

Province, for when an honest man falls, whether his views accord with those of all his fellow-citizens or not, there is cause for mourning.

Mr. BOULTBEE: It is rather difficult to divine at what precise object the hon. gentleman who last spoke had in rising, for he seems more to have carried on a desultory conversation than to make a speech on a particular point. He charged the hon. member for Niagara with calling gentlemen on that side of the House, fourth-rate pot-house politicians. I did not understand the member for Niagara to say so, and I should be very sorry that any man should make use of such language. What I understood the hon. member to say was that the new Syndicate was a small trick, worthy of a fourth-rate pot-house politician. These gentlemen cannot say that that cap fits them, unless they assume the paternity of that Syndicate. If they did that they might inferentially come under the cognomen the hon. gentleman applied to the Syndicate; but then it would be through their own act, and not through the act of the member for Niagara. I feel myself, as no doubt the gentleman who spoke last has felt, that very often in the heat of debate we use language which should not be used in a Chamber like this; but I would say to these hon. gentlemen who comment so severely on the remarks of the member for Niagara that we have had a great deal to bear from them. We have had insinuations thrown across the House that we have been bribed by the Syndicate. We have heard the man who leads us, and of whom we are proud, charged with a mercenary motive in bringing this matter to an issue. I think gentlemen should consider this a little; they should recollect that we are men with the same feelings as themselves. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), in speaking of the party to which he belongs, remarked that it had been honored with the leadership of Robert Baldwin. I think there is a group around the member for Shefford composed of the heirs of the men who hunted Robert Baldwin into a too early grave. They were called Reformers then; but about the time they destroyed Baldwin they were called Grits, and the name has stuck to them since. They cannot call up the shadow of Robert Baldwin to cover them now. I knew that great patriot when a lad; I admired his sterling qualities; and there is no man in broad Canada who would say that if Robert Baldwin were alive now he would have spent seven weeks of useless opposition in trying to retard the greatest scheme that was ever launched in Canada. For seven weeks the discussion has gone on with no apparent object; nothing has been done. Not a vote has been gained from this side of the House; no opinion has been created in the country except that this is an excellent bargain, and one which it is well for Parliament to affirm and carry out. The only vote in this House I have seen changed is that of an hon. member who generally, I believe, follows the Opposition, but who now it seems to me is voting consistently and determinedly with this side of the House. After seven weeks' debates, it looks as if the debate would be continued still further; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they expect to gain by it. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), appeared to endeavor to raise up some feeling among the members from the Province of Quebec. There seems to be no good ground for that. So far as we can see, the construction of this great work will be of greater service to Quebec than we think it will be to Ontario, and there seems to be no reason to try to raise any jealousy in any such matter, because this scheme is one so grand in its conception, and large in its interests, that it involves the building up of a nationality, and its advantages will be such that not the smallest Province but will feel the beneficial influence of this scheme when it is fully consummated. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), after the subject has been discussed for two months, said the Government permitted no alteration to be made in the con-

Mr. HUNTINGTON.

tract. No alteration can be permitted. The Government who have the confidence of the people and an enormous majority in the House, and possess not only the confidence of the Conservative party, but a very large portion of the Reform party also, who think public affairs are conducted safely and wisely by the present Administration and are very unwilling to disturb them—spent a whole year in formulating this agreement, and going over clause by clause with the other parties to the negotiations, protecting every interest that required to be protected; and a more carefully drawn instrument I have never had the good fortune to see, and the assault made upon it during the discussion and the attempt made to tear it to pieces more clearly demonstrated the great wisdom and care bestowed in drawing up the document. But once drawn up who is going to remove from our shoulders a burden which the people thought too heavy to carry; what were the Government to do? It seemed to me, although the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) is an older politician than myself, that, to a certain extent, he talked nonsense. The agreement could not be altered and cut up. The bargain was a made-bargain, and what the House had to do was either to affirm or reject it. When the bargain was first thrown against hon. members, owing to the novelty of the transaction, and to its being one with the like of which they had never previously been called to deal, and owing to some of its terms not being sufficiently understood, some hon. members felt uncomfortable. They heard what the Opposition were saying; they heard the opinion expressed by clever men that the agreement would ruin the country and destroy the party, and there was some uneasiness. What has been the result? During two months every clause of the contract has been discussed, and every hon. member on this side of the House is fully satisfied not only that the agreement was well done, but that it is the best bargain ever offered, and they are convinced that the utmost skill and care and the greatest wisdom possible has been shown in framing the agreement, that it is perfect in all its parts, and it will effectively carry out the object we all have.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on a division.

And the question being put—that the Bill be now read a third time; it was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Allison,	Gault,	Montplaisir,
Arnell,	Gigault,	Mousseau,
Baker,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Muttart,
Bannerman,	Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,
Barnard,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Beaty,	Hackett,	Orton,
Beauchesne,	Hesson,	Quimet,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Hooper,	Perrault,
Bill,	Houde,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Hurteau,	Platt,
Boultee,	Jackson,	Plumb,
Bourbeau,	Jones,	Pope (Compton),
Bowell,	Kilvert,	Pope (Queen's),
Brecken,	Kirkpatrick,	Richey,
Brooks,	Kranz,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Landry,	Rochester,
Carling,	Lane,	Ross (Dundas),
Caron,	Langevin,	Roulean,
Cimon,	Lantier,	Routhier,
Colby,	Longley,	Royal,
Connell,	Macdonald (King's),	Ryan (Marquette),
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Ryan (Montreal),
Coughlin,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Scott,
Coupal,	McDonald (Pictou),	Shaw,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Sproule,
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Stephenson,
Daly,	McCarthy,	Strange,
Daoust,	McConville,	Tassé,
Dawson,	McQuaig,	Tellier,
DeCosmos,	McDougall,	Tilley,
Desaulniers,	McGreevy,	Tupper,
Desjardins,	McInnes,	Valin,
Domville,	McKay,	Vallée,