

depreciate our country—to do that which the *Globe* has often been untruly blamed for doing—to say that our land is not worth as much as that across the line :

“ If our land subsidy of 25,000,000 acres be worth two dollars an acre, the Northern Pacific lands must be worth much more. For while the population of the whole Territory through which the Canadian Pacific runs, from Callander to the Pacific, does not at this hour exceed 200,000, the smaller and more compact region traversed by the Northern Pacific is comparatively well settled. * * * If it be said that the mountain section of the Northern Pacific was more costly than the mountain section of Canadian Pacific Railway, and that in the case of the Canadian Pacific the heavy work on the Pacific slope has been assumed by the Government, the answer is that the Northern Pacific had no rock division, 650 miles long, such as that which stretches in unbroken desolation between Port Arthur and Callander.”

Six hundred and fifty miles of unbroken desolation in Canada ! It is the *Toronto Mail* that is saying this ! Six hundred and fifty miles of unbroken desolation on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ! Why, Sir, if the *Globe* said that, it would be paraded through the country ; it would be shouted from every Conservative platform, and copied in all the papers, to the ends of the Dominion, as an instance of the virulent and libellous assertions of the *Globe* with reference to Canadian land. It is bad enough to have the *Mail*, the official organ of the Government, calling it a blunder ; but it was not alone in that. Shortly afterwards we had the *Gazette* of Montreal, which is credited with being the organ of the gentleman who is to be the next Finance Minister or Minister of Railways, or whatever he is to be, stating on February 20th :

“ Rumor has been busy for some weeks past with the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company is reported to be seeking further assistance from Parliament, to have incurred a floating liability to a considerable amount, and to have failed to raise a loan in the money market, and it is no longer a secret that these reports are substantially correct.”

The *Gazette* says that the company has failed to get along so far with the money it has had. That is a confession of failure, a confession of blundering.—

“ The company has been compelled to obtain the money for these purposes on its credit and that of its directors, and has in this way created the floating liability now existing. But the expectation entertained by the company of being able to borrow in the open market such money as might be required to properly equip the property has been disappointed. Twice during the year means were sought for the extension of the branch lines in the North-West, but, though liberally subsidised with land, though promising to be profitable from the outset, capitalists have declined to invest in these enterprises, principally because of the arbitrary mortgage on the whole property of the company held by the Government.

Is not this a confession of failure—a confession that the credit of the company has declined ? Perhaps it is an attempt to destroy the credit of the company ; at all events, it is a confession that the scheme of relief devised last year was a blunder, because it did not succeed in relieving the company. The money given last year evidently was not sufficient ; and yet the security taken from the country by the Government was of such a nature as to prevent the company borrowing the money elsewhere. There is a failure on the part of the company to do what they expected to do with this money ; there is a blunder on the part of the Government in their policy with regard to the company, a blunder which has been fatal to the company's credit in the markets of the world. But that is not all. We have again in the *Mail*, of March 7th, a more determined attack on the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway :

“ It is to be regretted that Mr. Stephen was unable to deal with the Opposition assaults upon the financial standing of the company. The *Globe* the other day produced a heap of figures to prove that the members of the syndicate had made and were making millions out of the work. The same tables were exhibited a year ago when the company was applying for the loan of \$22,500,000 and the country was asked to believe that Mr. Stephen and his associates could not possibly require more money for the honest purposes of construction, inasmuch as by the *Globe*'s figuring they had amassed colossal private fortunes even then. It was subsequently learned that, at the time that loan was hanging in Parliament, the leading members of the company stood indebted on their personal guarantee, as well as by the obligations of the road, to the extent of many millions, and that if the loan had been refused they would have been ruined and hundreds with them. If the truth could be

told just now—I do not know why it could not—the same state of affairs would probably be exposed.”

The *Mail* thus says that probably the condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway is as bad now as it was last year before they got their loan of \$22,500,000 ! If that is not a confession of failure on the part of the railway, and of bungling on the part of the Government, and of something worse, perhaps, on the part of both, I do not know what would constitute such a confession. They say they were in a desperate condition last year when they got \$22,500,000, and are just as badly off now as then. Where have all the millions been sunk ?

“ If the truth could be told just now, the same state of things would be found to exist, but, as the Opposition well know, the company cannot lay their books before the world, nor by showing their sores claim exemption from illusage.”

Poor company ! They are covered with sores, these “ sores ” appear in the books ; and if they show the books to the world, the world will know all about them ? The metaphor is a very mixed one, and the only meaning I can get out of it is that there is something very rotten in the state of the company, which would be seen by the public if only the books were shown, and for that reason they cannot show their books. Talk about showing their sores and claiming exemption for ill usage ! What more could an exhibition of the books do to damn the credit of the company and make it utterly impossible for them to obtain loans in any part of the world than these revelations ? Was it the intention of the *Mail*, in making these revelations, to create public sympathy for the company just as mendicants create public sympathy by showing their sores to the public ? Or is it possible that after all they may only be artificial sores, as is sometimes the case with mendicants' sores, got up to create pity, and which can be washed off with soap and water as soon as the sturdy tramp gets his pocket full of alms and goes off with his companions to enjoy them ? Is it not possible that this plaint of the *Mail* is a mere pretext to excite pity, and that the case is not quite so bad as represented ? But, Mr. Speaker, this is a digression. The principal object of my quoting these expressions was not to discuss the Canadian Pacific Railway policy, but to show that, according to the *Globe* and the *Mail*, nay, on the confession of the *Herald* itself, the credit of the company is gone, and the policy of the Government has failed in making the company strong and prosperous, or even in enabling it to borrow money. The *Herald*, on March 9th, said :

“ Even the Government guarantee has not availed to provide any capital from private sources, even the credit of the company, backed by the Government, has not been able to provide the money needed.”

If the credit of the company is worth nothing, and the credit of the Government which backs them is worth nothing, is not that as thorough a confession of failure as can be imagined ?

But, leaving the question of failures of Government policy, I want to call attention to the fact that we have not merely our own experience to go by in dealing with Customs matters, in dealing with tariffs and expenditures, but we have also the experience of a great nation beside us. We all know that the favorite argument used for the National Policy in 1878 was the prosperity of the United States under a highly protective system. It was useless to tell the people that the circumstances in the United States were different, that the United States had practically free trade over half a continent, and that it was the internal free trade and not the external protection that built them up and caused them to prosper. The great facts stared the people in the face that the United States had protection, and that they were prosperous, and it was useless to argue that the one was not a consequence of the other. What is the state of things to-day ? We all know that the last presidential election turned on the great question of the tariff, and that the triumph of the Democratic party was the triumph of the