

every member on this side of the House—we have no antipathy against any part of this Canada of our. We are Canadians before we are provincialists. The fault I find with the member for Westmoreland and others of his friends is, that they are provincialists and not Canadians. The hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) said that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Hale) should support this railway because it goes through his county. Are we to be told that a member of this House should support a national transcontinental railway as it is called, simply because it runs through a portion of his county? Are we to take such a narrow view of national questions? Are we to consider only the interests of the little district in which we live, and not the interest of our country as a whole? As a member of this parliament of Canada, I protest against being asked to take any such narrow view as that. We are here as Canadians, expected to legislate for the best interests of Canada, and not to narrow our minds by local considerations when the good of the whole country is at stake.

No man in this House will stand up for the particular district he represents more strongly than I will if it is being interfered with or is being injuriously affected in any way. But what we are to look to is the good of all Canada, the good of the greatest number. Is this proposed railway going to do the greatest possible good for Canada? That is the first question for us to consider. Afterwards we may consider how it is going to affect the particular district in which we live or the particular province from which we come. I say I object to this railway on broad grounds, because I do not believe that it will do what its promoters claim it will do. I do not believe it will prevent Canadian freight going through Canadian channels to American ports. That could have been prevented; but the very men who are promoting this railway, the very government which is pinning its faith and pledging its existence to this scheme, have by their contract failed to prevent that being done, notwithstanding the objections which have been urged from this side of the House. I am opposed to this scheme because it will to my mind destroy as a trunk line the Intercolonial Railway, on which \$70,000,000 of the public money of this country has been expended. I am not alone in that view. The leading man on the government side of the House from the province of New Brunswick, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair)—a powerful member of the government he was too—felt so strongly on this point that he abandoned his office and resigned his seat in the cabinet rather than agree to this scheme.

Let us for a moment contrast the conduct of that hon. gentleman with the conduct of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), and see which shines the brighter by the contrast. The hon. member for West-

moreland was just as strongly opposed to interference with the Intercolonial Railway as was the hon. ex-Minister of Railways, if we can judge of the strength of a man's position by the strength of the language he uses; and that is the only way we can test it until we find that his acts do not harmonize with his language. The hon. gentleman urged strongly in the Railway Committee the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Depot Harbour. But now we find that the hon. gentleman has abandoned that position entirely. He has swallowed this Bill holus-bolus, although it was too severe a dose for the ex-Minister of Railways. Why has the hon. gentleman gone back on his professions? Why has he changed his view? Does he put his party before his country? Surely he was honest and sincere when he was advocating so strongly the extension of the Intercolonial. He waxed most eloquent. I was pleased to hear him, because the language he used was entirely in accord with my own view, and I contributed to the generous meed of applause which his remarks received in the Railway Committee; and a man has to be pretty eloquent to get any applause there. So you can judge of the strength of the language the hon. gentleman used on that occasion. Since then, as I say, a change has taken place in his views. Has he seen more light? What is that light? Is it the bright reflection of office? Is it that he sees an office in the distance? Does he hope to rise by the fall of his former benefactor and chief? Is he willing to give up his principles? Is he willing to go back on that which he so strongly urged, and which he claimed was required in the best interests of Canada, because he sees, forsooth, an opportunity of becoming a member of this cabinet, and this is the only way he can reach that desired goal? I do not like to impute motives. I am not imputing motives; I am merely asking the question. I do not say for a moment that that is the case. It may be that some miraculous intervention of Providence has taken place. It may be that there has been a miracle as in the time of old, when a great light broke in upon a benighted man and he saw clearly what he had not seen before. It may be that that is the case with the hon. gentleman. If so, I am afraid that the light that has broken in upon him is not a light from heaven, but that he is being deluded by a false light.

What is the great reason given for the building of this transcontinental railway? The reason is the freight congestion in the west. One of the reasons why I oppose this road is because it will not relieve the present congestion in the west. This proposed road cannot be built for many years; but the freight congestion is acute to-day, if we can believe the statements of western people. And so, if you are only going to apply your remedy to a deep-seated disease ten years hence, I am afraid your patient