

rebuilt, not as it is now, but as it was when first constructed. And here he would point out an important difference between the contract with the Syndicate and the one with Sir Hugh Allan. In both the model is the Union Pacific. In the contract with Sir Hugh Allan it was as that road was after it had been re-built at a cost of millions of money to the United States. In that with the present Syndicate it is as it was when first constructed. And what was the Union Pacific when it was first constructed? It was the flimsiest kind of a road. Its ties were of basswood or poplar, and other un-substantial material. Its rails were of iron. There is no limit to the grades of this proposed road."

He had got his cue from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he said the ties were of cottonwood and basswood, and the road was ballasted with lumps of dirt. Those who signed that petition did so under the impression that the Government were giving \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres to build this clap-trap railroad. Another gross misrepresentation was in respect to the allotments of lands. The gentleman who spoke knew the weak point of the people of Prince Edward Island. We suffered for years under the absentee system, but, thank goodness, we have been emancipated from it. In order not to misstate I will read what he said on this point:

"But this is not all. The most infamous part of this wicked bargain has yet to be told. It is said that the Syndicate land is to be taken in alternate blocks, no part of which is to be more than twenty-four miles from the railway. Now, this phrase 'alternate blocks' has a good sound. On the face of it, the division seems to be a fair one. But there is a 'but' in the business. It is provided that if any of those blocks, in the opinion of the Syndicate, is unfit for settlement, they can choose other lands from those held by the Government, and it is further provided that if any of the land is swampy or barren or occupied by water stretches or river or morass, it is not to be calculated in the concession, but the Syndicate can select portions of arable land sufficient to make it up. Now, what does this mean? It means that all the arable land within twenty-four miles of the railway is to be given to the Syndicate."

There was not a man who signed that petition who was not induced to do so, through misstatements such as this. Many of these signatories are respectable men who, I believe, if they had as much light on the question as has been thrown on it in this House, would have withheld their signature. I would be a coward and recreant to my duty if I allowed this petition, even were it signed by 14,000 instead of 4,000, knowing the means by which it was obtained, to cause me to deviate from the course which I believe to be in the true interests of the country. Mr. Warburton, in his letter, which the hon. member for Gloucester read, assures this House that all the signatures to that petition were the signatures of electors of Prince Edward Island. I have been twenty years connected with politics in that Province where, as the hon. member for Gloucester said, there were many of the same name, and I would not venture to say whether the signatures were those of electors or not; and the assurance of Mr. Warburton is not worth the paper it is written on. I feel perfectly satisfied that not 25 per cent. of the men who signed that petition had an opportunity of an unbiassed consideration of the merits of the question, and I know there are men in Prince Edward Island who would sign a petition to hang, draw and quarter every one of us, politically. Their policy is: "No good can come out of Nazareth." When this work will have been in operation two or three years, those most opposed to this contract will recognize its merits. I do not believe that there are 10 per cent. of the signatures upon that petition who are men who ought to sway the mind of any hon. member of this House. I believe that the contract is a good one, and that it is in the interests of the country, and I believe that those of us who support the Government will find when we go to the hustings that the people will recognize that we have discharged the duty that was reposed in us by exercising our common sense and refusing to be deluded and humbugged by our practical opponents.

Mr. KILLAM. I merely wish to say, with reference to the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), that, in common with, I am sure, all hon. members who

Mr. BRECKEN.

listened to it, I heard it with a great deal of pleasure. He seems to have gone fully into the question, and, perhaps, if his speech had been delivered at an earlier period of the debate, many of the speeches made upon this side would have been unnecessary, and some of the amendments and in consequence some of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on both sides might have been dispensed with. No doubt a speech which, like that of the hon. gentleman, occupied six weeks in compiling, and which the hon. gentleman has been able to add to from time to time, should be one covering the whole ground and be practically effective; but the hon. gentleman and his references to what I have said on previous occasions, has failed altogether to touch the points I raised. When I referred to the hon. member for Halifax, I was speaking about the taxation which would be imposed so suddenly upon the people of Nova Scotia, and I said I thought it was his duty as representing the metropolis of that Province to have protested against that imposition both in Halifax and in this House. I said that this contract, by increasing the debt of the Dominion too rapidly, was placing burdens on the people of his Province which were unjustifiable. My remarks were general, and applied to other Nova Scotia members in the House—some of whom were here before me and some of whom have come in since. I believe that true patriotism does not consist of a blind support of party such as the hon. gentleman from Halifax accords to the hon. Minister of Railways; but that true patriotism at this time is to consider the position of our Province and of the Dominion as a whole, and to see that unjust burdens were not imposed by reckless Governments to the disadvantage of the people. I also referred to the outlets from the North-West, and the hon. gentleman has taken me up on that question. I was led up to my remarks by the speech of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), and from what I had read of the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways at London. I gathered from them that at present, at all events, there would be no outlet from the North-West except by St. Paul. The hon. member for Provencher said that the people of Winnipeg were dissatisfied with that prospect, but since they have been told that there was an alternative line to be built by way of Hudson's Bay, they have become more contented. I thought it no more than right—and I think I said so kindly and properly—that I should warn the member for Halifax, that the interests of his city were being affected in this particular. It is not necessary for me to enlarge on this point, because both the member for Halifax (Mr. Richey) and the member for Queen's (Mr. Brecken) have admitted at the close of their speeches that the feelings of their constituents are against them, as I believed they were when I spoke before, and in which belief I am confirmed by every report which has reached me from that Province. I do not care to throw out useless challenges across the floor, but I think that while we hold the views which we do hold, we can only wait until the electors in the different localities have an opportunity of deciding upon them.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I feel very reluctant to prolong this discussion any further, but occupying as I do the position of a representative of one of the most important constituencies in this Dominion, I feel I could not take leave of this question without saying something with reference to it. Whatever may have been the case three or four weeks ago, with reference to the general question it cannot be said now that it is not well understood. The general principles of this measure have been discussed on both sides of the House, and I am sure there is not an hon. gentleman here who does not understand it fully and thoroughly. In fact, I may say that there is not a man outside of this House, within the Dominion, who takes any interest whatever in public affairs who is not conversant with the merits and demerits of this contract and the