

the whole of Canada are asked to pay \$125,000,000 for its construction. I desire to say a word in reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) that this railway will open up a large area for settlement in the province of New Brunswick. That was replied to pretty well by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale). There is no gentleman in this House for whom I have a higher respect than for the hon. member for Westmoreland, but we have before us the fact that an hon. gentleman who represented the province of New Brunswick in the cabinet the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was forced to resign an important seat in the cabinet, carrying with it much influence, because he could not accept the proposition of the government, and yet we now have a gentleman who has been a protege of the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals coming forward and saying that he approves of everything. Can it be true that the hon. member for Westmoreland, who is living in expectancy and is hoping to be a member of the government, at some future day, will endorse everything, while the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals resigned his position because he could not accept what was proposed by the government. I desire to say a word or two in connection with the petitions that are being presented to this House. I have presented many of these myself and I accept the responsibility, of saying, as a member of this House, that every petition presented by me, having my name endorsed on it is a right and a proper petition. In addition to that, while I take the responsibility of endorsing these petitions, I say that it is an insult to the people of Canada to say that they would send a petition to this parliament which is not properly and correctly signed. The hon. gentleman for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) made a remark this morning in connection with a petition presented by my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). I can assure the hon. gentleman that his statement is not correct.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I referred to the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), not to the hon. member for East Prince.

Mr. HACKETT. I accept the hon. gentleman's apology. I would not for one moment have stated that the people of East Prince or of West Prince who attach their names to any petition of this kind are doing it by fraud. They are honest and straightforward, and I would say in addition to that that there is not one man whose name appears on the petitions either from East Prince or West Prince or from Queen's or from King's who is not the equal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay the proceedings of this House. We

have been here for many months threshing out as far as possible the rights of the people and endeavouring to ascertain the views of the government. We have been charged by our friends on the other side of the House with obstructing public business. Sir, what are the facts? During a period of four months and a half, from the 12th of March until the last day of July, although the House was in session this important measure was not placed before parliament. Can you blame the representatives of the people, who are charged with doing their duty to the country, because they opposed by every means possible a measure which is brought down four and a half months after the opening of the session when it would be supposed that we were to prorogue and go to our homes? The hon. gentlemen, for some reasons of their own, withheld this proposition until the last day of July when the House had been in session four and a half months, and then they charge hon. members on this side of the House with obstruction. I heard the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) make a charge a few days ago that the opposition were obstructing.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. HACKETT. It was in connection with this debate; it was part of this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that this discussion of delay is not germane to the question before the House. The subject now before us is the third reading of this Bill, with the amendment thereto proposed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling, I submit to it, and I trust that the amendment offered by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) will be accepted by this parliament, because it is an amendment in the right direction. It is an amendment that will not allow the passing of this Bill until full information has been obtained by the people of this country; until after the people have had an opportunity of raising their voice and speaking through their representatives in parliament, and have had submitted to them at the polls this question of building a railway, costing over \$100,000,000, from Quebec to Moncton. My first intention was to say one word in connection with the remarks made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) who has gone back on his benefactor and who has not acted fairly by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). I want to say in connection with the late Minister of Railways and Canals and to say it honestly and fairly that so far as the province from which I come is concerned, I found the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals progressive and up to date and