

caused this change in the Act, and that it was made on the reports of the chief engineer of the Province at the time—a very unfortunate selection—I pointed out where the influence from Terrebonne was.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Sherbrooke spoke of influences, but he gave no name. It was my hon. friend from West Durham who gave the name of the Secretary of State, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend from West Durham, when the Secretary of State is in the House, will repeat in his presence what he has said.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member can report to the Secretary of State what I have said, and if he has anything to say in answer he can say it. I have no occasion to repeat my remarks. I pointed out that the influences from Terrebonne were obviously those of the member for Terrebonne, who was the First Minister of the Province.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He was not the First Minister at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. No; he was not at that time the First Minister, but he was the Provincial Secretary; he was a Minister of the Crown for the Province of Quebec in the DeBoucherville Government. The hon. gentleman has said he has no doubt Parliament will grant this cheerfully, and that it is an addition of \$80,000 a year for 20 years. But there is also \$170,000 for 5 years, which the hon. gentleman forgot to mention. And the present value of the whole, as I have said, is a million and a-half. The hon. gentleman says great results are going to be achieved by it. We will not discuss that question now; we may differ in opinion as to the magnitude of the results. Last Session I stated that I had always desired to see shorter communication between the different Provinces of the Dominion; that I thought it was a great mistake not to have had that shorter communication, even before the Intercolonial was built. I believed a great error had been committed at that time, in not accomplishing the short communication between the two Provinces, and one of the serious consequences of this step is in relation to the Intercolonial Railway itself. But that is not of prime consequence. The hon. gentleman does not tell us that he has any assurance from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they are going to take the through traffic of their railway to the provincial ports. He has no such assurance. But the company have announced their policy. We know what they propose doing. We have found them going to Portland and negotiating for facilities there. We have found them discussing the question of the Portland and Ogdensburgh. We have heard Mr. Stephen declaring publicly that they were desirous of obtaining a Portland connection, and indicating their understanding of what the people of Portland would do, in order that they might make that connection. At that time the city of Montreal was their summer port and they wanted to go to Portland for their winter port. Why? Not because they disliked the Maritime Provinces or the Province of Quebec, as some people have said. I do not believe they have any feeling of liking or disliking about it, but it was from commercial considerations that they believed they should reach Portland. I have heard hon. gentlemen in this House, at least one, say that it was hatred for the city of Quebec which actuated them. I had no idea that they were moved by either love or hatred; I thought they were passionless in the matter. They believed, rightly or wrongly, that Portland was their objective point for their through traffic. Well, if they believed that, and if they make that connection, I suppose that it will be from purely commercial considerations. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) told us that there was a line of road something over 200 miles long between Montreal and Portland, but he did not tell us what the distance would be by the proposed route. But that is not the question. The question which

Mr. BLAKE.

I put to the hon. gentleman and which he, experienced in avoiding giving answers to difficult questions, answered by a patriotic effusion, was this: Last Session we were told that this subsidy of a capital value of under \$1,900,000 would accomplish this result. This Session we are told it will take a subsidy of the capital value of \$3,400,000. I asked him to state how it was that he told us last Session that this first sum would suffice for building this road, and that twelve months afterwards he comes down and tells us that he was mistaken, and that he requires \$1,500,000 more. The hon. gentleman says it is based upon the report of the engineer. But I have not seen any report of the engineer which says that this additional subsidy is requisite, or that it will answer. It must be a verbal report of the engineer. But is that sufficient data? After we have been deceived and disappointed last year, after the experience of last year, is it enough to say that the chief engineer thinks this \$1,500,000 is necessary and that it will suffice? I say there is no satisfactory information upon which Parliament is to be called upon to agree with the Ministers who were so egregiously mistaken, as they now say they were, last year. But what were the data of last Session? Upon what ground was it that last Session we were told that a subsidy, the capital value of which is under \$1,900,000 a year, would do this work? The information was kept in the Ministers' breasts, but they told us that they had acquired it, and a confiding Parliament believed their statement and voted a subsidy. And this Session we get no more information, except the statement that they were all wrong themselves, that their information was imperfect and inaccurate, and that they require a million and a-half more. Who is to get this million and a-half, and why is it required? On what basis is it that \$150,000 for another five years and \$80,000 for twenty years are now required, when \$120,000 for fifteen years was ample twelve months ago? That is an important question, because we have no assurance in the face of these facts, that we will not be called upon next Session to vote a still further sum. I think after the experiences of last year, when the Ministers have come down and told us that they were disappointed in their expectations of last year, they ought to have brought some data, some tangible information to guide us in our decision, some information from those persons who are to take an interest in this matter, some information from the anonymous individuals who are at the back of all this transaction, which will show, first of all, that it was necessary to give so much, and secondly, that so much would do.

Mr. STAIRS. This question is so important to the Maritime Provinces, that I must ask permission to point out some of the reasons which induce me to support the line which has been selected by the Government. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has fallen into an error, I presume inadvertently, as to the length of the road provided for by these resolutions. I understood him to say that there were 216 miles to be built.

Mr. LAURIER. That is what the Minister said.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the chief engineer estimated the distance from Fredericton to Salisbury at 95 miles, and the distance as given by the Minister, I understood, was the distance which was necessary to reach St. John. But of course it is necessary to reach Halifax, which requires about 113 miles. But the whole length which it will be necessary to construct to reach the ports in Nova Scotia, will be something like 300 miles. We have heard a good deal to-night upon the question of routes and distances, and we have heard about a line by Quebec, and this line which has been chosen by the Government, represented in Mr. Schreiber's report as No. 6. I may say that a very careful examination, even before the subject was brought before the House, convinced me