

enough of this material in the spring to pave the Grande Allée or St. Louis Road from end to end and such other promenade thoroughfares, at a far cheaper rate than stone and much more durable, as the pores of the wood presenting themselves upright to the traffic, fill with grit, when the surface of the wooden block becomes harder, so to say, than stone, or at any rate more durable and is not to be worn away as stone is by the combined action of friction under wet or moisture.

Again I say, Gentlemen of the City Council, Ministers of the Federal and Local, the peoples representatives, in general : visit the locality and judge for yourselves. We should do so, we do not know our geography of Canada. No more did the French, when beaten in 1870 by the Germans who had studied french itineraries much more diligently than the French themselves. We do not know our geography and hence we are beaten on our own territory by out-siders on such questions as the "Short Line" between Montreal and the Maritime Provinces. There are other things we do not know and should know, for we read not or pass our time at clubs while others are arming themselves with weapons to defeat us. Had our representatives in Parliament known, when on the question of the bridge at Cap rouge, that the bridge of similar construction now in course of erection over the Firth of Forth in Scotland, is being done under a written contract for not over £1,600,000 sterling, equal to less than 8 millions of dollars, while Light and Braunlees correctly estimated the Quebec structure of only one third the extent (a single span of only 1400 ft. and lesser with, against a double span or two spans of 1700 ft. and greater breadth and height) to cost \$3,000,000 ; I say, had that been known, no one would have dared on the floor of the House, deny the correctness of the lesser estimate, nor have had the barefaced audacity to put the figure down as was done at \$7,000,000 as a potent, an omnipotent argument against granting Quebec her due.

Let us hope Sir Charles will put his opinion in the scale in relation to the utility of the bridge at Quebec, of which it has been argued that it would injure the city as it was also argued at the time of building the Victoria, that it would ruin Montreal. Is such the case or is it not the contrary. Through trains of passenger and freight traffic destined for points beyond Quebec, must undoubtedly go straight through the Bridge and not stop at Quebec where they are not wanted and where the freight would only be an embarrassing nuisance on our lines and sidings ; but on the other hand, the bridge would allow of all passenger and freight traffic destined for Quebec to come straight into the City from the Maritime