

ritories and finally to the Pacific Ocean. The Grand Trunk authorities were obliged to shift their eastern terminus from North Bay to Quebec. They were obliged to take that action because of the hostility of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and because their application for a charter from North Bay was absolutely refused. But having consented to extend their eastern terminus from North Bay to Quebec, they then found, I assume to their surprise, that there were other interests to be dealt with and other claims to be satisfied; and so, when the Bill went to the railway committee, it was discovered that strong opposition would be raised to the proposition unless the eastern terminus was dragged 400 miles still further eastward from Quebec to Moncton. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) told us the story pretty truthfully and pretty faithfully when in the course of this debate he said:

See again
The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company then decided that they would extend their line to the port of Quebec. That was all very well so far as it went; but it was not sufficient, and a strong contention arose that the road should be continued down to a maritime province port. I believe the members from the maritime provinces are to a certain extent responsible for supporting the hands of the government in that connection, and we are entitled to credit for it.

I presume that the hon. member (Mr. Wade) and his friends thought that the Grand Trunk Railway Company might as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb, and that having got the terminus to Quebec, they would insist as a condition of granting the charter that it be extended further eastward to Moncton. This was done notwithstanding the repeated declarations of the Hon. Mr. Blair that the extension to Moncton was a sheer waste of public money, and that it also meant the practical destruction of the Intercolonial Railway.

There was no talk then about the advantages which Canada reaped from the continuance of the so-called bonding privilege. Up to that time the status of the bonding privilege was absolutely normal; we were not threatened with its abrogation; the bonding privilege bogey was not thought of then; it was only resurrected to do duty some time afterwards. The hon. member (Mr. Wade) puts the situation so succinctly that I had better quote his words. I have already recited a quotation from him in which he states that the extension from North Bay to Quebec, while it might suit certain interests did not suit others; that the maritime province interests were to be considered, and that in consequence he and his colleagues demanded the extension some 400 miles further eastward. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) said:

The time has arrived, Sir, when it might as well be known that the maritime provinces are an important portion of this Dominion of Canada. We have been brought into this confederation,

and we are here to stay. We have our aspirations as well as other parts of the Dominion. We hope to develop and improve; we hope to go forward in the march of progress equally with the balance of the Dominion; and no scheme having for its object the national advancement of Canada can be carried through this parliament successfully unless it takes into account the rights and interests of the maritime provinces.

National advancement, Sir, in the best sense of the term, can only be had when the rights and interests of all sections of the Dominion of Canada are taken into consideration and receive fair and equitable treatment. That is what we on this side of the House contend for; that is what has ever been contended for by the party of which we are humble members. It is because we believe that the rights and interests of all sections of this Dominion are not being safeguarded by this scheme of the government that we have offered strenuous objection to it. We are firmly convinced that this trans-continental railway scheme is a reckless and improvident proposal; that it does not safeguard the interests of all the provinces as it should; and that, as a consequence, the rights of the maritime provinces, as well as of the other provinces of the Dominion, are not being respected and preserved as we consider they ought to be. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) made the further statement:

When the maritime province members put forward their first fight for the extension of this road to those provinces, I am glad to say that we had the assistance of very many of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the House; but afterwards these hon. gentlemen turned completely on their tracks, and they have since opposed us with all their might and main. I understand that their object in supporting us in the first instance was this. They thought that if the government compelled the Grand Trunk Pacific to have its terminal point in the maritime provinces, it would kill the whole scheme.

Well, Sir, that certainly is not paying a very high compliment to the patriotism of the maritime province members who sit on this side of the House. The allegation of the hon. member (Mr. Wade) need only to be mentioned to be resented by every fair-minded man here, no matter on which side he sits. It is known to us all that gentlemen from the maritime provinces who support the hon. leader of the opposition are as jealous of the rights of their provinces, and are as zealous in promoting the welfare of those provinces as are their confreres on the Liberal benches. And, Sir, I go further and say that it has been already established beyond all cavil that the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Wade), and those associated with him in supporting this scheme are sacrificing the best interests of the maritime provinces and are doing very serious damage to the great Intercolonial Railway, which is so closely and inseparably identified with the welfare of that portion of the