

terly yesterday. His position yesterday, lacking as it did that dignity which ought to pertain to the position of a gentleman who resigns on high patriotic and moral grounds, and the bitterness of his attack convinced me that there is something beneath and beyond the ostensible reason assigned for his leaving the cabinet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I repeat what I said last night, that the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks gives us a clue to his feelings in regard to this matter, a clue to his action in this matter, when he tells us that he was not consulted, that no official of the Intercolonial Railway was consulted, that the government forsooth, that the Premier of this country and his advisers proceeded to organize and arrange a policy about which the hon. gentleman was not consulted and which he did not approve of. I imagine Mr. Speaker, that when that hon. gentleman resigned, he had arrived at the conclusion that he would make the captain shoot at his command instead of shooting at the captain's command.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. And the outcome was that the captain did not shoot, and that the rebellious member retired from the ranks, and he is out of the ranks. I am sorry for the whole incident; I am sorry that the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) should have thought so highly of his own individual opinion; should have decided that it was necessary for the government to accept his opinion and act upon it, and that if the government failed to do so he would leave the government in the lurch. Well, he has left the government in the lurch, if being deprived of the hon. gentleman's sanction could place them in that position. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) devoted a large portion of his speech to the Intercolonial Railway. As I said last night, I shall leave the detailed discussion of that matter to gentlemen better acquainted with the condition of affairs in the maritime provinces than I am myself. Still, it is patent to me, and must be patent to any person who has a fair knowledge of the situation, that the hon. gentleman in his criticism upon the policy of the government with regard to the Intercolonial did not take the pains to put us in possession of all the facts. He laments the ruin of the Intercolonial. He laments that we did not adhere to the policy of attempting to create a business for our maritime ports by using a second-class road with an unnecessary mileage of from 100 to 140 miles, with heavy grades, and one that we know cannot fulfil the conditions that we must expect of it if the scheme of the government is to be made a success. He did not tell us that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk are separate and distinct corporations. He did not tell us that

the government had a contract with the Grand Trunk for 99 years to turn over to the Intercolonial at Montreal all freight the road brings to Montreal designed for points east of Quebec. The Intercolonial cannot be deprived of the business, one of the largest items of business it possesses. He made no calculation as to the great accession to this road of business at Moncton for Halifax and St. John. If the straightening of its line, if the reducing of its grades, if the increase in its capacity, which are making it first-class and shorter, will lead to bringing from the west of a large amount of grain for shipment at maritime ports, the Intercolonial must share in the benefit. The Grand Trunk Pacific ends at Moncton. There are 183 miles of the Intercolonial road to share in the business that will come to Halifax; there are 89 miles from Moncton to St. John to share in the business. The gross business of the Intercolonial will inevitably be increased by the construction of this short line, owing to the large increase of traffic between Quebec and the maritime provinces; and there is besides the retention to the Intercolonial of the trade which I have mentioned that pertains to it and that cannot be taken away from it. I will not dwell further upon the position taken by the hon. gentleman; I will not criticise further his statements.

As I said last night, I have a line of argument to present with relation to this scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific which I propose to enter upon briefly at this stage of my remarks. As to the question whether we need another transcontinental railway, the question has been answered by the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) at Vancouver. I can quote him as an authority. According to him, we need the road and we need it quickly. It cannot be proceeded with too soon. He said on that occasion that men were standing in the audience who would live to see three or four transcontinental lines across the continent. I have no doubt he was right. At all events, the construction of this road is not premature. We must bear in mind the fact that we cannot get this road at once. We are taking the initiative steps now towards getting it. We have to proceed with surveys, we have to locate the line; we have to proceed with the construction of a road 3,030 miles long in an air-line, and it cannot be done at once. It will take several years to do it. In the meantime, population is pouring into the North-west, new acreage is being brought into cultivation; its prolific soil will furnish a large harvest every year, and at the time this road will be completed, it will be a crying necessity. We have undertaken its construction none too soon. I estimate that five years from to-day with a continuance of the conditions that exist now, the grain products of the Canadian North-west will have increased at least three-fold. The present means of transportation