

among hon. gentlemen opposite; so much is that the case that party government can no longer be carried out in this manner, and a third party will become necessary. We find the hon. member for West Durham deserted by his supporters, notwithstanding his able efforts, and he is most skilful in making much out of little. I did not hear the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), but I think we should listen to his remarks, and answer them. I do not approve of this continual scraping of desks, and noises made to drown a member's voice. We can certainly afford to conduct our debates in such a manner as will conduce to the intelligent discussion of the subjects in question, without making unseemly noises.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that I am not so grateful as I ought to be to my hon. friend's contribution to the debate. These resolutions are submitted by the Government not as a party question at all. They are resolutions which, in the judgment of the Government, touch the vital interests of the country. They are submitted for the purpose of promoting the prosperity of the country as a whole. They are submitted for the purpose of developing the trade and commerce and business of the country; and I cannot conceive that there is the slightest want of party allegiance on the part of any hon. gentleman in the House who believes that by any one of these resolutions the good of the country is advanced, in giving a hearty and cordial support at the same time to these resolutions one and all, and, at the same time, preserve the most perfect party allegiance to the hon. gentleman who leads them with such signal ability in this House. I do not accept such support as any indication of any disintegration of party. I only accept it as an indication from independent gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House, that when, in their judgment, and in the judgment of any one of them, a measure, in their opinion, conduces to the advantage of the country, they are quite as much at liberty to give it a hearty support as is any hon. gentleman on this side of the House at liberty to support anything proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when they believe that such a proposition will advance the interests of the country.

Mr. IRVINE. As an humble member of this House, I would like to say a few words on this question. Much of what I have heard I entirely disapprove of, and I do not know that I would have attempted to address the House at this time except for some of the extraordinary statements which I have heard. I entirely dissent from most of what has been said by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, and who have endeavored to congratulate hon. gentlemen on this side on what I would call a right-about-face. I entirely dissent from the proposition laid down by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, or by any hon. member of the Government, that the Government of this country should so depart from well understood principles as to subsidize local or Provincial railways. I disapprove of such a course *in toto*; and I say this: That up till last night I defy any hon. gentleman in this House to point to one instance in which the Government of this country, or any member thereof, acknowledged in their place in this House, or out of it, that the Government considered it their bounden duty to take Provincial or local railways under their control; and I believe I am correctly informed on this point, when I say that the hon. Minister of Railways held the same views until a very recent period. Neither he nor any of his colleagues gave the country any reason to believe that the Government of Canada contemplated any such thing as the subsidizing of local or Provincial railways. We have an hon. gentleman—I know his bland smile, if I am not able to mention his county—who spoke just before the hon. Minister of Railways—

An hon. MEMBER. The member for King's.

Mr. IRVINE. The hon. gentleman from King's. He smiles across the House, but I warn him that there are men in Canada to-day who stick to the principles until lately laid down by the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, that local railways should not be subsidized by the Dominion Government; that is, that the people of this country should not be taxed for such subsidies taken out of the revenue collected from the people. This was never contemplated to be done by the Federal Parliament, and never until last night did this Parliament understand the contrary. The hon. Minister of Railways can smile, but I make this broad proposition: That not one of the railways for which \$2,000,000 are to be voted in subsidies, can be properly called an inter-provincial and national railway. You commence and subsidize a piece of line in Cape Breton, and another piece of line in the Province of Quebec near the boundary line; and what is that for? We do not know, and we have no guarantee that this road will ever be built one mile farther than the boundary. What is the plain fact? Another line is built to Old Town or Bangor, nearly opposite to Moose Lake, about twenty-five or thirty miles from the boundary, and nothing is to hinder, when that subsidy comes out of the funds of this country, out of the Federal Treasury, a road in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture is deeply interested, as I am informed, being run down to the boundary and for the other road to meet it at that point, Bangor thus reaping the benefit of our subsidy to that line. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways, to-day, if that is the short line that was projected, concerning which the people of this country and members of this House sent a memorial to the Government for a subsidy; and if one mile of this road is contemplated to be subsidized, which members of this House wished to be subsidized on that score? Not one mile of it is to be subsidized. The building of a road to Louisburg is not part of the short line projected, and for which aid was asked from this Parliament; and the subsidizing of the line to the boundary is not part of the line, in the course which was intended to be taken by the company, which asked for a subsidy. It is very well known to every hon. gentleman that there is a lake not far from the boundary—Moosehead Lake. You must either go north or south of this line, and if south, you must intersect the western extension not far from Bangor, or Old Town if you please; and, as the hon. Minister of Railways said, Mattawamkeag. This was the word he used last evening for New Brunswick, but any person knows that Mattawamkeag is fifty miles from the frontier, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as any man living that the line which this company asked to be subsidized, and the line to be built, is not a line running to Mattawamkeag, but a line to Houlton. And when at Houlton you tap the whole system of American railways, and it is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to carry out this proposition. It is not necessary perhaps for the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, because he has two strings to his bow; and the road from Old Town to the boundary subsidized with money voted by the Federal Parliament, will answer the Americans first-rate to complete their line to Bangor. There is no doubt about that. I, as a humble member of this House condemn *in toto*, in every particular the subsidizing of local lines out of Federal funds. This is a principle which was never acknowledged heretofore until this time. The Government never acknowledged that they would do such a thing. They always disowned it. The hon. Minister of Railways disowned it. I think I am certain in making this statement that until last night we never knew that the Government would take Provincial railways under their care.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Irvine) was in the House last Session when the hon. Minister of Railways brought down his policy with regard to such