

**Mr. BLAKE.** I really think the hon. gentleman's statement is too thin, quite too thin, so thin that we understand it. It is a polite way of saying it was managed in this particular manner. Here we are with this proposal, the Acting Minister of Railways acknowledged he could not take part in it. I did not know his disability went so far that he could not say a word about it, even in private. We have this important admission, that in the decision of this matter we are deprived of the responsibility of even the Acting Minister. We want information of the principle upon which this subsidy has been fixed. Is it on the principle, which is now ascertained, that the hon. gentleman's railway and others will have to be bought, and the public money will have to be paid for them? Is it on the principle that a part of the subsidy will have to go in that way? If so, how much? When we find an addition of \$1,500,000 to the sum said to be sufficient last year, and find that addition coincident with the announcement that we require the International line, we have a right to be informed what sum of money is to go into the acquisition of the International line.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** The hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) put me a question whilst the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) was addressing the House, and of course I could not then answer it. As I said to the hon. member for Sunbury, this vote has nothing to do with the bridge at Montreal. The vote is for a line of railway to connect Montreal with St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, *vid* Sherbrooke. When the time comes to apply this subsidy due the line mentioned here, of course the Government will take care that the connection between the south shore and the St. Lawrence be made in such a way as to meet the requirements of trade and the public interests generally. There are different ways of making the connection. Of course, there is always the Victoria bridge, and then the proposed Lachine bridge. That question has not come up. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has asked what is to be done with this money, whether it is to be employed in purchasing this line or the other, or whether it is to build the 216 miles which are mentioned in the tabular statement I gave as a portion of the line which is not built, and which must be built, if we want to have a complete line from Montreal to St. Andrews, St. John or Halifax. No doubt this money will go towards securing a line from Montreal to these ports. How will that money be employed? As the hon. gentleman says, it is so much a year for so many years; therefore, the Government must see that the conditions of the vote be fulfilled; that is to say, they must have proof positive that this line will be obtained, which is considered the shortest and the best under the circumstances, from Montreal to the maritime ports. I cannot say whether there will be so much for rolling stock or so many miles built, but when I gave these figures about the miles built and to be built, I wished to show in what position was the line for which we were asking a subsidy. A portion of the line is built and a portion is not built, and the company that will be formed must show that they comply with the requirements of this vote; that is to say, that this line will be obtained, by which we can reach, for example, St. Andrews by a line not to exceed 430 miles, as mentioned here. The hon. member for West Durham said we must not use this money to increase the private fortunes of anyone. There is no desire or intention on the part of the Government to use this money in any other way than the resolution says, purely and simply, that is, to give to the company the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to the seaboard in the Maritime Provinces. That is the sole object we have in view. The amount of money is large, as the hon. gentleman says, but we believe, on the information we have now from our chief engineer, that this

sum is required. This vote is a heavy one, no doubt, but it is a vote which, after all, will give good return to the country. It will secure our connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific by the shortest route possible under the circumstances. Of course, if we do not build this direct line we would have to see our trade go from Montreal to Portland. Then all the advantages of the terminus of such a great railway in winter would be to the benefit of the United States. We do not wish this. In the same way that we have taken care that our railway shall not be tapped in British Columbia for the benefit of the United States of America, our enterprising neighbors, who have their own rival railway, the Northern Pacific, so we thought that we should not allow them to benefit at the Atlantic end of the railway; or, after all the sacrifices we have had to make, to obtain the terminus at Portland or elsewhere in the United States. We thought the railway should end on our own territory on the Atlantic shores, so as to give us the benefit of the cargoes which are to be sent abroad and the return cargoes which would secure to us the benefit of that foreign trade. Under these circumstances, we expect that Parliament will not refuse to make this sacrifice again in order to complete this system. After the large sacrifices the country has made for the opening of the North-West by the Canadian Pacific Railway, though this vote of \$80,000 a year for twenty years is considerable, nevertheless we think it is not such as to warrant a refusal on the part of Parliament. Parliament would wish to complete its work by linking the two oceans by its railway route, and therefore we believe that the vote which we are asking will be cheerfully granted by Parliament. The hon. member for West Durham has alluded to Mr. Light. As far as he is known to me personally, I have nothing against him, and I have never known anything against him, except what was stated to-night by hon. gentlemen who brought reports and statements, and of course were responsible for those statements. The hon. gentlemen who made them must have had good data, and I am only sorry that the opportunity has occurred to bring them here, because it is always a pity that a man in the position of Mr. Light should be damaged in his reputation. But if these figures are not correct, as given by the hon. gentlemen, the latter must take the consequence. The hon. member for West Durham has given his version of the way in which the North Shore was extended to Terrebonne, and so on.

**Mr. BLAKE.** No; it is the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall).

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** I think the hon. member for West Durham has added something to the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, in giving the name of a gentleman connected with the Government, one of my colleagues. I am sorry my hon. friend the Secretary of State is not here, because I have no doubt he would have been perfectly able to defend himself before the House, and I hope he will be in better health to-morrow, so that he may answer the hon. member for West Durham. As to these resolutions being in my hands, this is not the first time that one Minister takes a portion of the work of another Minister, and brings up a matter and does his best to lay it before the House and to help his colleagues. I did so the other day, in regard to the railways in the North-West and their land subsidies, though those were matters connected with the Department of the Interior. I am not Minister of that Department, but I was asked by the First Minister to take charge of that matter, and I did so, as I have done now; and, no doubt, I might ask some of my colleagues to take some of my work, if I were not in good health.

**Mr. BLAKE.** With reference to the Secretary of State, I must say that the hon. member for Sherbrooke having pointed out that it was influence from Terrebonne which