

way, I confess my suspicions became almost a moral certainty, and subsequent evidence in regard to the matter was such as no disinterested person in this House or the country could afford to overlook. It is a most improper state of affairs. If I were to characterise it in the way I should like to characterise it, you, Mr. Speaker, would probably call me to order, as using expressions contrary to the proprieties of the House. I therefore will not do so, but I state again that it is a most improper thing that the Minister of Railways, at the same time he was negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to afford them relief in their embarrassment, in connection with the enterprise of building a railway across the continent, should have been engaged in receiving propositions, and the company engaged in considering an undertaking to enter into another contract, which would oblige them to either buy or secure favorable running powers over a line which is owned by the Acting Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman told us that he himself was so much interested in the International that he could not have anything to do with the resolutions. He told us he was so interested in that railway that he could not bring down the resolutions for the short line, and the First Minister brought them down; and at the same time the Minister of Agriculture knew he was himself a party negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to the short line. This state of affairs is very suspicious, and it leads us to believe that the determination of the Government to insist upon the adoption of the short line, in which is included the International, is a policy hasty, ill-considered, if not unconsidered, and I believe all independent-minded members in this House should support the amendments moved by the hon. member for Megantic and the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was somewhat surprised to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher); I was somewhat surprised at the line of argument he adopted and at the amount of ignorance he showed, especially in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman commenced his remarks by attacking a line of railway for which I hold myself as specially responsible as any member in this House. If there is any member to whose activity, public conduct and strenuous efforts the location of that line may be attributed, I believe that man is myself. And then the hon. gentleman casts reflections on the location of the line, and attempts to throw on the Government, at this day, the responsibility of determining that location. When he endeavors to place that responsibility on the Government alone, he is ignorant of the events of that time. I was a member of the Government of that day, of which my respected and hon. friend the First Minister was the leader. Was the Government alone responsible for the location of the line? No; Parliament, by an immense majority, adopted the location. We find the leaders of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs voting for that location, and yet we find the whole blame thrown by the hon. gentleman on the Government, if blame there was. I want to make no excuse for the location. I assume my share of the responsibility, as a member of the Government of that day. It was a location approved by Parliament and by the British Government, which aided us in raising money, and guaranteed a certain portion of the cost of the construction; and looking at the result, there is no reason to be ashamed. I assume, so far as one individual can, the responsibility of that location. Let us see how the leaders of the Liberal party voted on that question. With the exception of Mr. Workman, there was no member from the Province of Quebec who voted against it. Among those who voted for it were Sir Richard Cartwright, Messrs. Geoffrion, Holton, Joly, Pelletier, Poser, Tremblay, and others. If the hon. gentleman is conversant with the position of any of those members, and with the

proceedings that took place, he would not say that the Government of that day alone were responsible for the location of the Intercolonial, but that Parliament almost unanimously supported it. I am not making this statement in extenuation of the act. I do not wish to relieve myself of any responsibility connected with it. I repeat, as I did in 1867-68, that the location was justified by the necessities of the country, by considerations for the future security of the country, and by what would best serve and conserve the interests of Canada. I was a little surprised at a remark made by my respected friend, the member for Jacques Cartier, for whose opinions I have great respect and who manifests a great deal of that independence which I myself occasionally exhibit. I was surprised that that hon. member made a mistake in referring to the position of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman stated that the Intercolonial cost \$42,000,000. I am not prepared to say whether my hon. friend has overstated the amount or not, but this I will say, that the people of the Province of New Brunswick do not thank the people of Quebec or Ontario for the outlay upon the Intercolonial Railway. It was our due; it was a matter of treaty; it was part of the bargain. It was a concession they were bound to give us, and I appeal to my right hon. friend to say whether I am not stating the facts, in saying that in the bargain, which was the foundation of the legislation which led to Confederation, it was not stipulated that that road was one of the conditions of the consummation of the Union. What right has the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to cast in our teeth that we have had more of the public money of Canada than was proper, or than we were entitled to receive; that we were indebted to Canada with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, and the outlet for us which it afforded. We, in the Maritime Provinces, have desired and have always shown our desire to develop the country in the west; \$100,000,000 are being spent in lands and money on the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Montreal, to the Pacific Ocean. Who gets the benefit of it? Do we, in the Maritime Provinces get the benefit that you do here in Ontario and the Western Provinces? Do we participate in the enjoyment of these advantages which you will enjoy in the building and running of that road? Certainly we will not. And if we have not those privileges; if we cannot enjoy the advantages of that enormous outlay, surely we ought not to have that cast in our teeth, when we want a short line of communication, when we wish to perfect that system, when we wish, having Montreal and Quebec as summer ports, and an outlet for that country, is it not right, when we have winter ports, when we have St. Stephen and St. John, and Halifax, open at all seasons of the year, is it not right that we should have those privileges, and is it proper to have it cast in our teeth that we got so much advantage by the building of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. GIROUARD. I never said so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I withdraw the remark. I am not going to discuss the merits of these lines. I think, after the able speech—the magnificent speech, if I might so term it—the forcible, energetic and earnest speech of my hon. friend from Stanstead, it would be inconsistent for me to take up the time of the House in discussing the relative merits of the two lines. But I will take up a few minutes in discussing the impossibility of carrying out the ideas of those who speak about an air line, which was dilated on to some extent by the hon. member for Brome. The hon. gentleman talks on a subject about which he knows very little. That question was better understood, and as fully discussed in 1867, and certainly better discussed than it has been during the present Session. These surveys of Major Robinson were fully before Parliament, before the Parliament of that day, and perhaps few men took as much interest in the discussion of that matter as I did; and I tell the hon. mem-