

to leave some memento of what they have done during their regime in Canada. We look back at the seven years during which these hon. gentlemen have been in power and we ask: What they have done? They came into power at a time when there was unbounded prosperity in this country and by embracing the financial policy of their opponents they have succeeded in affording a fair measure of prosperity to the country. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who has always preached blue ruin in this country, is happy and satisfied knowing that, at least, by the exercise of the policy of the government he and his colleagues have succeeded in shutting up some of the manufacturing concerns in the country. What have they done for the Northwest Territories? They came into power finding that country rapidly filling up owing to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway had, against their remonstrances, their wishes and denunciations been extended into that country, thus opening up these great territories? They have practically done nothing. No monuments remain to their greatness or to their ministerial activity. They went down into the maritime provinces, and by the expenditure of a large amount of money they succeeded in bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal and if they had carried out a wholesome policy such as that which has been enunciated by the hon. leader of the opposition, they might have succeeded in making that railway a great factor in the prosperity of the country. But they seem to have abandoned that undertaking now, denouncing their act of a few years ago in that regard. Neither have they carried out their policy in respect to the construction of a line of railway into the Yukon. It is true that they were stopped in their wild career in that regard by the action of the senate. It is true that the right hon. leader of the government and those behind him denounced the senate for having done that. He said that it was an unfortunate thing that the senate was antagonistic to them because otherwise this project would have gone through. Well, they have a senate now of their own creation, a senate which is putty of their own hands, which is moulded according to their own inclinations. The Klondike is still there. Why do they not pass their Klondike Bill again? There is no danger that it would be killed in the senate. They have their majority in this House which is as tractable as ever it was and I think it is even more so because as we approach the dissolution of this parliament those who are going into soft places are more pliable than ever. I do not think the government has ever had a more tractable majority in this House than it has at the present time, and certainly the government has never had a more, tractable majority in the senate

Mr. BENNETT.

than it has at the present time. Why do they not pass their Yukon Bill, because then we will have the satisfaction of knowing that they have at least erected one monument to themselves in this country. The fact of the matter is that this whole proposition is backed up from two or three sources, and these sources represent, first, the owners of this Quebec Bridge who have unloaded that great public work on the people of Canada, finding that it is hopeless and bankrupt unless it can be loaded on the country.

In the next place the Prime Minister seems to have the idea that he should leave a name to posterity in the work of nation building, and lastly, there is a group of grafters and contractors who hope to make a great deal out of this undertaking. The Act is specially framed to meet the wishes of this element in the community, because, although there are to be three commissioners to look after the work of construction, their position will be a sinecure for they can let no contracts involving over \$10,000, without the concurrence of the government, which reserves to itself the right to let enormous contracts to their favourites without public tender and without competition. There was once a politician in the United States, who when remonstrated with for his course, and threatened with the condemnation by the public, said: 'the public be d—.' That seems to be the attitude of this government to-day in their disregard of public opinion. Look at the humiliating position they are in. The Minister of Finance is speechless in his seat, because this amended contract is allowing the Grand Trunk Pacific Company certain concessions which last year the Minister of Finance denounced as being against the public interest. If he had any strength of character he would declare that he had the courage of his convictions, and leave the government. But resignation is not his forte, or the forte of his fellow ministers. It is true that one or two of them did resign, but the example is not catching. We remember that last night the Minister of Customs instituted a comparison between a civil servant and an hon. member for this House. It was not a very polite thing to do, but nevertheless the Minister of Customs told the hon. member, that if he were thrown out on the cold charity of the world, he would never be able to earn as much as this civil servant. Probably these gentlemen in the cabinet, having heard the opinions which each expresses about the other, have come to the conclusion that if they were thrown out on the cold charity of the world they would not earn as much money as they earn out of their positions to-day. Mr. Blair earned more going on strike, because he succeeded in kicking himself into a position in which there was more pay, and in which there was less risk, because he will not