

to meet this need. The tide of immigration was just setting in full and strong towards Canada particularly from the south, and he believed the time was near when there would be a greater immigration than ever before to Canada from the motherland. This influx of settlers, he said must bring its problems.

It meant an increase of soil production and necessarily of means of transport. We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line. I am ambitious myself to see another right away. It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me, and I am doing all I can, in my small way, without public pretense about it, to insure its construction.

How does that compare with the language used by the hon. gentleman to-night? Has he come around, after giving utterance to these sentiments, to the position that we are using undue and indecent haste in spending a few months in perfecting a scheme to construct a road which cannot be ready for use before four or five years.

We have the hon. gentleman's words quoted also in the 'Daily News' and 'Advertiser' of Vancouver. He is there reported as saying:

This influx of settlers he said must bring its problems. It meant an increase of soil production and necessarily a means of transport. We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line, I am ambitious myself to see another right away. It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me, and I am doing all I can in my small way, without public pretense about it, to insure its construction.

Then there is another report of the same speech in the 'Daily Province' of Vancouver. I quote these three in order to avoid the charge that the speech was not revised by the hon. gentleman and that his sentiments were not correctly reported. This report says:

We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line. I am ambitious myself to see another right away. It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me, and I am doing all I can in my small way, without public pretense about it, to ensure its construction.

These were, I think, sound sentiments, and I endorse them. It is unfortunate that there was a difference in tone and in position compared with the position occupied and the language used by the hon. gentleman to-night. I am at a loss to account for the discrepancy. I would hardly suppose that the hon. gentleman could have had so radical a change of views in eight or nine months, as he has shown by his speech to-night compared with his speech of October the 9th last. It has been suggested to me that, in quoting from these newspaper reports, I have overlooked something. I find that the hon. gentleman gave utterance to the following sentiments in Vancouver:

There are young men, perhaps middle aged men, who are listening to me who will see three or four transcontinental lines running through Canada. And they will not see more than enough.

Three or four transcontinental lines, and these will not be more than enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to account for the difference in these expressions of opinions as indicated by these quotations and the speech of the hon. gentleman to-night.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You would want to read the whole speech.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have read the essential part of it and will take another occasion to read the rest of it. There are some expressions in my hon. friend's speech, which perhaps indicate something that was not fully revealed, but persons skilful in such business may read between the lines and draw inferences. He says:

As Minister of Railways I was entitled to know what was going on, I was entitled to know what the Premier of the Dominion thought about the matter, what he was doing about it. I was entitled to be consulted from day to day and step by step, if I was not entitled as Minister of Railways to dictate which course should be pursued.

Again he said:

No Intercolonial Railway official was consulted about this matter.

I do not know what this means. It is not possible, I presume, that pique would have induced my hon. friend to resign. It is not possible, I apprehend, that a feeling of indignation because he thought he had not occupied that prominent position in shaping affairs in the councils of the state to which he believed he was entitled, could have influenced his conduct, but it was unfortunate that he introduced these illusions to the fact that he had not been consulted. Comparing his remarks to-night with his speech of eight months before, one is naturally led to look to some reason besides the one given that he left his position as minister of the Crown because the government had adopted a scheme for another transcontinental railway, much less radical and objectionable than the one he had proposed and advocated. He tells us in his speech that we want no railway, that there is no demand for it. How does that compare with his speech in Vancouver, where he tells us that we want railways to open up unoccupied territory, so that we may invite immigration? The two positions are radically and diametrically opposed to each other. No demand for a railway through unpeopled regions? I think I have heard that in the old Canadian Pacific Railway time. I think we ourselves made the mistake of using the same language, and I think we paid dearly for our lack of comprehension of the position of things. And we are not going to be led into that trap again. We are not going to take advice that will lead us into a line of action of which we have such unpleasant remembrance. The hon. gentleman tells us that there is no demand in Quebec for a