

I will say, in response to that, in the words of Temple :

" There lives a man who is so base
As other men's figures to deface,
All in his own, his native land."

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before recording my vote upon the question now before the House, I desire to explain it. As I said a few days ago, when the Government moved these resolutions, when I thought it my duty to say that these resolutions did not fully meet my views. As I said then, they comprise three perfectly distinct questions, which are merged into one sole motion. These three distinct questions again come to-night under the same form, and the Government, who are asking us to vote the present resolutions, ask that we should vote first the grant to the Edmunston Railway secondly, the choice which they have made of the Short Line, and thirdly, the Pacific Railway extension to Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I wish the position which I am taking to be well understood. The hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) comes here with a motion in amendment, asking that all the words of the main motion be struck off, and that his proposition be adopted by the House. If that motion of the hon member is adopted, the three resolutions moved by the Government are put aside, and we are left with no alternative, except to pass condemnation on the Government. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this may be fully subservient to the interest of a political party, but that it is not at all in the interest of the country, and for that reason I shall pronounce against the amendment of the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), because I find that he lays aside all the questions whose happy solution would be in the interest of the country at large and of the district of Quebec in particular. It does not follow, Mr. Speaker, that I am in favor of the resolutions of the Government; on the contrary, I make these restrictions for the moment, but when the time comes to vote on the resolutions, I shall record my vote against them. The sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) has the same bearing. It strikes out, it is true, all the words contained in the main amendment, but it substitutes similar words to them, and the only difference is the provision that the surveys to be made will be made at once. I do not object to such a provision, as I would have no objection to declare, with the hon. member for East Quebec, that the Government should have kept the promises which they have made both to Parliament and to the country; but I will add this, if we adopt the sub-amendment and the amendment, we lay aside all the resolutions, while I only object to one, or perhaps to two, of the questions involved in the resolutions, such as proposed by the Government. For the same reason, therefore, I shall vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Megantic. Sir, what is the end which is sought to be attained by the present legislation? The object is to secure to the Maritime Provinces, or at least to a seaport in the Maritime Provinces, the shipping of the western traffic, the Pacific trade. At the present time Montreal is the terminus of the Pacific Railway, and as such the distribution point of trade. The traffic may take two routes; it may take the southern route or the northern route. If the traffic, when it leaves Montreal, immediately takes the southern route, a bridge must necessarily be built at Laachine; then the laws which regulate trade will apply there as they will elsewhere; and if, to-day, we are discussing before the House the choice of a line which is pretended to be shorter, if the Government have made their choice, which is that of the Mattawamkeag line—because they pretend that that route is the shortest of any—in preference to a line which would run through Canadian territory, for the same reason, when the traffic once gets on the other side of the river, at Montreal, it will take the shortest line, and as it will only have 297 miles to go to Portland, it will go to Portland,

and will never go to the Maritime Provinces. Here, Sir, is an argument which I used some ten days ago in this House, which has never been answered, and which cannot be answered. If we cannot avoid altogether these grave inconveniences, we have at least at our disposal a powerful means of extenuating them, and it is this: If the traffic, instead of taking the southern route, takes the northern route, and goes down to Quebec, then Quebec, instead of Montreal, becomes the great distributing point for trade from Quebec; the traffic would have to go 317 miles to reach Portland. If we take St. Andrews, in the Maritime Provinces, as the nearest port to Quebec, from Quebec to St. Andrews the distance is 258 miles. These figures are taken from the reports brought down by the Government; these figures are given by the Government engineer, Mr. Schreiber, himself. Therefore, from this point of view, Quebec becomes the point of distribution of trade. The traffic coming to Quebec by way of the North Shore Railway, it follows necessarily that the shortest route, the winter port which is nearest to Quebec, is in the Maritime Provinces, either at St. Andrews or even at St. John, to compete with advantage against Portland. But as long as the flow of trade is not directed towards Quebec, as long as traffic will be allowed to go from Montreal to Portland, we cannot expect to keep the trade on Canadian territory. For that reason, and for that reason only, I shall pronounce against the line which goes through Mattawamkeag. With regard to the promises made by the Government, I do not wish to say any more about them; I have expressed my views on that question the last time I spoke in this House. I believe that, in the interest of the country at large, in the interest of the Province of Quebec, and more particularly in the interest of the district of Quebec, the Short Line which goes through the city of Quebec ought to be chosen. I regret that the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), who pretends to represent here more especially the interests of his city, or, at least, the interest of his constituency; I regret the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), the chief magistrate of the city of Quebec, instead of serving the interests of their party, by making a motion whose result would be, if it was adopted, to deprive the city of Quebec from all the advantages which these gentlemen ought to strive to secure for it—I regret, I say, that instead of making that motion, they have not made a motion in the direction of my remarks, in the direction of the true interests of the city of Quebec, of the district of Quebec and of the country at large. I hope that when we shall have voted against the amendment of the hon. member for East Quebec, and the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Megantic, the time will have come when we can move an amendment embodying the opinions which I now express, and which, I have not the least doubt are the opinions of most of the hon. members of this House. I do not intend to fully discuss the question. The hon. members who spoke before me, the hon. members for Megantic and East Quebec, have given figures which have proved that the line passing through Quebec is even shorter than that which it is sought to-day to impose upon the House. I say to impose, and I do not think that the word is too strong. At all events, I do not wish for the moment to go over these figures again, but I say this: There is one well-established fact which the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Lesage) pointed out in this House the other day, and it is the diversity of opinions expressed by the different officers employed by the Government in the survey of these various lines. This diversity of opinion on figures and facts, which are in their line, which are within their province, ought to open the eyes of hon. members of this House. I believe that, under the circumstances, the Government ought to give us more extensive surveys, and should give us an opportunity of examining the figures which have been given. I