

remote points. I repeat that in spite of all that has been said and of all that has been done we will have the Pacific Railway terminus at Quebec. The argument is brought forth that our position is the same as it was last year. This, Mr. Speaker, is not so. Our position last year, let it be remembered, was that given to us by a law which enacted that \$960,000 would be appropriated to the purchase of the North Shore Railway in case the Pacific Railway could make the necessary agreements. A delay of six months was allowed to make these arrangements, which were entirely optional with the two companies. After those six months, if the arrangements were not made, the \$960,000 were to be appropriated for the construction of a new line to be built, which was to be organised. Such was then the position, but such it is not now. A year ago everything was optional; each company could conclude to not enter into these arrangements. Now, as the Government tell us, the arrangements are complete and final. The particulars of these arrangements have been stated to us. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has agreed to sell, upon certain stated conditions which I will discuss. The Pacific has also, we are told, agreed to purchase the road on the terms imposed by the Government. That position is altogether different from that in which we were last year. Last year there was an offer to sell or to buy. Today the conditions are settled, agreed and determined. As we are told by the Executive, it is a final settlement, and all that is required is the sanction of Parliament. Sir, I believe in the statement made by the Executive on the subject. I believe in it, such as it has been made to us; the more so, as I rely upon the honor of the one who made it—upon the honor of the Government, in whose name it has been made; and for another reason, because no Government would survive such a statement if it was not fully executed and followed to the letter. This is for me another guarantee, as, for my part, I state it emphatically, if these arrangements, such as they have been pointed out to us, if the policy which was enunciated to us was not carried out, I would be the first to condemn the Executive for misleading the House and the first to withdraw my support from them. This, Mr. Speaker, satisfies me on the question whether we shall have the terminus, and I take it for granted that the terminus will be given us within as short a delay as possible. But we are told: Supposing that we should have it, that would give us nothing, because we have no winter port; but we forget the crossing, we forget that the crossing is one of the conditions of this contract under the existing law, and that consequently the produce can be carried over from Quebec to Levis during the whole of the winter season. We also forget the Bill now on the Paper, by which the navigation will be kept free opposite Quebec throughout the winter; but we forget something more, we forget that there is not only the grain trade, which can be carried on during fall and winter, we forget the shipment of grain through Quebec during summer; we also forget the enormous exportation of square timber which comes down from Ottawa during summer, and which, owing to the operating of the North Shore Railway by the Grand Trunk, has only come down by water, because the Grand Trunk Company has until now always refused to carry it; we also forget what could be done with the cattle trade, which must necessarily come to Quebec, thus saving to the shipper the enormous losses which they suffer between Montreal and Quebec. I say that for these conditions our port must take a very large development. I may be mistaken, but I say from the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway will be relegated to the South Shore, while the Pacific Railway Company will be in the same position on the north shore, that a bright future lies in store for us. These two great companies will wage a keen and legitimate competition to one another, and bring to our ports the enormous traffic of the western part of the Dominion; and even if we should

Mr. Bossé.

only get a small portion of this traffic, there is quite a difference between that prospect and the disadvantage under which we have labored until now. To attain this end we cannot afford a delay, which has often proved so fatal to us. Have we not already favored to lose the benefit which the legislation of last year had secured for us. We have on Paper a legislation giving aid to the Pacific Railway Company. These resolutions, according to the hon. Minister of Public Works, form a part and parcel of the resolutions which are now under discussion. They must all go together. If, to-day, we should lose the opportunity of obtaining the terminus at Quebec, where would we be a year from now, with the unexpected changes of all kinds which might come up. I say, moreover, that we will have lost the opportunity this year of controlling the company and of securing the terminus for Quebec. In a year from now the coercive means which we have now and which can be utilized will have ceased to exist, and we will not be able to control the Pacific and bring it to our port. I see in the postponement and in the fact that we should lose the only opportunity afforded to us, something which would be unfair towards the city of Quebec. For these reasons, and as I do not wish at this late hour to enter into other considerations which might be favorable to the adoption of these resolutions, I must vote against the amendment and the sub-amendment and in favor of those resolutions.

Mr. FISHER. I believe that this is a question of the utmost importance, of national importance, and not only of interest to the Maritime Provinces. A question in which all and every part of the Dominion should take part and think well over before deciding upon it. The proposition of the Government is probably an effort on their part to repair, as much as lies in their power, the great evil which they entailed upon the country when, a good many years ago, they located what is called the Intercolonial Railway. I believe it is in consequence of that mistake, which was protested against by hon. gentlemen on this side, that to-day Canada is called upon to grant a large subsidy to build a short line to connect the Maritime Provinces with the rest of the Dominion. It is not my place to decide so intricate a question as that of the engineering capabilities of the different routes, especially after the expression from a high professional authority which was given this evening. I allude to the expression of opinion which the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) gave, and I think the House may congratulate itself that he arrived here so opportunely as to be able to give a timely warning to Parliament, a warning it will be well to take to heart and ponder on before casting our votes. I am not going to enter into an elaborate discussion of the various comparisons of distances and grades over the different routes. That has been done by hon. members who have already addressed you, though I think I have some data to go on, but, at this late hour, it would be out of place to allude to this question at any great length. I cannot refrain from alluding to one or two points brought forward by hon. gentlemen who support the resolutions. The Minister of Public Works alluded to the obvious absurdity, that of any triangle, the two sides might possibly be shorter than the one. Of course, we know well, when a triangle is formed of straight lines that is impossible; but when we find one side of the triangle shaped like a corkscrew, it is quite possible that it might be longer than the other two. I am not in a position to state whether this is the case or not. I will not attempt to decide the question of railroad mileage, but as long as there is question about it, I feel bound to support the amendment of the hon. member for Quebec East. When the hon. Minister of Public Works spoke of that base of a triangle, he alluded to it as being as nearly as possible an air line. I presume we can take