

in Dakota and Minnesota, as you will do in the North-West; but if you are a well-to-do immigrant, take notice of this, says the *Toronto Mail*, that the western, south-western and southern States present to people of your class an infinite, an incomparable variety of advantages. There is the statement of the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have the endorsement of one who was a member of that Government, and who would discharge the duties of one of the Departments of that Government, at all events, quite as efficiently as they are discharged by its present incumbent, and who says that that article is true.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. I did not say that the article was true. What I said was, that the portion of the article referring to the frosts in Manitoba, up to which point the hon. gentleman had read, was true. I am not responsible for the *Mail*. I am not going to defend the *Mail*. It is quite able to take care of itself, and its friends in the House are able to defend it. But I do not think it is doing justice to me, when I said that frosts occurred in Manitoba, which extended all over the country, to draw me into defending every statement which appears in the *Mail*. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON. I have no desire to draw the hon. gentleman into defending every statement, if he does not desire it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have an organ of my own, as you know.

Mr. PATERSON. But it is very natural that I should have referred to the hon. gentleman, when I was reading one article, and as I understood he endorsed it.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was; it was very natural for you to misrepresent.

Mr. PATERSON. So eager was he to interrupt me by stating that the article was the truth, while the article he has read from was a lie. I believed he intended to state that the article which I was reading was true, and that he was prepared to endorse every statement in it, and I think that is what every hon. gentleman in the House supposed. I am glad to hear that he does not endorse every statement contained in that article.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether the article says that frosts occur more frequently and more severely in the North-West than in Dakota, or that on that occasion the frost was more severe?

Mr. PATERSON. I read what it says, and hon. gentlemen opposite were quiet and heard what I read. I have no time, in the course of a speech, to go back and explain what it says. I ask, what are we to think of language such as that? I want to ask what you think of gentlemen opposite, who are prepared to rise and put themselves in the ridiculous position of reiterating charges against the Opposition, of decrying the country, and who produce no utterances of members of the Opposition, but, where they find that a correspondent, who is responsible for his own letter, describes what I presume he supposes to be the truth, in reference to the country, proclaim that this is with a view to decry the country, and that the newspaper which publishes the correspondence makes itself responsible for it all. This is not a correspondence, but an editorial of the *Mail* newspaper, an article written by the gentlemen who control it. We have again this statement. I think it was an article which appeared two or three days afterwards, which preceded an article in the *Montreal Gazette*, in which the *Montreal Gazette* said:

"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 of 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."

That was from the *Montreal Gazette*, to prepare Parliament for the new demand. Two or three days before that there appeared in the *Toronto Mail*, in the same direction, an article seeking to prepare the public mind for additional aid for the Canadian Pacific Railway, pointing out the reasons which would justify Parliament in doing so, as the writer evidently felt it was a very embarrassing position when the company came the third time to Parliament for aid. We find the following:—

"If our land subsidy of 25,000,000 acres be worth \$2 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 the 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."

There is a description of that country, given by the *Mail* newspaper—the road was to run through 650 miles of rock, one unbroken, barren desolation—printed in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have the audacity to rise, time and again, to charge upon gentlemen on this side of the House that they decry their country, but who have always been utterly unable to produce the proof. In that article of the *Mail* was the justification of every word that ever fell from any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, when it admits that the Government made a mistake by over-estimating the value of the land, when it admits they made a mistake by not acting as reasonable men, instead of acting like men who have lost their heads, when they speak of that country. Sir, there never was a time when hon. gentlemen opposite were less justified in making the charges that they have made against us tonight in connection with the North-West, when we are considering proposals to build colonisation roads throughout that country, which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House proposed to do in 1878, and which, if unfortunate circumstances had not deprived them of the reins of power, I have no doubt would have existed, to a very large extent, in great portions of that country at the present time, and instead of 200,000 people that the *Mail* said you had there now, you might have had over a million of people developing that country, these roads feeders to a road owned by the Government, and the proceeds and the profits accruing to the country instead of being lost to it. And now let me just refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which these roads will be tributary. I would like to ask the hon. member for Northumberland one question—I do not know whether he will answer me or not. He stated that the second syndicate that offered to build this road was a bogus syndicate, and he justified that expression when he rose to make his speech, by declaring that he knew a good deal about this thing; he gave us to understand that he was sufficiently in the secrets of the gentlemen who comprised that second syndicate to know that he was warranted in his expression that it was a bogus syndicate. Well, now, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was sufficiently in the confidence of the gentlemen who composed that company to be able to say it was a bogus syndicate. But whether he was or not, hon. gentlemen in this House will not doubt that if the hon. member is not deep in the confidence of the second syndicate, he, at any rate, ought to be deep in the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate, from the manner in which he defends them on the floor of this House; and if he is deep in their confidence it would interest this House and this country if he would explain to us how it was that the Government of this country were made to give the bargain they did to the present Canadian Pacific Railway