast that the prices of bank stock in September, 1878, and September, 1879, when the hon. gentlemen know that matters were unsettled in the latter year in consequence of bank disasters that occurred at that time, the result not of what had occurred in the year immediately preceding, but of continued mismanagement which at last became developed and known to the outside world—the idea of stopping a moment to contrast the two periods, was simply to insult the intelligence of the country, and an injustice to his candor in dealing with questions of this kind. At that time business was paralyzed, the industries of the country were struggling almost hopelessly, our great North-West was looked upon by our best minds as an incubus, and people talked of abandoning it, and the people were looking forward with but a slight gleam of hope to the future of Canada. What is our position to-day? In every town and village we find reviving trade, in every homestead we find reviving happiness. The hon. gentlemen opposite tell us this Government does not make the sun to shine; but I heard a gentleman the other night say that this policy did make the sun to shine in many a household where formerly there was only sorrow, gloom and hopelessness. In regard to the North-West to-day, instead of its being looked upon as an incubus, we find our best men are going there. In every township of the country the hon. gentlemen opposite, like the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, know from letters they have received for maps of that country, that you cannot go into a bar-room or into a friend's house but the subject of the North-West is the general theme. In relation to the obligation undertaken by the Dominion for the construction of the Pacific Railway, we find that by the surplus of three years which the policy of this Government has brought about, and by the advantage which will result to Canada in saving of interest by the redemption of our bonds, which in the three years we shall have to redeem, we shall be able, without spending a copper as represented by the annual obligation by way of interest, to pay every