

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to make glib statements about the condition of that country, which he knows no more about than the man in the moon. I have never yet seen an hon. gentleman who possesses such a vivid imagination. He can imagine almost anything, and then he will speak with such an air of candid sincerity that people almost believe him. But we want something more definite than the mere statement that a man has tramped on foot over a certain portion of this territory, when the snow was three feet deep, and then gave his opinion on the fertility of the soil. We want something more definite before we spend \$150,000,000. That country may be the most fertile part of Canada. I am not saying anything against it. But I am opposed to your proceeding before you have definite information regarding the character of the country, and before you know whether there will be any local trade developed there or not. As to the gradients that may be obtained, of course, you can go through a mountain if you have money enough. But then comes the question whether or not the cost would be so great that the freight rates would be too heavy to enable freight to go that way. All these things have to be considered. There should be full information on all these points before we undertake this responsibility. That is what the people of New Brunswick are saying. What the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) suggests is that the people of New Brunswick are so venal as to be bribed to vote against their conscience and what they believe to be best simply because there is going to be a railway down there through some portion of the province. A suggestion of that sort would come fittingly from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), who described the maritime provinces as the shreds and patches of confederation, but I cannot understand an hon. gentleman who is a son of New Brunswick, who has had the honour of being premier of that province, making such an insinuation against it, more particularly when that province has done much better by him than he deserved. He has tried to lead the House to believe that we in New Brunswick are to be bought, simply because a railway is going to be brought down to our country. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we are not that kind of people in New Brunswick. There is no part of Canada where the Canadian spirit burns more strongly. We look first to the interests of Canada, and then to those of our province.

Some hon. MEMBER. Good.

Mr. FOWLER. I can quite understand how the hon. gentleman can say 'good' in his sarcastic tones. That sort of thing does not appeal to little minds. I have heard that particular hon. gentleman before in this House, and can quite understand how

anything of that kind would appear absurd to him. But there are men to whom that sentiment would appeal. They are the sort of people we have in New Brunswick, and are not to be dragooned into the supporting of Bills simply because you are going to throw a sop by building a line down there. I would not have taken up the time of the House had it not been for the hon. member for Westmoreland. I do not know why he spoke. Surely he must have received the same instruction as the rest of the rank and file on the back benches. Surely he was told as well as they to retire into the cave of silence and remain there. Did the ministers not speak to him? Is it because he is just standing on the threshold of a cabinet portfolio that he was not spoken to? Perhaps he did not get his notice and was dragged into the debate. But I understand it was whispered around the corridors that one minister was deputed to spank the hon. gentleman for having interfered in this debate. I hoped the hon. gentleman had enough manliness to resent that and prevent the Minister of Customs from giving him that spanking.

Amendment (Mr. Blain) negatived, on the same division.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I notice, in reading the 42nd section of the agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, that it is very ingeniously worded. I am not a lawyer, but I will submit my point, and will challenge any legal gentleman in this House to controvert the statement I make. That 42nd section reads as follows:

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory—

From that point it goes on as follows:

—or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through-rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

That makes provision only for traffic for export. But what provision is made in the agreement for the Canadian manufacturer in eastern Canada, or the Canadian shipper from Manitoba or the North-west over this line? Suppose a manufacturer in the eastern provinces wants to ship to Winnipeg over this line, there is no provision that his goods shall be carried as cheaply as by lines running over American territory.