

remain idle for a whole year. That is a kind of wisdom, shrewdness and capacity which, I confess my humble inability to admire or appreciate. The hon. gentleman, in order to confirm what he said about the discovery by this American engineer of the route by the Kicking Horse Pass, told us that several American engineers approved of that pass. I can quite understand it; they were patriotic men, and did not wish to have a Canadian railway better located than their own, and they naturally felt pleased that an American engineer had selected a pass which would seriously damage the Canadian Transcontinental Railway in comparison with their own. It is quite natural; and, perhaps, if the hon. gentleman had been a United States engineer he would have approved of it also on the same ground. Then the hon. member told us, in that way he has of telling us, as if nobody had ever heard of anything before he announced it, that it is not the through traffic, but the way traffic which builds up a railway. I was rather under the impression that that was a rudimentary principle now in railway operations; but I should like to ask the leader of the hon. gentleman why it is, if the through traffic is a matter of such small moment and the way traffic is of so great consequence, that the Government laid such stress upon the completion of this road in a hurry—why the Government made it a matter of such vast consequence that the line should be open for traffic in 1886, instead of 1891? That is a question that would naturally suggest itself. The reason given in another place was to get the through Asiatic trade at once. I allow the hon. gentleman to settle that with his leaders. The hon. gentleman referred to a very good thing—that the company had wonderfully brilliant prospects. The only comment I make on that is this—that if the company's prospects are so good, and their property is so valuable, it is a strange thing that they should have to come here to ask us to advance them more money. That is a sort of thing which, I venture to say, no one can quite understand. Then the hon. gentleman, referring, I think, to the language of gentlemen in another place, spoke of the injury that had been done to the Canadian Pacific Railway from the beginning, by

the misrepresentation of the Opposition. As I ventured to say yesterday, in that floundering speech which I made, inasmuch as this misrepresentation had consisted in stating that the company had too good a bargain, it is not easy to see how that could injure their prospects in the money markets of the world. That is another inconsistency which the hon. gentleman and his leader may reconcile. Then, the hon. member devoted a good deal of his time to discussing the grinding monopoly; there was very little said about the monopoly this year, in this House, at any rate. He also pointed out clearly and well the unique advantages which this Canadian Pacific Railway possesses in owning a road which extends from ocean to ocean, it being the only railway company owning such a line. Then again the inquiry naturally suggests itself, why is it that this Company, with these unique advantages, is obliged to come to us and ask for an advance of \$5,000,000? That is a question which cannot be answered and has not been answered. The hon. gentleman intimated that it was an outrageous thing to contend, as it was contended here yesterday by some members of this House, that the company should not be allowed to select their own terminus. I do not think it was contended yesterday by anyone that the company should not be allowed to extend their road beyond Port Moody if they pleased. The only contention was that the Government should not be a party to that transaction, and that if they erected terminal buildings they should be at the place where the Government by Statute and by Orders-in-Council having the force of Statutes, fixed the terminus. The hon. gentleman, not dealing with what was before us, but going back, as the hon. gentleman is so fond of doing, to old times to have a blow at men who are not responsible for what is being done now, and who if they sinned or erred have paid the penalty of their sin or mistake, told us about the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the narrows of Lake Manitoba. I am not denying that that location was a mistake, and of course the Prime Minister of the day was responsible for the location in a sense, but that location was not made by that hon. gentleman. It was made by his chief engineer, and