

ment makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, and to take advantage of this vote of money, of \$250,000 during 20 years, the Government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith; the faith of Parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as Parliament wishes. I think I am explicit enough, and that hon. gentlemen will not have the fears which the hon. member for Quebec East has expressed on that point. Now, the hon. gentleman says that it is all very well for us to speak of making Quebec or Montreal the summer seaport of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that if Quebec is the seaport of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the summer, it is impossible for that port not to be connected with the seaports of the Lower Provinces, because he is otherwise afraid that wheat may come to Quebec and have to remain in the elevators there when the season of navigation has closed. The hon. gentleman must know that in the case of Quebec as in the case of other seaports, when goods are there at the end of the season, they have either to remain until the next spring, or, if there are railway facilities for exporting them, the owners of those goods take advantage of those facilities. If there is anything at Quebec to be exported which has not been exported during the season of navigation, and it is a necessity that it should be exported during the winter, the Intercolonial Railway is available, and there will be other facilities as well, because there are two other roads by Quebec which Parliament will have subsidised. The first is the Quebec Central Railway, which, when extended by the subsidy voted by Parliament last year, will tap the short line to the Lower Provinces. Then, under these resolutions, when they become law, there will be the road from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, and from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, and so on. Therefore, the facilities for Quebec will be much greater than they have ever been before; there is no fear, and I am glad to allay all the fears of the hon. member for Quebec East on that point. The hon. gentleman's fears about wheat and other goods remaining in Quebec are because he had in his mind, that we must have a bridge at Quebec. The hon. gentleman seems to be very nervous just now about the prospects of Quebec in connection with all these great works; he will not allow us to wait a month or a week, but we must do everything at once—if this bridge is to be built, it must be built immediately. But about this short line, the hon. gentleman says, no short line, no extension of the Pacific Railway to Quebec, but we must have new surveys and exhaustive surveys, and these will take a year or two, before we decide about this route, and the hon. gentleman says we must make it pass through Quebec. If, by passing through Quebec, we cannot obtain the shortest route, we must make up our minds to pass elsewhere. It is very unfortunate for Quebec that the short line does not pass through Quebec; I am very sorry for Quebec, though the hon. gentleman did not think I could be; but we must look first to the interest of the country at large. The hon. gentleman represents Quebec, and I have no doubt that is the reason he is just now burning with patriotism, and wants all the interests of Quebec to be put aside, or postponed for a year or two, until new surveys are made; and he does not care if Quebec suffers during that time, or for all time to come. All these may be very good and proper sentiments; but I must say that that patriotism may exist and the railway be built. The hon. gentleman must know that we are making large and necessary expenditures now on all sides, which the progress and the development of the country require; but, on the other hand, if a bridge is required, one day or another, sooner or later, at Quebec, the Government of that period will see what

policy should be adopted and what should be done; but I do not think the hon. gentleman should call upon us to do everything in one day. We must do what we can to-day; let us build our railway; let us bring the Pacific Railway to that great and beautiful seaport of Quebec; we shall have the short line built, and then see what other works are required. The Government and the Parliament of that period will see whether new works should be undertaken, whether that bridge should be undertaken, whether it will be, as the hon. gentleman said, the interest and the necessity of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build that bridge. I have no doubt that if that necessity imposes itself on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they, with their great spirit of enterprise, will not hesitate to see what ways and means should be adopted, in order to have that bridge built; but, at all events, I think the country, and especially the Province of Quebec, will be satisfied with the policy of the Government, and see that we are doing quite enough for one Session. The hon. gentleman has stated that he had a great sympathy for me, because I was sorry my native city could not have everything it wished to have, and he thought my heart was broken. Well, I will reciprocate with the hon. gentleman. If his heart is broken to-day, it is because we have no bridge there; if his heart is broken, it is because we have not made twenty or thirty surveys more than we have made; if his heart is broken, it is because our resolutions will be adopted. Well, I pity the hon. gentleman; and he may be sure that I have as much sympathy with him, under the circumstances, as he has for me. Without wishing to extend my remarks further, I must say that the motion of the hon. gentleman for an extension of time, in order to have new surveys, and to prevent the completion of these lines for an indefinite time—a year or two, or I do not know what length of time—the motion of the hon. gentleman, I think, is not one that can be accepted by this House. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions, and also the Bill, are on the Notice Paper and that we are waiting for these resolutions to be passed to see how far we can go with the Bill. He knows well the whole thing is one scheme, a scheme to complete the great work of the Canadian Pacific Railway; therefore, we ask Parliament to help the Government in adopting these resolutions. There may be on one side or other some interests that cannot be served exactly by these resolutions, but we must rise above these local interests and see what is good for the country at large; we must see whether the interests of the country lie in the passing of these resolutions and of the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. We believe they do. We have made the best selection possible, under the circumstances, for a short route to the Lower Provinces. We are sorry we cannot satisfy all the views of all our friends on both sides of the House, but we are convinced that these recommendations are the best that can be made under the circumstances, and we hope hon. gentlemen on both sides will help us to make these resolutions become law and complete the great scheme of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by bringing the Canadian Pacific Railway to the seaboard of the Lower Provinces.

Mr. L'ANGELIER. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) made some disparaging remarks about Mr. Light, evidently thinking that by killing the reputation of Mr. Light they might also kill the line itself. In furtherance of that project, the other day the hon. member for Sherbrooke doubted whether Mr. Light had power to assume the title which he has assumed in the pamphlet written by him. Mr. Light called himself a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) said he had gone to a great deal of trouble in looking through books which contain lists of members of that institution, and