have just as great a stake in the prosperity of the land in which we live as the hon. gentlemen opposite. Our fortunes are as much bound up in its prosperity as their fortunes—perhaps more. Our hearts beat as true to this country as theirs can. Why should they not? What interest have we to decry our country? Here we live; here the most of us were born; here our children, those we love, abide; here it is that we hope, when the day of rest shall come to us, to lay our bones; and why in the world should we desire to decry, or defame, or depreciate our country? But if we see that those who are entrusted with the reins of power have abused their trust, if we see that those who have had control of public affairs have mismanaged those affairs, if we find that their policy has been such as to injure the country, to interfere with its prosperity and lessen its chances of progress, I should like to know whether it be not true patriotism to point out those defects, to signalise those errors, to indicate those abuses, in order that they may be remedied. Therefore, Sir, no such language as the hon. gentleman has used, in which, under pretence of patriotism, he seeks to evade criticism of transactions which cannot stand a searching criticism—I say no such language as he has used to-night, any more than like language on former occasions, shall deter us, at all proper times and seasons, and upon all proper occasions, from explaining clearly what we think the condition of this country is, and to what cause that condition is due. Now, Sir, the Secretary of State, in the second volume of the joint speech, as I said, entered upon the ancient history of the question, and he pointed out that the mistakes of the Liberal party had begun at the beginning, that we were mistaken in objecting to the original contract that was made, and to the proposal to ratify that contract by the Parliament of this country in the years 1871-72. He declared that we did object, and that we ought not to have objected. How did the hon. gentleman himself describe that transaction? He said it was an audacious transaction. It was a thing unexampled in the history of the world, up to that time, that a contract and undertaking for the construction of so many miles of railway at one time should have been projected. He said: True it is that France has built large numbers of miles of railways; true it is that Austria has entered into large railway operations; but not even France, with her 40,000,000 of people, not even Austria with her power and strength and population, ever did that which was proposed to be done by Canada in the year 1871. We objected, not that we objected to a Canadian Pacific Railway being built, not that we did not desire that a Canadian Pacific Railway should be built; but we declared then, what events have verified most certainly, that it was not reasonable or prudent to agree that a Canadian Pacific Railway should be built by us within ten years, as prescribed by the obligations of that day. That was our declaration. We declared that it would take a very long time properly to ascertain the route, and that it would take a very long time, without imposing great burdens upon the country, to build the road. And mark you, Sir, at that time that happened which has often happened since. Hon. gentlemen met our declarations with promises of the impossible. They declared to Parliament, they declared to the people of Canada, that they were about to build that railway without increasing the then rate of taxation, and to build it within that time without increasing the then rate of taxation. They boldly stated that that was their policy, that that would be accomplished, and by that means, by a narrow majority of 10, they succeeded in inducing the Parliament of the country to agree to their proposal. I have said that that was the original statement. That was the statement made in the Act of Parliament itself: that the road should be built without any increase of taxation. The Liberal party declared that it was not prudent for Canada to agree to build the Canadian Pacific Railway within ten years, as was then proposed. I want to know how many of the business men of Canada, if the question was put to them to-day, would not say the Liberal party was right in that declaration. The Liberal party declared it was not possible for Canada to build the road as proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it was not possible to implement the obligation without imposing heavily increased burdens on the country. I want to know how many of the business men of the country would answer that proposition in the negative, would dissent from it to-day. How many members of this House would dissent from it; would say to-day that although that promise has not been fulfilled, although the road has not been built within the time, although a longer time has been taken, yet our burdens of taxation and burdens of debt have not been heavily increased in order to secure the construction of this road. The Act of Parliament passed on 14th June, 1872, says:

"Whereas the House of Commons of Canada resolved during the said now last Session that the said railway should be constructed and worked as a private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government, and that the public aid to be given to such undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land and such subsides in money or other aid, not increasing the present rate of taxation, as the Parliament of Canada should thereafter determine."

That was the resolution brought in by the Government of the day; that was the resolution incorporated in the Act of Parliament, forming the preamble of the original Act for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Has the pledge been kept? Has the road been built within the time, and has it been built upon the terms? Have we not had the taxation enormously increased? Have we not had boasts from those benches opposite that $20,000,000 have been paid into the coffers of the country by means of enormously increased taxation, and spent in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Do we not know that loan after loan has been brought down; that a loan was made last year largely for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that a Loan Bill passed through the other day, partly for the Canadian Pacific Railway; and that having raised the taxes to the highest point, and so dragged all we could out of the pockets of the people, and having borrowed all we could and given the cash to the company, we are now told that, having first taken all the taxes and given the amount to the company, and, in the second place, borrowed all we could and handed that too over to them—having come to the end of both those sources of revenue, we are now to give them our notes for the last advance. That is the position we occupy to-night. Under those circumstances, I say the prediction of the Liberal party that the policy of the Administration in 1872 would prove not a realisable policy, not a policy of which events would indicate the wisdom, has been proved by an accumulation of testimonies melancholy in their cogency, their force and their influence, on the future destinies of this country. Then the hon. gentleman has said that this general policy of 1872 was a policy which has conquered the North-West. This is the third conquest of the North-West which hon. gentlemen opposite have made. They made a conquest when they first took hold of the country.—a military conquest. Then it seems there has been a peaceful conquest—I admit there is a domination by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway—and they have had another conquest since the Session opened. So, Sir, we find they are fond of conquest. They are a military form of Government; and now we find, not content with the conquests made under Wolseley and Middleton, they have conquered the North West with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and through the Canadian Pacific Railway they hold it in subjection. The hon. gentleman says that in 1876, at all events, whatever difficulties there had been before, however excusable might have been that short-sightedness,