

considered unfair was, that the cost of the improvements made and to be completed between Montreal and Quebec in the channel, was charged against them. This ought to be viewed as an undertaking of public utility, and not as a mere local undertaking; and it was in this light that they expected the Government would approach this important question. However, at all events, it was concluded that Montreal was to be the head of navigation; and, in common with the member for Montreal West, I hope that the day was not far distant when the Government would see the necessity of taking up the whole work and finishing it at its own expense.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Although I am not a representative of the city of Montreal, I feel somewhat interested in the object of these resolutions, as they concern the Province of Quebec. I rise only to proffer one observation. I have just heard it stated since this debate opened that this should not be considered a Dominion work. It seems to me, however, that this is as much a Dominion work as is the deepening of the canals. Nobody will pretend that the Lachine Canal is not a Dominion work; and the question now before us relates to the dredging of the channel between Montreal and Quebec—which is not deep enough for a certain class of vessels. This dredging is necessary to give greater capacity to the St. Lawrence as a navigable river, and is as much a Dominion work as would be the deepening of a canal. Supposing there were rapids which had to be overcome by deepening the bed of the river, that would be considered a Dominion work; and I cannot see why dredging this channel, thereby making it navigable for a certain class of vessels should not be regarded as a Dominion work.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation). Mr. Chairman: As a member from the Province of Quebec, I think it is my duty to make a few remarks on this question. They desire to represent me as representing exclusively the Quebec district, because recently when a deputation came to Ottawa, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Quebec, I had the pleasure and the honor of accompanying this deputation, firstly to the Ministers who represent in the Cabinet the interests of the Province of Quebec, and afterwards before the Privy Council itself. On that occasion, as in the present, I took this stand, Mr. Chairman, which I am happy to make known to the House and to the public. Quite recently one of the hon. members of this House, on a question of privilege which he raised, was disposed to treat us as narrow-minded men, at a time when we had not an opportunity of defending ourselves. This being the first chance I had of protesting against the appellation of the hon. member, I avail myself of it with pleasure, and I say, for his information and that of the public, that if they wish to scrutinize the motives which influenced me, they must, in the first instance, establish whether the question which is now before the House, is either a national or a local question. If it is a national question, all local or parish questions must be secondary, and the public good must take precedence of local interests. If it is a local question, then it is our duty as representatives from the Quebec district, to consider the interests of our district, as is likewise the duty of the members from the Montreal district, to first consider the interests of their district; and on this assumption of an accord to the members who represent in this House the interests of Montreal, the right to take the position which they think they should take; on the other hand, they should concede to the representatives from the district of Quebec, the right to take the position which we deem best. With us, this is the question: Is it a national or a purely local question? At the present time it is hard to say. We have not been furnished with all the data necessary to elucidate this question. The Government is likely in possession of all necessary documents which can throw light on this question,

Mr. DESJARDINS,

and place it correctly before us. On this point we have every confidence in the Government. We know that what they do will be in the general interests of the country and not in the purely local interests of either Quebec or Montreal. I wish to take these grounds and have them made known to the country. When we were admitted to an audience with the Privy Council, we discussed the question from this stand-point: we considered it in a comprehensive light, so much so, that one of the hon. Ministers, who is in the House to-day, and who can give his testimony in corroboration of what I say, stated that he was most happy to observe that, although the deputation came from Quebec, which might excite a certain amount of apprehension among some members that had taken the correct course, to establish a basis for our most equitable demands. If this is a Montreal question, we desire to establish the dredging of the channel between Quebec and Montreal, to obtain means of communication from the West to Montreal; if we really wish to have the commerce of Montreal, I think it is also important, in a national point of view, to continue and complete as soon as possible the dredging of our channels—for what is commerce if not the interchange of our products; if we wish to enable the large vessels which come from the East to ascend to Montreal, we must also enable the large vessels which are able to carry all the products of the West to come to Montreal also. All these vessels, all the large barges from the West, must be able to start from Lake Superior, and arrive at the port of Montreal without being obliged to stop at way ports and unload their cargo in from five or six vessels of smaller tonnage. It is in this light that we ought to consider this a really national question, and that we should open up to commerce not only a part of the St. Lawrence, but the whole country from the extreme West. From this point of view I congratulate the Government on the line of conduct they have adopted, as expressed in the resolutions now proposed. But, Mr. Chairman, we must not in a question of this kind forget the subject of acquired rights. And if I understand the question rightly, it seems to me that when the Quebec Harbor Commissioners loaned from the Government the sum necessary to carry on the works, which are now being constructed at Quebec, and for which it has become necessary to impose certain dues on vessels coming to Quebec, it seems to me that at that time it was agreed between the Quebec Harbor Commission and the Commissioners of the Montreal Harbor, that in future the works which should be undertaken to deepen the St. Lawrence, should not be built at the expense of the Government. If that Convention which was made at the time no longer exists, I think the rights of Quebec will not be forgotten; and if at some future day the Government be disposed to assume the debt of Montreal; if they wish to take off the duties from vessels which might prevent them coming up to Montreal, it will be only justice to place Quebec in the same position, and that they assume also the debt of Quebec, so as to permit vessels to come either to the port of Quebec or to the port of Montreal, and to find in both ports like favorable conditions.

Resolution reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 142) to make further provision for deepening the Ship Channel of the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec.

Bill read the first and the second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

EVIDENCE IN RELATION TO CRIMINAL MATTERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 125) to make provision for the taking of evidence in relation to criminal matters pending in courts of justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions, or before foreign tribunals, said: Since the Imperial Ex-