

made by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre. As to the rest of the charge brought by my hon. friend, the Minister simply stated that it was the intention of the Government during the present session to introduce a Bill with regard to this question, and he asked us to wait until then. He did not indicate what would be the character of the Bill. But the Bill can have but one object, and it is an object against which I must protest—the object of the Bill can only be to free that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, formerly known as the North Shore Railway, from the encumbrance that now rests upon it in the shape of debentures. But why is this legislation necessary in the year 1891? Why should there be the necessity for such a measure as is contemplated? It is in the memory of every member who was in the House in 1884-85, that the policy then indicated by the Government was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Quebec, and to make the harbour of Quebec the summer terminus of that railway. Nothing can be more certain than what I have stated. It was declared by the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, and embodied in resolutions. Here is the language used by Sir Charles Tupper when this policy was first propounded in 1884:

“Thus the policy of Parliament and this Government has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be extended on the north shore of the St. Lawrence down to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, by the North Shore Railway, to Quebec, and thence by the Intercolonial Railway.”

Such was at that time the declared policy of the Government—to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway along the south shore towards a maritime harbour, and on the north shore towards the city of Quebec, to make the harbour of Quebec the summer terminus, and to connect the North Shore Railway with the Intercolonial Railway. For this purpose a sum of money was appropriated, and it is to be found in the statute of 1885:

“For the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus from St. Martin Junction, near Montreal, or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the harbour of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole \$960,000.”

At the same time Parliament appropriated this amount, \$250,000 a year for twenty years for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a port of the Maritime Provinces, by the south shore. This latter part of the agreement has been carried out. The subsidies have been paid towards the completion of the railway from Montreal by the south shore to a port in the Maritime Provinces, but nothing of the kind has been done towards the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to the city of Quebec. Certain transactions have taken place by the Government. The road has passed from the North Shore Company into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but neither the letter of the statute nor the intention of the statute has been carried out. This subsidy of \$6,000 per mile, amounting to \$960,000, has never been paid by the Government. The Government have distributed money; \$960,000 have been taken out of the treasury, not towards carrying out the object contemplated, that is to say, the application of this subsidy for the extension of the Cana-

Mr. LAURIER.

dian Pacific Railway to Quebec, but the Government have made an investment of that amount, and this sum is to be found entered in the Public Accounts. On page 12 of the Public Accounts we find, under the title of investments, North Shore Railway bonds amounting to \$960,000. What my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) complains is, that the intention of Parliament in this matter has not been carried out, that neither the intention of Parliament nor the letter of the statute has been carried out, under which that sum of \$960,000 should have been paid as a subsidy to the road and have discharged the liabilities and debts that were accruing. Instead of so acting, what has the Government done? It has simply purchased bonds, which are to-day assets of the Government of Canada. This was certainly not the intention of Parliament. When Parliament voted this money, it had no intention of voting it to be invested in this manner, but simply to have it applied in like manner to that adopted on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, and to have the railway carried as far as Quebec. But, instead of doing so, the Government have simply taken the bonds of the North Shore Road, and now hold them against the Canadian Pacific Railway, who are the owners of the road; and, under such circumstances, the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is simply to let the road go to decay and not improve it, because if they improve it they give value to those bonds and make it worse for the company to redeem them. That is what my hon. friend pointed out. The policy of the Government is such that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has no object in improving the character of the road. On the contrary, the company are serving their best interests in allowing the road to fall into decay, because then, forsooth, the Government bonds will be valueless, and the company will get rid of them. What we have asked, and what has been asked by the people of Quebec generally, is, simply, that the letter of the law should be carried out, and that the money voted in 1885 for this object should not be kept in the treasury in one form or another, because it is still in the treasury in the form of bonds, but should be applied to improving the character of the road. That is a just policy. This question was again and again brought before Parliament by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), and no dissent was ever expressed by the Government. During the last election there was a new departure. When a candidate was selected to contest Quebec Centre on behalf of the Conservative party against the present member, the Conservative candidate, Mr. Châteauvert, appeared flanked on one side by the Minister of Public Works and on the other side by the Minister of Militia and Defence, and he stated that he had the promise of the Government that justice would be done and the question connected with the \$1,000,000 of North Shore Railway bonds would be settled. That is what we object to. The people of Quebec desire no favour, they simply ask for justice. What was the measure of justice demanded? It was simply one that could have been given long before. A measure, that should have gone into effect some years ago, was then held out as a bribe to the electors in order to corrupt them from their conscientious and correct view of public affairs generally. I say, again, that the people of Quebec desire no favour in this matter but simply