

Trunk Railway Company to part with it even on those terms, and it is an advantage to the Dominion to obtain it even at a figure in excess of its actual value. I am very glad that the transaction has been closed.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—I am very glad that the advantages to the country are so apparent, and that the Government is now getting the road for about \$2,500,000 less than it cost the Grand Trunk Railway originally. When the steel rails are laid upon it it will be as good as any part of the Intercolonial Railway.

The Bill was then read the second and third times.

The question being put, shall this Bill now pass?

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE said: I do not rise to oppose the measure before the House, but to protest against the unseemly haste with which a Bill of its importance has been introduced, read three times, and is now ready to pass. It seems to me most unseemly haste to put through an important measure in that manner. Not having been for a long period a member of the Dominion Parliament, I am naturally unfamiliar with the history of these proceedings, but it does seem to me that the remarks of the hon. Senator from Richmond illustrate with what little wisdom the world is governed. It seems to me that if the rulers of this country had possessed a little foresight and sagacity they would have known that at some future time Canada would have to acquire that railway, and they should have made provision for being recouped for any aid given to the Company to construct it. I believe that such arrangements are now made with railways when bonuses are granted to aid them. I think it is a subject for congratulation on the whole that the Intercolonial Railway is to be supplemented by that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway which intervenes between it and the city of Quebec. It strikes me as an obvious corollary of this purchase that the Government anticipate better times. They would hardly make such an investment unless they saw clearly ahead of them an improvement in the trade of the country.

*Hon. Mr. Scott.*

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—If the hon. gentleman will turn to the proceedings of the other House, he will find that this Bill was introduced, read three times and passed there yesterday just as here, and I think that the reflection on the Senate for the haste we are displaying is quite unnecessary. The result of the Intercolonial Railway being brought up to Quebec will be to place us in connection with the railways already existing and in operation on the North Shore of the St. Lawrence, and, in that way, we shall have alternative lines to Ottawa and the West; and the result of the transfer, I am glad to learn, will be to place the Grand Trunk Railway in direct connection with the great grain distributing centre of the West, altogether beyond the control of Vanderbilt.

Hon. Mr. REESOR—I think that the Bill will have a very good effect, in consequence of its affording the means of making a connection with Chicago in the west, and drawing the produce of the Western States over the Grand Trunk Railway and down by the Intercolonial. I rise more particularly to call attention to the fact that many members of this House have been arguing, in connection with railway charters, against having any connection with United States Railways, and against being placed in the position of carrying on trade with that country. (Oh, oh.) That has been the argument, and their support of this Bill is inconsistent with the course they pursued only yesterday in connection with the Pacific Railway. They urged that it should not terminate at Burrard Inlet because it would build up an American city.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—The Pacific Railway is not before the House. I rise to a question of order.

Hon. Mr. REESOR—I am not out of order.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—The point of order is that the hon. gentleman is discussing the Pacific Railway which is not before the House.

The SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman is not in order in discussing the Burrard Inlet question.