

city of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government have come to no conclusion and no decision whatever. During the 12 months which have elapsed since the close of last Session, the Government, who had taken power under the Act, to settle that question, have not been able to come to any decision yet. True, last Session the Government took power, in view of the policy which, they said, was essentially their policy, of making the harbor of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to provide for the organisation of a company, if they could not bring the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway to an understanding with regard to the purchase of the line from Montreal to Quebec. So far, they have done nothing. This year they have taken exactly the same powers; they do not bind themselves to anything definite, but they ask that the powers given to them last year to effect that object, and which have now lapsed, should be again given to them and extended for a period of two months after the close of the Session; that is to say, failing any agreement being come to between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk for the purchase of the North Shore Railway, the Government may organise a company for the same object. We may ask Will this policy be carried out this year or not? Will it remain a dead letter, as it was characterised by the hon. Minister the other day, on the Statute book? or will it have some tangible effect? I say, whether the Government act or do not act, under the subsequent resolution of the Government with regard to the Short Line Railway, they have dealt a death blow to their so-called policy of making the harbor of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as I will show hereafter. With regard to the railway contemplated to connect Montreal with the seaports of the Maritime Provinces by the shortest route and the best route, they have made a selection. They could not come to a conclusion upon the other matter, but on this one they have, and they have selected a route by the way of the International Railway. The Minister of Public Works, the other day, when he introduced this matter to the House, made a statement to which it is my duty at once to take exception. He spoke as follows:—

“The policy of this Government has been to secure the connection of that railway, not only with the harbor of Montreal, but also to extend it to the port of Quebec, at all events, for the summer, and that during the winter months it should communicate with the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, by an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal. That policy was promulgated and supported by Acts of Parliament passed last Session, by which we voted, for a direct line from Montreal to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, a yearly sum of money during a number of years, in order to assist the construction of that extension from Montreal to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax. On the other hand, Parliament, at its last Session, expressed its desire that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended from Montreal to Quebec by the north shore of the St. Lawrence. An Act of Parliament was passed to that effect, and certain conditions were inserted, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway could extend its line from Montreal to Quebec, or failing that, certain other conditions were put in the law. Thus the policy of Parliament and this Government has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be extended on the south shore of the St. Lawrence down to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and on the north shore of the St. Lawrence by the North Shore Railway to Quebec and thence by the Intercolonial.”

I take exception to this language, in so far as it tends to that the policy adopted by Parliament last Session was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway south of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. I take exception to this statement in the most emphatic language. I challenge the accuracy of it. I deny it. I say that Parliament never adopted such a policy as that. I say that Parliament never committed itself to any line whatever for the continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. On the contrary, the policy adopted by this Parliament and recorded in the Act is that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended from Montreal by the shortest and best line,

wherever that could be found, not south of Montreal, not from any other place, but wherever it should be found, after survey, the best and the shortest on the ground. This was the policy adopted by this Parliament, and the hon. gentleman cannot find a single syllable in the records of this House which can justify the statement he made the other day, that the policy of Parliament was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway by the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the seaboard of the Maritime Provinces. I say more. I say this was not the policy of the Government and, if it was, I should be bound to say, and it would be my duty to say, and I should be warranted in saying, that the Government have been guilty of the grossest deception to this House, because the House never heard, until the 1st of July instant, in the speech of the hon. gentleman, that the policy of the Government was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence; that was the first statement that was ever made. We never heard a word of it before, and if it was the policy of the Government, they carefully kept it concealed in their own breast. I repeat that, if such was the policy of the Government, they have been guilty of the grossest deception to the House and the people of this country. Occasions have not been wanting for them to express their views. There has been lurking in the minds of many a suspicion that indeed this was the policy of the Government, that it was in fact what was declared the other day their intention, to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence; but, if there was a suspicion on that subject, the Government never spoke on it, though time and again they had an opportunity of speaking their minds on the subject. There was a lurking suspicion, and that found its way into the press many times, not only that, but the Minister of Militia last summer had a picnic at Rivière du Loup for the express purpose of talking a little with the Prime Minister on that subject, and he the Prime Minister, had an opportunity of speaking then, and what did he say? Did he say that the policy of the Government was that which has been stated now by his colleague, to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway on the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Montreal? No, as reported in the press, the Prime Minister said on that occasion that the Government had no line but the shortest and the best. If that was the policy of the Government then, the policy has varied since, and if it has not varied, then I say the Prime Minister did not act towards those whom he was addressing with that fairness to which they were entitled. Not only did the Prime Minister give his views upon the subject, but the Minister of Public Works himself had occasion to speak on the matter. He spoke in the month of December at the city of Three Rivers, and he did not then say as he said the other day that the policy was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. He is reported to have made a statement which agreed with the statement of the First Minister, that the policy was to secure the best and shortest line, after proper survey. I say that the action of the Government to-day, coupled as it is with the language we have heard from the Minister of Public Works and even without that, will create in parts of this country, and in several parts of it, a deep sense of regret and indignation, regret and indignation arising, and naturally arising, from the fact that the Government have not kept the promise they made last year to this House, that they have broken the pledge which they then gave to the House and to the public. What is the history of this matter? Last year, when the first measure was presented to the House, the Government took power to decide themselves, without any reference to this House, the selection of the best and