

this means, destroy the good name of Canada, they will not destroy the good name and fame of the statesman who has presided over the destinies of the country for the last twenty-five years, they will not even destroy the Pacific Railway, the greatest of all the enterprises we have undertaken. Since I first entered political life I have been accustomed to see the persistency of my hon. friends on the other side in speaking of the bankruptcy of the nation. I heard it in 1854, when I was not fourteen years old, on the first occasion, when I heard two of the greatest orators of our Province, the great Morin and the great Papin; I then heard statements that the Grand Trunk Railway system had brought the country to ruin and bankruptcy. I heard the same thing years afterwards, and still I have seen the country growing more and more prosperous year after year. I heard the same thing in 1866, when the scheme of Confederation was before the country, when, from parish to parish and from county to county, I, though a young man, was fighting the battle of Confederation; I heard gentlemen saying that Confederation was to be the ruin of our Province, and was to result in the bankruptcy of the whole Dominion; that the vast stretch of country embracing seven Provinces, and extending from ocean to ocean, without any backbone, would result in disaster. But, Mr. Speaker, there was a backbone; there was the energy of British subjects, the energy of the men who had made this country; and that backbone has saved the country, in spite of all that defamation, in spite of all those who have been decrying our country. I heard the same thing again in 1870, and I remember, in 1872, when I was contesting one of the seats for this Parliament, that I heard one of the best champions of Liberal ideas in the Province of Quebec, my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), saying that the price paid by the Government of the day for the North-West, £300,000, was a loss to the country, and that those wild Provinces, where the buffalo still roamed, would be no profit to us. Since that, I have seen millions upon millions of capital invested in that country, and thousands and hundreds of thousands of people flocking to that region, which will become the granary of British North America, as the north-west of the United States became the granary of that country. I have witnessed the progress of our country, in spite of all that has been said to retard it. And, after that, when this great enterprise of the Pacific Railway came before the public, I heard a repetition of the same thing which I had previously heard in 1854, in 1866 and 1867, and in 1869 and 1870. I heard it in the beginning of that scheme, and still we have seen the result; we have seen the country growing more and more, and becoming the admiration of statesmen and men of business in the United States, and creating a feeling of jealousy on that side of the line. But there is one thing which I have not heard, and which I should wish to hear from my hon. friends. During my trip through the United States last year, the campaign for the Presidency was in progress. Never was there a campaign in which personalities were so freely indulged in as that; personalities were at the top of all discussions that took place. It was to be regretted, and good men regretted it; but I found what I regretted I did not find in my own country, that while every one who spoke on the platform referred to his opponent as the worst and the meanest of men, not one of them dared to cast the least shade upon one of the stars of the flag of the United States, but all united in upholding the credit of the country and of every State in which the campaign was conducted. Sir, the calumnies of those who want to villify the Government and who desire to destroy the credit of the country, of those who want to destroy the great work of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be of no avail. They will be like loose winds, blowing smoke and sand, and carrying dark things with them. Their dark ideas and their dark thoughts, everything that is dark in their

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

heart, and which is blown and breathed against us and against this enterprise, will not do more than those winds which cannot destroy the monuments of the old world. They may give a darker shade to the granite and the marble, but the solidity of the pyramids and of the great monuments of Europe remain, as the Pacific Railway will remain, as solid as if these winds had not passed over it.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, if the rest of the Cabinet do not desire to continue the discussion, I will trouble the House with some reference to the speeches we have heard, and the proposals on the table. I congratulate the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) upon the events of this day. I congratulate the High Commissioner upon the events of this day. Government brought him out before, and specially for the purpose of engineering the last Canadian Pacific Railway aid measure through. He came at their call and spoke, although not qualified to vote. He comes no more.

"Oh, for one blast of Roland's horn  
On Fontarabian echoes borne!  
Through the dark Ronces Valles pass."

As he came not, it was necessary to fill his place by a double performance. It was not exactly a duet. I can hardly call it a concerted piece, for there were some discords between several of the expressions and phrases. There was not that degree of harmony which I should like to have observed between the arguments of the hon. gentleman who moved and the hon. gentleman who seconded the resolution. We have had a speech, in at least two volumes, with this peculiarity about it, that the authors of the speech seemed to reverse the proper order of these volumes, because the modern history came in the first volume and the ancient history came in the second. We have had a joint composition. One was a speech composed of figures, and the other was composed of figures of speech. I will admit that there were a good many tropes in both. But, Sir, although I have, upon this occasion, to meet these two hon. gentlemen, who have taken a course unprecedented in my brief parliamentary experience, on the occasion of a Ministerial proposition, of pressing two speeches in support of their measure before a voice from the other side was heard; although I have got to meet them both, the same spirit which induced them to think it was necessary that there should be two opening speeches, may, I hope, serve to sustain me in this unequal contest, as I have been sustained in former contests against the eminent statesman whose place they have attempted to fill. This is a great day for Quebec. Her Ministers have opened the battle. Her Ministers have commenced the war—in the absence, it is true, of the Minister of War, who may have gone away by the *Grand Nord*, for aught I know; but they have commenced the war. But would not one of them have done? Was it absolutely necessary that they should both speak. Would no one hon. gentleman from Quebec have been adequate to open the Ministerial proposition? Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke last at some length, closed his speech somewhat in the tone of Sir Charles Tupper, and in a course and strain of exhortation which we have heard not unfrequently when from that side of the House, they invite us to discuss the question. They say that they invoke criticism, that they challenge it, that they are not at all afraid of it, that they rather relish it. If our observations indicate that their policy has been injurious to the country, and that the country has been injured by their policy, oh, they say, you are decrying the country, you are injuring the country. Criticise us as much as you like, but admit that we have caused the country to prosper, and that our policy has been all that it should be. These are the conditions under which the hon. gentleman invites us to discharge our duty. Now, Sir, we