

believe that it was one of the chief means employed by one of the hon. members who advocated the Short Line *via* Sherbrooke. He has pretended that Mr. Light was a man who went to work with his eyes shut, who had given figures which were not accurate; but we find that if we take the figures given by the Government engineer to contradict these figures, we stand face to face with the same inaccuracies, with the same interests, and perhaps with interests which are even greater. I believe that, for these reasons, the Government, seeing that these officers have not come to a uniform decision, seeing that the men whom they have employed did not agree on the surveys which they had made, ought to postpone their decision, and even hold an investigation, to verify the reports which have been laid before the House. There are some of these reports which, if they are not accurate, are an insult to this House, and those who have made them ought to be punished. There are men who have come and stated things in dishonest reports, and who have tried to mislead public opinion, and even hon. members of this House. They are men who, if convicted of dishonesty, should not for a moment continue to hold the position which they now occupy, and to control, as they do, the destinies of the country, the same as the Deputy Ministers do. For the reasons I have just stated, I believe that in the interest of the city of Quebec, in the interests of the Province of Quebec and of the country at large, we should vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Mégantic, because this sub-amendment does away with all the propositions made by the Government, and even against the amendment of the hon. member for East Quebec. As I said awhile ago, when the main question comes before the House to be voted upon, I hope that we will contrive to move an amendment which shall better express our views, and which shall be in the interest of the country at large and of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. HALL. I do not propose to take up the time of the House in regard to the merits of this question, in addition to the remarks made by me the other evening, but these remarks have been criticised by two hon. members to-night: one questioning their propriety, the other their correctness. It was very natural and commendable that the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) should come to the defence of his colleague and friend Mr. Light. So far, however, as the question of propriety is concerned, the House is to bear in mind that the question before it was, whether the surveys, which had been made at great expense to the country and which demonstrated that there was a practical line by a certain route, should be set aside, on the impressions of Mr. Light as to a theoretical line of his own. As it was within my personal knowledge that his professional views heretofore had proved not only erroneous, but disastrous to my Province, I felt justified in making, under these circumstances, reference to those matters, and my statements, in those respects, have not been controverted, and could not be controverted, because the facts alleged were matters of record. As to the statement I made about the use of titles by Mr. Light, the impression has been conveyed by the hon. member for Mégantic, that my statements were inaccurate. I can only say that they are not. I stated that he was not in the employment of the Government of Quebec. I knew it personally, and I have the certificate of a provincial Minister, to that effect. The only statements in contradiction is, that under an Order in Council, Mr. Light had the right for two years to use the title of engineer of the Province of Quebec. Whether, now that his services have been dispensed with as such engineer, he is entitled to use that designation or not, is for hon. members to consider. The answer to the other statement I made, as to his not being a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, is that a good many years ago he was a member of that institute, he has written a

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny).

letter to the Quebec papers, stating that he intends to renew his subscription, and again become a member of that institute. It was within my own knowledge that his use of that title was criticised by the institute itself, and that it appeared by the catalogues, for many years past, that he was not a member of that institution, and the only answer to my statement, is that he has formerly had that right and intends to avail himself of it hereafter. My statement, therefore, is not, and has not been disputed; but unless I made this explanation, the remarks of the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langeher), might have led the House to imagine that my statements were incorrect.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter is one of great importance to us in the Maritime Provinces, and by that I do not wish it to be understood that it is not of equal importance to all the Provinces, because there is no Province whose interests are not affected by it. I was sorry to hear a statement from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) (and I hope the spirit in which he made it does not actuate many members of this House), that he was willing last year to vote a small amount of money, by way of soothing the feelings of the people in the Maritime Provinces, towards a project in which he had not much faith, but he was not prepared to vote any more money to encourage what he believed to be a chimera, or something like that. I have a great respect for that hon. gentleman, but I think there are many members in this House who believe that, in view of the opening up of trade between the Maritime Provinces and the Upper Provinces, this is a line which will pay, and that there is a great deal more than a chimerical idea in it. The hon. gentleman stated that we built the Intercolonial Railway for the people of the Maritime Provinces. "We" is a very large person, sometimes, but "we" does not mean the member for Jacques Cartier or even the members from Quebec or Ontario alone. All the Provinces of the Dominion assumed the debt for the building of the Intercolonial Railway, and I think nearly one-half of that line runs through the Province of Quebec. At any rate, if not, the longest part, the most expensive part, runs through that Province, and that is the part which brings in the shortest returns. So it is not merely the Maritime Provinces which were interested in building that railway. The people of the Maritime Provinces have some claims to be considered in this respect. We contribute, in common with the larger Provinces, to the canals, nearly all of which are in the upper Provinces. We cheerfully contribute our proportion of the cost of deepening the St. Lawrence and making that great waterway which we hope it will be; and I think we have a claim, which we have a right to prefer, that this short commercial line should be completed, and that the Maritime Provinces should be joined, as closely as their geographical position will permit, with the older sections of the Dominion of Canada. I think that derives additional importance from this: We speak a great deal of the through trade, and it is a very important thing in connection with this road; but there is also the interprovincial trade. When the Provinces formed a Dominion, and when, more especially, the National Policy was adopted, the Maritime Provinces were, to a larger extent than before, thrown upon the older Provinces of the Dominion, and they were, to a greater extent, thrown off in matters affecting their commerce and trade with the United States, especially with the Eastern States. So it becomes us, more than ever before, to overcome every geographical difficulty which it is possible to overcome, by opening up the shortest commercial route between those Provinces and the Upper Provinces, and to develop the interprovincial trade as much as possible. I do not understand the present discussion to be upon the advisability of having a short commercial road of that kind. After the vote of last year, when the principle was