

that kind pursued by gentlemen of both parties when a matter of great public consequence came up for the consideration of Parliament, and Governments have been willing to take the House into their confidence. But in the present case the disposition of Ministers has been quite the opposite. They have said in effect: "Don't make a suggestion, because we will not dot an *i* or cross a *t*." And from the day we came here and during all the discussion that has taken place the attitude of the Government has been simply—if you don't accept this contract just as we present it to you we will go out of office at once. They would not accept the smallest suggestion from any of their supporters. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey) has just stated that he would be almost tempted to vote against this bargain if he did not believe the terrible Opposition would come in. Is that not partizanship? The hon. gentleman was so frightened that he would vote for a bad bargain rather than jeopardize the Government. What would that hon. gentleman, and others like him, have done if the terms of this contract had been doubly as onerous as they are? Let them ask themselves this question in that calm, friendly, and dispassionate manner which they have been recommending to us. If the exemption from taxation and from duties had been more extensive, the money and land compensation doubly as great, and the Government had said: "We will have the contract carried or else we will go out;" does the hon. gentlemen on the other side pretend that in that case the Government would have been driven out of office? Perhaps not. There are many people in the country who believe as I believe, that the hon. gentlemen opposite would have voted almost any Pacific Railway contract rather than see the Government fall. Whence then the partizanship? On which side of the House is it? We have been obliged to take care of ourselves, and have defended ourselves when the Government have risen and hurled epithets at us. The Government refused to accept suggestions from us, and then because we make suggestions we are unfaithful to the country. I say, where is the partizanship, and where is a better evidence of partizanship than the statement frequently made by hon. gentlemen opposite that though a good many clauses in this contract were objectionable to them they would still vote for the contract, for fear the other side would come in? Now, we had one evidence of yielding, it was a gentle evidence—I am not going to make any observations about it—but a certain hon. gentleman was said on more than one occasion to have expressed himself very strongly against some of the terms of this contract. He seemed to think that the monopoly that was being recreated in the North-West was as bad as the one he had bought out years before. He had a little concession made to him, one just large enough to hang his hat on, one that enabled him to take part in that interesting little piece of acting when the Prime Minister rose at the convenient moment and promised to withdraw the objectionable clause. So it seems there was a chance to have dotted one *i*, and to have crossed one *t* for the sake of winning a recalcitrant supporter. I cannot avoid asking one little question. We have heard about Prince Edward Island. According to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is rather a tight little place. We have heard some things about it I hope are not true. We have heard a sort of rumor about what happened in Ontario, but things have been mighty quiet in Quebec. Yet Quebec is represented in this House, to a considerable extent, by gentlemen who sit on Ministerial benches. I should be sorry, without giving two days' notice to ask those gentlemen any questions, but I should like to know, if it were proper to ask, what arrangements have been made by the Province of Quebec to protect her own special interests. It was held out last winter that the business of the great sea-board trade would be brought down from our North-West and the American North-West by the

ministry of the Sault Ste. Marie Branch, and thence through Quebec to the sea-board. I would like to ask those hon. gentlemen, who were so much elated by the news last winter, what assurance they have that this Sault Branch is now to be built. I would like to know whether those gentlemen, if they have not actually made arrangements in this particular, are aware that last year George Stephen and Donald A. Smith, and other members of the Syndicate were powerful allies of theirs in favor of the construction of the Sault branch, and whether they are aware that by this contract they have made this powerful company enemies and opposers of the scheme of the Sault railway? This is an important matter. The people of Quebec ought to be acquainted with it, and if any hon. gentleman would get up and explain this matter in the House, the people of that Province would be relieved of considerable anxiety. Why is that which was so good for us last winter so bad for us now? We have heard a great deal of the security that was to be taken on the part of the Province of Quebec. We have seen in the *Minerve* and other papers that troubles and clouds of darkness were hanging over the Province of Quebec from which she must be protected, and there have been occasional itinerations of our public men to lead us to believe that they were looking after the interest of their Province; and now, have they placed themselves in such a position that their railways are safe, or may the Syndicate, like the monopolies of the United States, discriminate against all the future trade of that Province? Have they left to the Syndicate the power to build a rival railway along the St. Lawrence and drive them into the sea? We are told that enormous benefits are to accrue to this country from the developments that are now taking place. When an anxious elector has suggested that the interests of Quebec should be looked after, he has been told that Sir John would make it all right. Well, the Prime Minister is about to cease to have any control over the railway destinies of this country. The Prime Minister does not control the Grand Trunk; he does not control the Syndicate; for after they have once got their feet in the stirrups the Province of Quebec, like any other Province, must look after its own interests or its interests will be forgotten. I know that the Province has powerful men in the Government, and if they were not there there would be less danger for the province. If my hon. friend who sits before me were on this side of this side of the House there would be a wail of lamentation that would reach to the Citadel of Quebec over the terrible condition of things which now exist. Now all is silence, all is serene. I remember when the hon. gentlemen who represent a majority in that Province thought they had a grievance. There was no silence then. There was a disposition to secure a certain end, and that end was secured against what was thought to be a constitutional doctrine; that end was secured, at all events, by the firm alliance of gentlemen from the Province of Quebec, who said, as we all believed, to the Prime Minister: "Unless Mr. Letellier is dismissed we will oppose you." I do not mention this circumstance on account of the unhappy event which has occurred. God forbid that I should bring Mr. Letellier's name into this debate. But I refer to a great public movement in the Province of Quebec, which I say was a personal movement, and that movement caused the Prime Minister to fulfil the demands of the members from Quebec then, as he would have been obliged to fulfil them now, if the hon. members from Quebec were so inclined. Let me say one word, in which the hon. members from Quebec will join with me. This is, perhaps, no place for the allusion I am about to make; but I think every one will forgive me when I say that there is no man in the Province of Quebec who does not mourn over the calamity which has befallen that Province. The death of Mr. Letellier is a calamity to the party to which I belong; but it is also a calamity to his native