

engineers, the responsibility rests on the Government and on the engineer they have selected; and if their engineer has selected the Megantic line, I think we, who are unskilful and unprofessional men, should adopt that line. In our Province, as I have said, we have been agitating for this Megantic line. Last winter, for the first time, a deputation was sent from the city of Quebec to our people; but that deputation, although received with every respect and courtesy, were told plainly that so far as our people were concerned the Megantic line was the line they wanted, and the line which they believed was in the true interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces. While Quebec is to have the summer port, we desire to obtain for the Maritime Provinces the winter port. Then, the combination line is put forward to compete with the Megantic line; but since the last debate took place a line is proposed by Mr. O'Sullivan, the only claim advanced in favor of which is that it is all on Canadian soil; it crosses the mountains in a direct route from Grand Falls to Moncton, but Major Robinson and Captain Henderson found it impossible to get a line where he proposes to carry his. But I protest against that line on another ground, because the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are hand in hand in endeavoring to get this short line, and I think weight should be given to the fact that every member from the Maritime Provinces is in favor of the Megantic line, and that the line proposed by Mr. O'Sullivan in his letter is one that would leave St. John and St. Andrews, and the whole valley of St. John, without any advantage whatever. We complain that when we go to Montreal we have now to travel 100 miles eastward before we can turn our faces towards Montreal, and Mr. O'Sullivan proposes to give us another line, which will compel us to go farther still. We have not only this line surveyed, but a charter has been granted in Maine for a line across that State. The hon. member for Megantic has called attention to the railway law of the State of Maine, and has pointed out that we need not wait until the Session of 1887 in order to obtain a railway charter, because the law of that State provides for it; but my hon. friend forgot to point out all the steps that have to be taken. Every company, after certain things are done, and when it is approved by the Railway Commissioners, obtains an endorsed certificate, and that certificate being filed, the company becomes *de facto* and *de jure* a corporation, but it is also enacted as follows:—

"Every corporation organised under this Act, before commencing the construction of its road, shall present to the Board of Railroad Commissioners a petition for approval of location, accompanied with a map of the proposed route, on an appropriate scale, and with a profile of the line on a vertical scale of ten to one compared with the horizontal scale, and with a report and estimate prepared by a skilful engineer from actual survey. The Board of Railroad Commissioners shall, on presentation of such petition, appoint a day for a hearing thereon, and the petitioners shall give such notice thereof as said board shall deem reasonable and proper, in order that all persons interested may have an opportunity to appear and object thereto. If the Board of Railway Commissioners, after hearing the petition, shall approve the proposed location, and that the public convenience requires the construction of such road, the corporation may proceed with the construction of their road."

In the case of larger roads, application must be made to the Legislature for a charter; and so far as I have been able to ascertain, the general law adopted in Maine is for the purpose of enabling parties to build short lines, pretty much as we do by our Consolidated Railway Act, without application to the Legislature. Now, we have to consider that a charter has been granted by the Legislature of Maine for a railway across that State, to connect with our system. If we ask to build a line across the State of Maine, which will divert the traffic from other portions of that State, we cannot expect them to authorise a line which would draw the traffic from the Penobscot and Bangor districts to New Brunswick and Quebec. I feel that this is a matter which cannot be delayed; I believe that it is in the interest of the Maritime Provinces that it

should not be delayed. What we want is a union with the western system of railways, in the hope of getting a portion of the traffic that passes over that system. Give us the line, and then I am not afraid of the energy and enterprise of the people of Halifax, St. John and St. Andrews, and of the counties through which those roads will run, finding means to counteract the natural advantages which the American ports possess over them. That is for us to do. What we ask this Parliament to do is to give us a helping hand, to enable us to form a connection with that system of railways, and leave the people to develop, by their own energy and enterprise, the trade which we think we are entitled to. I do not wish to detain the House any longer; I only desire to give the reasons why I shall vote against this amendment, because it is calculated to produce delay and to injure the interests of the Maritime Provinces, for I fear that if we let this opportunity slip, many years may elapse before we shall get another. We may find that these railways cannot wait until we get over our differences, and the consequence will be that the traffic, instead of coming to our Provinces, will be diverted to the cities on the seaboard of the United States, to which nature has given advantages over us; but we hope by this line to counteract them and get a share of the traffic.

Mr. GIROUARD. I rise to say a few words to explain the vote I intend to give, and my remarks will apply to the amendment as well as the resolutions. The railway resolutions have two objects in view: first, the purchase of the North Shore Railway, and second, the construction of what is called the short line. With regard to the purchase of the North Shore Railway, I would remind the House that last year, when the Quebec railway resolutions came up for discussion, I expressed the view that it was unfair to deduct from the indemnity payable to the Quebec Government the sum of \$6,000 a mile for the road from Montreal to Quebec, either to purchase the North Shore Railway or to build a new road. I protested against the Government retaining a sum out of the Quebec indemnity for that purpose. I could not do more, because the Province of Quebec was interested to the extent of \$2,300,000. However, my protest was made, and holding to-day the views I expressed then, I feel called on to vote against the first resolution, for the purchase of the North Shore Railway out of the \$960,000 which forms a portion of the indemnity to the Quebec Government. The ground I take is, that in the past we never deducted anything from railway company subsidies, under the pretence that the Canadian Pacific Railway might want to purchase the roads these railway companies were intending to build. Take, for instance, the Canada Central road, which was subsidised to the extent of \$12,000 a mile, and the Callander and Gravenhurst, only a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Callander to the railways leading to Toronto, which were subsidised \$12,000 a mile; and in both cases the full subsidy was allowed. I do not see, therefore, why the Quebec Government, which has built a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, a portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, should not receive \$12,000 a mile for the road from Ottawa to Quebec. Now, as to the short line, it is true Parliament committed itself to the building of a short line last year, but only to a certain extent. It did not commit itself to building a short line that would cost about four times more than what was contemplated last year. Last year we voted \$170,000 a year for fifteen years towards the construction of that line; to-day we are asked to vote \$250,000 a year for twenty years: that is to say, last year the sum of one or two millions of dollars was asked to build the road; this year the sum of about \$5,000,000 is asked. The case, therefore, does not stand in the same position at all. The hon. member for Stanstead (M. Colby) laughs, but I would ask him if \$250,000 a