

down the credit of the country, and under-estimated the extent of the fertile lands in the North West, and that no person has been more keen and zealous in so doing, than the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). As to the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), I hope the next time he quotes anything in history, he will be careful to understand, before he starts, exactly what the story is, for I should gather from his remarks that he could not tell whether Cassandra was a man or a woman. I hope he has found out by this time; and I hope that when he next quotes history, he will previously rehearse it in the room, at the other end of this building. The hon. gentleman said that I would vote for these Resolutions. I tell him that I shall do so with all my heart, believing, as I do, that I am voting in the interests of my country. He said further, that I had stated that we would invoke the Court of Chancery to compel the Company to build the road. What I did say was, in answer to the hon. member for West Durham, who said the Company would build the prairie sections, and abandon the other, I said that the courts would compel them to build both, if proceedings were invoked, and I proved it. I showed conclusively that if the Company accepted the bargain, they must accept it in its entirety. They cannot take the good and reject the bad. But we are not in that position to-day, the Company has not failed to carry out the contract. They have five years to do it, but the wisacre from Huron says: Why they will invoke proceedings in the Court of Chancery; but they cannot do it, it is utterly impossible. I think I need not trouble the House further with regard to that hon. gentleman. With regard to the speech made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), I venture to assert, that when that hon. gentleman read the report of his speech next day he was astonished to see how a man could talk so long and say so little. Then we had a speech from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I would like to say with regard to that speech, if it were parliamentary to say it, that it was the most blundering speech that was ever delivered in this House. If that hon. gentleman were present, I think I could show, even to his satisfaction, that the statements made by him were so much at variance—I will not say with the truth, but with the Parliamentary records—that he would be ashamed of himself when he came to examine them. He said:

"Well, in the first place, as I have said, we made a mistake in making the time too short, and the result of that mistake was, that we had to pay the people of British Columbia a large amount to get an extension of time."

What did we pay them? Who ever heard of it? We paid them in promises. Why, Sir, the hon. member for West Durham, who desired to conciliate the people of British Columbia, said to them: We will give you \$750,000, though we are running rapidly in debt, if you will only give us time. The hon. member for East York, at one time, bought his peace with British Columbia, by promising to give them a railway costing \$3,500,000, and by guaranteeing to expend \$2,000,000 in that Province; and that is all I know of the many promises to pay which were made to British Columbia. The hon. gentleman says again, that the Liberal press have not abused the North-West. In answer to that, let me read what the hon. member for South Huron said:

"As to the Liberal press, he had hardly any words too strong to convey his disapprobation of their conduct towards the North-West and towards the railway. Now, Sir, I am not responsible, nor are my friends responsible, for all that the press of Canada choose to say."

I leave the hon. member for Wellington, and the hon. member for Huron, to settle their difficulties on that question. The hon. gentleman stated further, that the cost of the Intercolonial Railway was \$38,000,000; but if he will turn to the schedule of the Public Accounts, page 24, he will find that it cost \$28,080,650, and that he was astray only to the extent of \$10,000,000. The hon. gentleman said further:

"I notice, in looking over the Public Accounts, that the debt of the Dominion has increased about \$32,000,000 within the last six years."

Now, Sir, if it were a parliamentary expression, I should like to say that that was a "whopper;" but as perhaps that is unparliamentary, he can understand me as having said it. The total debt of the Dominion at the end of the year 1878-79 was, \$179,483,871; and in 1882-83 it was \$202,159,104, or an increase of \$22,675,230, instead of \$32,000,000. If the hon. gentleman had only gone further and given the net debt, he would have found himself still further astray. The net debt of the Dominion in 1878—going back to the 1st of July of that year—though we claim credit for 1874 as belonging to this Government, as they say they have the right to claim 1879 as theirs; but, at any rate, the net debt of 1878 was \$140,352,069; the net debt of 1879 was \$142,990,187; and the net debt of 1883 was \$158,166,714. The net debt had only increased \$15,476,202, instead of \$32,000,000. This shows how close those hon. gentlemen can sail to the wind, and how anxious they are to deceive the country. As I said before, I propose that the antidote shall go along with the poison. But, Sir, the hon. gentlemen gave up the whole case. The only member of that side of the House who has spoken with the courage of his convictions, who had the honesty to declare what his convictions really were, wound up by saying:

"The question of security was also mentioned, but we have not gone into the question of challenging the security, and I do not know where the hon. gentleman has got his information on that point. I have not heard anything on this side of the House upon that point. The whole question has been as to whether it is in the interest of the country that we should go on and make this grant, or whether we should withhold our hand."

The question we consider the most important is the question of the security; but the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that we have all the security necessary, and that they are not now discussing that question. He is the only member who has expressed himself so plainly. Now, let me refer to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming). That hon. gentleman has stated that in the conception of building this railroad it was intended that it should start at Callander and be carried to the Pacific Ocean. The reason was that it was unnecessary, he says, to have a Pacific Railway run further east than Callander, because at that point it would form its connection with the existing railway system of the country. I would like to know where the railways were at that time. The Canada Central was not built that far; and yet the hon. gentleman says the Pacific Railway was to connect with the existing railway system of the country. I think that hon. gentleman also gave up the case as regards the value of the security when he said that the earnings of the Company for the next two years would be \$2,500,000, and \$8,000,000 for postal service, which I think is somewhat exaggerated, but he shows that the earnings will be so great that the debt must be paid off inside of six years. Now, Sir, there is only one other gentleman to whom I shall allude: that is the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). Although he is an old member of this House I am somewhat older than he is in parliamentary life, and I would advise that hon. gentleman that when he wants to make a stump speech, he had better make it in his own county than on the floor of Parliament. When the hon. gentleman falls into the groove of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) and makes the assertion that the expenditure has increased \$10,000,000 in six years, I just wish to ask him to read the speech of the hon. member for South Huron on that question. But when the hon. gentleman says that the Railway Company has employed outsiders and foreigners to the detriment of Canadians, he states what he must know is not true. The hon. gentleman ought to have informed himself on that question before he spoke. If he had, he would have found out that of the 9,000 people at work on