

will be dead before the remedy can be applied. I believe in applying the remedy at once, when the patient can be relieved. I am opposed to this road, and I believe the people of New Brunswick are also opposed to it. The hon. member for Westmoreland will find that the people of New Brunswick are opposed to this railway irrespective of politics, apart from the heelers and the hot party men. I am not using the word healer in an offensive sense. I am only using it to indicate those men who are always prepared to swallow anything their party puts forth. Then, there are a certain class of men supporting the government, who have no party fealty, but whose sole idea is to get what they can, by whatever means they can, out of the public treasury. That class of men will support this Bill, as they will support anything that the government brings forward.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me if I ask him a question?

Mr. FOWLER. With pleasure.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to ask him if it is true that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Company proposed to have their line stop at Quebec, he, in conjunction with the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale), sent a telegram to the St. John Board of Trade to this effect:

Important that civic bodies take immediate, united and strong action re Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Apparent intention is to make Portland winter terminus; and if maritime provinces are to reap reward for past services, a fight to the finish must be made.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I sent that telegram, and I endorse it to-day. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I do not pursue so sinuous a course in politics that I have to take back to-day what I said yesterday. I sent that telegram, and I stand by it to-day. What does that telegram say? It says it is evidently the intention to make Portland the winter terminus. Has that intention been changed? Why, that is the very fault I have to find with this whole scheme—that under this contract between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, the Grand Trunk Pacific are enabled to send their freight originating along this line, by way of the American routes to American ports.

That is the very ground that I take now and that I took then. The alternative proposition of the leader of the opposition is the very thing that will prevent that. It is the very thing that my hon. friend proposed in the Railway Committee when he spoke so strongly and eloquently in favour of the extension of the Intercolonial. That extension I was in favour of then as I am to-day. He was in favour of it then, but is opposed to it to-day. And why? By the extension of the Intercolonial you would prevent most effec-

tively the making of Portland the winter terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is one feature which will appeal particularly to the electors of the east when called upon to pronounce their verdict. By extending the government system until it taps the wheat fields of the west, we would ensure to the people of the east the certainty that the sacrifices they have made for the development of Canada were not in vain. We will ensure to them their share in the trade of carrying the grain and other products from that great western country to the markets of Europe. I stand by every word of that telegram, and I defy any one to construe it in any other way than I am construing it now. But the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) cannot square what he said in the Railway Committee with what he has been saying here. There is just this difference between us. The one is guided in his career by patriotic motives, by endeavouring to do what is best for the country, whereas the hon. gentleman is evidently guided solely by what he thinks will be most to his own advantage.

Another objection to the transcontinental railway scheme is this, that by expending so much money you will restrict your capacity to spend in other directions. You are about to incur an enormous expenditure of over \$120,000,000, which is the lowest estimate of cost, and you are to build a road with gradients of four-tenths per cent, according to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) over which you will be capable of hauling trains of 2,000 tons. I am confident that there will be no such grades on that road, nor will you be able to haul trains of more than 250 tons, and you will prevent us from obtaining the proper transportation facilities which are so necessary in the east in order to handle the immense trade we expect to develop between the west and the east. When you tax the country to the extent of \$120,000,000 and over, you will find it more difficult to get the necessary millions to construct the great work required at Montreal, St. John and Halifax, and the other ports which it is necessary to develop on the maritime coast. You should do these things first, and then when you have obtained the requisite information, build your transcontinental. But do not take a leap in the dark. First develop our ports, make them free ports so that we will be in a much better position to compete against American ports, and after we have obtained full information about the character of the country through which it is proposed to build this line, will be time enough to build it. We object to this scheme on the ground that we have no definite information on which to base it. What have we? Nothing but guesses. We have no information such as business men would require before they took one step forward. It is all very well for the hon.

Mr. FOWLER.