

an air line between the points of Montreal and Canterbury, because I find, on looking at the map, that all the various routes proposed, even those that go to St. John and St. Andrews' converge on Canterbury. Therefore, I think the portion of the line eastward from Canterbury may be almost disregarded in the comparison of distances. If we take the air line from Montreal to Canterbury, the Minister of Public Works says that line goes at every point some 20 miles from the present proposed route; while, if the Quebec route be taken, the air line is, at one point at all events, 80 miles distant from it. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) alluded to all the lines proposed. I had imagined even he was going to omit the line which he alluded to as the line of one man, and I confess that I almost feared to have the temerity of being the only man who referred to it. When the hon. member for Stanstead spoke on this question, the other evening, he alluded to the rush for this subsidy. He said: Now, at all events, there are several Richmonds in the field. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has any idea of making a pun, but I thought that, at all events, there was one Richmond, the seat of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, which had a claim for this short line route. The hon. member for Stanstead said Mr. Graham was the only man who advocated that route. I am not going to advocate it, because I do not consider myself to be in a position, any more than the House, to decide on the merits of the question; but before going into the question of that particular route, I wish to allude to some things which relate particularly to the proposition before us. In this respect, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether, in the proposition now before the House, there is any arrangement made as to how the subsidies therein contained are to be disbursed to the companies which may take up the undertaking? In these resolutions there is nothing which intimates how the money will be paid, whether at a certain rate per mile of the road constructed, or upon certificates of the engineer, or in what way. I believe in the other House the Minister of Justice said this money was to be paid out at a certain rate per mile of the road constructed. If that is the case, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether the whole mileage from Montreal to Halifax is to be considered, or only the mileage that is to be constructed, and not the mileage that may be taken now as built. These two propositions would involve very different operations. From the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland, I am inclined to think this money is going to be paid for the line that is to be constructed, because he said the subsidy of \$3,500,000 will amount to \$10,000 a mile for the 330 miles which have to be constructed by this route. The Government, however, has not given us information on this point. But when the hon. member for Stanstead spoke, he alluded to the taking over of lines from St. Lambert to Chambly and Chambly to Lennoxville, etc., instead of having to build a new line from Montreal by the line round the back of the mountain to Lachine, across the Lachine bridge, and from Lachine to Chambly, and from there north of Waterloo to Lennoxville or Sherbrooke. We do not know which is the proposition of the Government, or how this money is to be paid out to the company who undertake this work; and, if the proposition of my hon. friend from Stanstead is to be taken as the true proposition, namely, that the bridge at Lachine and the various portions of railway now built between Chambly, West Farnham and Sherbrooke are to be taken, we must add a considerable number of miles to the distance to be calculated from Montreal to the objective points in the Maritime Provinces. Then, perhaps, we would find that the one side of the triangle is not shorter than the other two sides. My hon. friend from Stanstead said this bridge at Lachine was going to be built. I

would not dispute his statement of that point, in regard to which he should be well informed as one of the originators of the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, under whose charter that bridge must be built if he is not now one of the shareholders. He also stated that the people of Montreal would not be able to see the traffic going over that bridge. If that is the case, it seriously affects the people of Montreal and the whole of the calculation. In the consideration of this question there is a lot of information which we have not before us. We do not know the line of railway to which we are asked to give this subsidy. Therefore, I contend that we are not in a position to state whether the subsidy should be given as proposed in these resolutions, to a line by Sherbrooke, Mattawankeag, Frederickton and Salisbury. There is another point which is a reason why it is not necessary we should not decide to-night, or even this Session, in regard to this matter. My hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) says the people of the Maritime Provinces want this railway immediately. One would imagine that the resolutions involved the immediate commencement and completion of this road; but the Minister of Public Works, in answer to my hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), said that the company were to be given two years to commence and four years to finish the work. Then, it is evident that there is no necessity for this great haste to night. It will do no harm to wait until next Session before finally deciding upon the route, and in the meantime we may be able to get the additional information which is necessary for the Government, for the engineers, for the House and for the people of Canada, before deciding upon this question. Great stress was laid by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), and other hon. members, upon the air line. In looking at the map, I find that the air line from Montreal to Canterbury passes through the town of Richmond, goes on from there and passes to the north of the International line, 25 miles at least, I am convinced. Well, Sir, that route which my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) rather made fun of, the Richmond line, starts from the town of Richmond and proceeds almost coincident with the air line eastwards to a point called Portage, on the boundary line between Maine and the county of Beauce, in the Province of Quebec. It then proceeds just north of Chesuncook Lake, only about 15 miles at the farthest point away from the air line between Montreal and Canterbury. Then from the north side of Chesuncook Lake it follows what is called section B of the Government survey, to Canterbury. If the merit of that road is considered, it will be found that if an air line must be the shortest, then the line from Richmond must be a shorter line than is the line south of Moosehead Lake, and by the International. The only objection to that line that I understood the hon. member for Stanstead had, was that the whole of it had to be built; and he also said that the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Richmond was not available for this purpose. Well, that is a very wide question, which involves the question whether this country is absolutely dependent upon only one railway corporation. I do not think we are so dependent; I believe that we can obtain our objects without begging the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build this line. But that seems to be the stand taken by the hon. member for Stanstead, and other hon. gentlemen. Then there is another point to which I wish to allude. Within a very few miles of that line there is already communication with the city of Quebec. Within a few miles of Portage, the point to which I alluded, on the boundary between the county of Beauce and the State of Maine, we have the Quebec Central, and it has an extension by the Etchemin valley; and I understand from those well acquainted with the facts that that distance is only 30 miles. But if we should not take the Grand Trunk at the line from Richmond eastward to Portage, I believe it would be more in the interest of this