

railway built, and which is only 40 miles in length. Then, from Mattawamkeag to St. Andrews, the nearest point, there is 106 miles, and to St. John there is 147 miles; so it is evident that the line will be tapped at Mattawamkeag.

The line through Sherbrooke will also necessitate the construction of a second bridge at or near Montreal. It is well known that it is proposed to build the bridge at Lachine, so that there will be two bridges at Montreal. There is no bridge at Quebec, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway should pass by the combination line Quebec would get a bridge. When the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) spoke of the importance of Quebec having a bridge, in order to have the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he was answered, by the Minister of Public Works that the bridge would not contribute to bring the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say this is entirely wrong, and I speak from the authority of the business men of Quebec. This question has been discussed a great deal, and the business men of Quebec are all of the opinion that without a bridge or a ferry it is impossible to bring the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, even in the summer. The great advantage in having a bridge at this point is in connection with the grain trade. Quebec is a good place for storing grain during the summer season. When the European markets are not good the grain may be stored there, and exported as soon as the markets improve. Supposing grain is stored in Quebec to await exportation; as soon as navigation is closed, if there were no bridge at Quebec, it would have to be brought back to Montreal, and then taken through the Lachine bridge; whereas, if this bridge is built at Quebec, grain may be exported at any time; and when the immense docks at Quebec are completed, very great facilities will be given for storing and loading grain. But, on the other hand, to use the expression of one of the Quebec merchants, without a bridge at Quebec that city would be a *cul de sac* in winter, where grain would be stored without any means of removing it.

Moreover, it is admitted that if the Pacific Railway passes through Sherbrooke it will still be necessary to spend a million and a-half to build a branch to Quebec, but that amount will be saved if it is taken to Quebec on the short line. It is proposed by these resolutions to vote one million and a-half to the Canadian Pacific Railway to go to Quebec, and half a million to take it through Edmunston; and something like \$3,400,000 (the present value at 4 per cent, of \$250,000 a year for twenty years) to carry it through Sherbrooke. But if we adopt the combination line, all the money that it would be necessary to expend by way of Sherbrooke would be saved.

Another important fact to which I wish to call the attention of the House, to show that it was a preconcerted plan, agreed upon last year, to select the location through Sherbrooke, is this: that the combination line, which has so many advantages, was not even shown upon the map which has been distributed to members of this House. The line which was shown as being a line located by Mr. Light was, on the contrary, a line that was condemned by Mr. Light, that is, the line going to Hartland. Mr. Light himself was prevented from adopting that location on account of the heavy grades and sharp curves.

Now, the hon. Minister of Public Works tried to show that if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Quebec East was adopted, it would militate against the interests of Quebec, because, as he said, the resolutions proposed by the Government would then be thrown out, and the proposal to take the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec would also be thrown out. But, Mr. Speaker, suppose the resolutions were thrown out, what would Quebec lose? I do not suppose that the rejection of these resolutions would have the effect of removing the rails on the North Shore

Railway between Quebec and Montreal. It is proposed to give the North Shore line to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is all. We already have that line, and it is not proposed to give us any line that we do not possess. It is now controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway, but it would then be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is better for the interests of Quebec, for the local traffic, that the North Shore Railway should be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway rather than by the Grand Trunk Railway, because it will give us greater facilities for commerce between Montreal and Quebec. But as far as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, it does not matter to Quebec whether these resolutions are adopted or not; we will not have the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec, but we shall have two lines of rails between Quebec and Montreal, which will be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Another important point on which we have not obtained information, although we have repeatedly asked for it, is this: The line through Sherbrooke is called by all the newspapers, even by those supporting the Government, the Pope line. The line is principally owned by a member of the Government. The other day the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made an enquiry, the object of which was to ascertain whether it was proposed to acquire that line with the money it is proposed to vote. No answer was given to that question. What does that silence imply? It implies that the railway is to be purchased. It is not only going to have the advantage of being brought into connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the road itself is to be purchased with the money this House is now asked to vote. We never have been able, however, to obtain any information on this point from the Minister of Public Works. That hon. gentleman has given very full information on points that are of little importance; but on this essential point, not one word of explanation has been vouchsafed by him.

The hon. gentleman said that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were taken to Quebec by the North Shore it must be understood that grain carried there at the close of navigation must remain there the whole winter, as goods are now stored in Quebec until the opening of navigation. That is exactly what we are complaining of; that is what we desire to prevent. It is not proposed to remedy it by these resolutions. We want some means of communicating with the Canadian railway system in winter as well as during the summer. We shall gain nothing by the road proposed by the Government.

The Minister of Public Works mentioned that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) wanted everything done at once. The Minister of Public Works wants to have the matter respecting Quebec left over to another Session. What would be the use of building a bridge at great expenditure if the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic had taken another channel. If the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which it is hoped will be very large, passes by the Sherbrooke route, the company will be obliged to expend a large sum for terminal facilities, either in the United States or in the Maritime Provinces, and they would not sacrifice all that expenditure in order to come back to Quebec. It is well known that when trade has adopted a certain channel it cannot be diverted, unless there is a very great difference in the advantages, and there will not be so much difference as to lead the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to come back to Quebec.

We should not be called upon to pronounce an opinion on the documents before us, which are unsatisfactory, and I therefore move the following amendment to the amendment:—

To leave out all the words after "thereof," in the amendment, and insert the following: In the opinion of this House, additional surveys are required, and should at once be undertaken in order to obtain a sound decision as to the proper route for the short line railway, and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys had been made.