

tions—if I understood aright, to the resolution which is connected with the short line. He has not seen—and that is where he made the mistake—that his motion in amendment would necessarily involve the result which he seeks to avoid, by voting against the amendment and the sub-amendment which are now proposed. The three resolutions which have, no doubt, been dictated by what the Government considered to be in the interest of the various localities which they concern, are, by the declaration of the Government, urged upon us as a whole; they must be adopted as a whole or rejected as a whole; they must stand or fall as they are. It is not in our power to divide them or to parcel them out. If I thought the thing would be possible perhaps I would not follow the course which I have adopted. But it is because these three resolutions are submitted to be adopted or rejected together, that I am obliged to concur in the adoption as a whole. I said that the Pacific terminus at Quebec is, for us, a matter of the greatest necessity. That terminus, by itself, and the fact that it will enable us to get rid of the monopoly from which we have so long suffered, are, for me, the two great considerations which induce me to take that course. The city of Quebec has, for many years, maintained itself by its lumber trade and ship building. Either directly or indirectly, Quebec lived upon those two industries. Unfortunately, both disappeared at the same time. About the same time, or a short time thereafter, disastrous fires destroyed the greatest part of our city; and if the experience of other cities had repeated itself among us, the cities which have exclusively lived upon their lumber trade have inevitably disappeared with running out of the industries which supported them, and the same thing repeating itself in our midst, Quebec was doomed, but there was among us such vital forces that, notwithstanding those disastrous circumstances, Quebec has been able to maintain itself and to increase somewhat. Thanks to the success of its industries, thanks to the establishment of manufactures, it has not only kept up its population, but even became more prosperous than it was in the best days of the ship building and square timber trade. But those industries, started under such different circumstances, notwithstanding their prosperity, were not as thriving as they might have been, had they not groaned under the tariff which was imposed upon them by the Grand Trunk Railway, the North Shore Railway and Richelieu Company. Labor was cheaper than in surrounding towns and cities, land was also cheap and the manufactures have been able to sustain competition. But that competitor has become disastrous for us. The rates imposed by the Grand Trunk on the south shore of the St. Lawrence; the still higher rates imposed by the Grand Trunk since it controls the North Shore Railway; the corresponding high rates of the Richelieu Company, have almost isolated us from the rest of the Dominion. The Richelieu Company found profit in it, and so did the Grand Trunk Railway. I have not much to say against them, as business men, but in order to get rid of them, I have everything to say, because it was making Quebec powerless, and causing it to be deserted for ever, if that style of thing continued. Such is the position in which we found ourselves, and I say that to get out of that position we would have sacrificed everything. I say that, if by these resolutions, our position is changed, and if, added to that, we obtain the Pacific terminus at Quebec, there is not a Quebecker who, by studying the facts and weighing them, seeing what we will come to if that state of things continues, and what will be the position in which we will find ourselves if we obtain the control of the North Shore Railway, by the Pacific and the terminus, I say there is not a Quebecker who will not vote in favor of these resolutions. We have a choice to make. We have to choose between the position which we might hold if we wish for the resolutions, or that in which

we actually are, and which will perpetuate itself if we do not obtain redress. It is the short line which appears to be the bugbear, but I do not see any reason that we should feel anxious about. In my opinion, it cannot be for Quebec a source of anxiety, and for these reasons: It will never enter anybody's head that when western trade has once reached Montreal it shall take this short line and run over three, four or five hundred miles to go to the various seaports of the Dominion, and that it will not stop at Montreal, where it is already to take the steamers, or according to circumstances, that it will not go down to Quebec to be shipped from there. This so-called short line cannot draw the western trade by that route, because it is too long, and it cannot compete with Montreal, because the cars, on leaving Montreal, will have hundreds of miles to run over to reach the seaboard, instead of the produce being shipped from Montreal. It cannot be objected that the building of a bridge at Lachine will open a new route, and that consequently the trade will be directed towards Portland and other American ports. I do not see that there is a serious danger of that kind, because the distance between Montreal and Portland is 300 miles, and Portland is 300 further from Liverpool than Quebec is. We would have to suppose that trade would take, willingly, this longer route of 300 miles by rail and 150 miles by water to reach Liverpool. It is said that there would be compensation in the cost of freight, that there would be compensation through the greater amount of trade in those cities, but they are large enough to compete for ever, I do not say temporarily, against the advantages offered by Quebec and Montreal. If, unfortunately, we have at Quebec a society which has caused so much damage to the trade of that city, let us hope that by the force of circumstances it will soon cease to exist, to the greatest benefit of Quebec, and even of those who belong to it; and even if such would not be the case, even if we had to fear the competition of Portland and Boston, have we not already the Victoria Bridge, which gives a right of way to cars which do not belong to the Grand Trunk Company, and do we not know that their rates have lately been reduced from \$14 to \$4.50. Do not these rates represent what would be the cost to a company of building a bridge. And do we not all know that this bridge has been built in such a way as to allow the laying of a double track at a much lower cost than that of the building of a new bridge. All these considerations tend to show that the danger which is pointed out in the direction of Portland and Boston already exists, if it exists at all, and if trade is to take that direction it has already taken it at the present time. Therefore, I do not find in that short line any disadvantage which can compare to the great advantage which we are to derive from the Pacific, but the hon. members for Montmagny, East Quebec and Mégantic say that the surveys which have been made for this short line have been inadequate. Far from me the idea of saying that I can decide, from the returns brought down, that one line is better than another. None of the proposed lines are absolutely located, or recognised as practicable. But again, I say that I see no danger to Quebec from the short line. I cannot stoop to that consideration, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, our harbor is closed for six months in the year; we cannot think, during that time, of being benefited by these advantages. During six months only our port is open to navigation, and it is only during that time that we can derive the advantages which I have mentioned. It would be perfectly useless to have the short line during winter, because we could derive no benefit from it, because we could only see the trains going over a bridge nine miles away from us. In summer I submit that it would be perfectly indifferent to us that the short line should pass *via* Quebec, because the trade will stop there to be shipped, and would not willingly go over hundreds of miles by rail to reach seaports at more