

predictions, in seeing some of our best Canadians displaced by Americans, and obliged to seek a living in the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the second Syndicate was more Canadian than the present? Does he not know that the capital behind them was mainly New York?

Mr. ROSS. The capital of the second Syndicate was Canadian capital, made by Canadians in this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are Canadians in the present Syndicate who could buy up the whole of them—a single one of them, in fact, could buy up the whole party.

Mr. ROSS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell better what Canadians can buy up. I know very well that the second Syndicate was quite as competent to construct the road as the first. The hon. gentleman found fault with the resolution asking for a dissolution; and he says a dissolution would have been improper. He knew last year that if the Governor dissolved the House, with that scheme fresh in the minds of the people, it meant the dissolution of the Government. The hon. gentleman says in his boasting, confident way that he is not afraid of the people of this country. Let him try an appeal to the people and test his courage. He sometimes thinks he can browbeat members on this side by threatening dissolution. I speak for myself, and I think for many more on this side. I am prepared now if he chooses to go to the country. If he will give us sufficient time, and will not make a midnight attack and spring an election before the electors are prepared, we can meet him any time, and it requires very little prescience to know what the result would be. We have a public sentiment in this country. The people of Canada are not corrupt. They know when their rights are encroached upon; they know when a Government proves recreant to every promise which it has made; when it falsifies its own record; when entrenched on the Treasury benches it forgets all its promises, and sells the interests of the country to establish a monopoly to enable the hon. Minister of Railways to boast he has been able to do with one stroke of the pen what another Government was advancing slowly and steadily to accomplish. That was the purpose of the hon. gentleman in bringing down his scheme last year; and the scheme may serve its purpose for a time; but once let him face an aroused public opinion and he will no longer be able to boast of his majority or the success of his scheme. The hon. gentleman found fault with the hon. member from Westmoreland because he asked the House last year to wait until tenders were called for. Did the hon. Minister last night face the fact that he had given the contract to this Syndicate without asking for tenders? No. Not only the law, but the procedure of his Department was against him. Day after day we see advertisements calling for tenders for the construction of a lighthouse or the enlargement or construction of a lock, or some little public work that will cost about two or three thousand dollars. The hon. gentleman, however, submitted to this House a scheme for the construction of a railway involving an expenditure of \$80,000,000 or \$100,000,000—I do not know what figures to assume, the figures are changed so often—without any tender asked for or submitted. The hon. gentleman took the law into his own hands, and in his own way, in order to serve his own purposes—perhaps in the secrecy of his own office, surrounded by his own councillors, perhaps in the dead of night, with the lights turned down—agreed with the Syndicate for the construction of the railway, confident he had a majority at his back that would rather see him through with it than return to their constituents. I challenge the hon. gentleman, if he chooses to read the history of this or any country that has a representative or constitutional Government, to show me on the pages of its history any such

Mr. Ross (Middlesex):

gigantic scheme forced upon an unwilling Parliament as this Syndicate scheme passed last Session. Amendment after amendment was brought down without a word of reply. His majority knew perhaps what they were doing, but they were led, I fear, by that hon. gentleman to their doom, supporting him at every stage. Now he is going to the country, and I hope he will receive what these gentlemen should have given him last year, viz., the punishment he deserves. The hon. gentleman objected also to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Bothwell in regard to the monopoly of the North-West. Did he show that the Syndicate had not the monopoly of that trade? Not at all. He brought down a tariff of rates. Does that prove anything? It does not prove that the Syndicate has not the control of the North-West trade. What does the disallowance, on the representations of the Syndicate, of the three Acts of the Manitoba Legislature mean? It means that this House has been gagged by these hon. gentlemen. It means that the Province of Manitoba has been practically boycotted by the hon. gentleman, and charters passed by Manitoba, in the exercise of their provincial rights, previous to the inception of this gigantic scheme, have been disallowed at the request of the Secretary of the Canadian Syndicate. Is it for that we are sold body and bones to this gigantic monopoly? Here we have the line on the eastern section changed from an interior to a frontier line at the request of the Secretary of the Canadian Syndicate. Now we are going to change the road from the Yellow Head Pass to the Kicking Horse Pass, at the request of the Secretary of the Syndicate. Then we have last, but not least, the legislation of the Province disallowed because the Secretary of that Syndicate calls the attention of the Canadian Government to the fact that it interferes with their particular preserves. Where are we going? Are we a free people, or are we in the grasp of a Minister of Railways who will sell our dearest rights to a company of monopolists that will be able for years to come to crush the settler and hinder the free development of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to put us in the wrong with reference to our railway policy, as in all other matters. I do not propose we shall be placed in the wrong. Our policy was to open up the prairies of the North-West as soon as possible, or, to quote Artemus Ward, "immediately, if not sooner." That was our policy. I challenge the hon. gentleman to establish wherein we have failed in one iota in the fulfilment of that policy. I challenge him to show wherein he has done one iota more than we would have done or were doing in the fulfilment of that policy. Has he opened up the North-West more rapidly than we were doing? Not at all. The hon. gentleman has only got to Brandon, about thirty miles further than we reached; he has simply been carrying to completion the works we were constructing. He tells us we will have an all-through route from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, precisely what we would have done. He says: "Look at the prosperity of Winnipeg; look at the goods that are going into that country and the increased revenue to Customs; look at the value of the lands." What has the hon. gentleman done to improve the price of the lands. He has done nothing more than we should have done under our system. The hon. gentleman is simply a copyist; he is simply walking in the steps of the hon. member for Lambton, pushing to an energetic conclusion works that were energetically begun. If the prairie has been opened for settlement; if we are entering upon the possession of those lands, it is because the hon. member for Lambton, in the face of almost insuperable difficulties, true as the needle to the Pole, persisted in opening up the prairies of the North-West to settlers. The hon. gentleman says that things were not as lively in 1878 as in 1881; that may be very true; but does he not recognize the great changes for which he cannot claim any credit.