

ber for Brome that notwithstanding the various surveys made on that occasion there were but two lines that Parliament entertained the slightest idea of accepting. These were the Intercolonial Railway, as at present located, or Major Robinson's northern line, and his survey by the valley of St. John. The third line ran through what was a sea of mountains.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). What?

Mr. MITCHELL. British Columbia is indignant that I should use a portion of the title that the leader of the Opposition applied with reference to his Province. The central or air line was looked upon at that time as an impossibility, and was rejected, and but two lines were discussed, as I have said, with any probability of being adopted. I merely speak of this to show the almost impossibility, the great improbability, of any sane man accepting an air line through our country, no matter how short. There is one passage which I do not think I have looked upon for 15 years, but in the report of the middle line of Major Robinson, my impression is that there is one 13-mile section of that road which will cost about one-third the cost of the whole Intercolonial Railway, thus showing the improbability of ever building a line such as the hon. member for Brome talks about, as an air line.

Mr. FISHER. I did not allude at all to Major Robinson's line.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; the hon. gentleman did not, but the hon. gentleman talked of an air line which would go through very much the same country as Major Robinson's line. He did not allude to Major Robinson's line because he did not know anything about it—that is the fact of the matter. The hon. gentleman has chosen to refer to the views and feelings of an hon. gentleman who is not now in this House—the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and he speaks of that hon. gentleman being so dead to the interests of his county as to advocate a line which passed by his own county, and he went so far as to impute motives, which were scarcely in order, according to the rules in this House. Does the hon. gentleman forget his own position? Does he recollect that the county he represents is in close proximity to the line he was opposing? What will his constituents say when he goes back for election, when they quote the speech he made to-night; when they ask him what county he represents; if he represents the county of Brome, which is in close proximity to this line, or if he represents the city of Quebec, or some of the ports of the Lower Provinces. What answer will the hon. gentleman make? I am afraid he will not be quite as cool as he was to night in making his speech. He also took occasion to refer to another hon. gentleman who was not present—the respected member who is Acting Minister of Railways in this country. I think his remarks were certainly not such as he ought to have made with reference to a gentleman who has occupied the high position he occupies, who possesses great parliamentary and practical experience, and who, with all due regard to the hon. member for Brome, possesses quite as much alike of the confidence of the country and of Parliament as the hon. gentleman himself, and I think a good deal more. It has been my honor and pleasure to occupy a position in the same Cabinet with that hon. gentleman, and a position in Parliament along with him, and I say that when the hon. member for Brome made these remarks, I felt ashamed of him attempting to impute motives to the Acting Minister of Railways. They would be unworthy of him if he entertained them, and they were as unjust as they were uncalled for. I will not, at this late hour of the night, occupy the attention of the House; but I will give him one more hit before I part with him, and it will apply to the gentlemen who sit beside

Mr. MITCHELL.

him—I refer to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and to the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Lange-lier). They all sounded the same keynote and rang the changes of delay, procrastination, put off. What has been the cry of these gentlemen against the Government of the day? What has been my own cry? Too much procrastination, too much put off, too much delay; and yet in one of the most important concerns which relate to the Maritime Provinces, it is to be put off to the injury of the country, and of the constituency I represent. We, in the Maritime Provinces, have our rights. When we entered this Confederation we did so believing we would get our just rights; we have never got them. We went into this Confederation believing that we would get even-handed justice; we have mighty hard work to get it out of these western people. When we put our assets into the Treasury of this country we put in valuable assets, representing every dollar of our debt. What did the Upper Provinces put in? They put in rotten institutions, like the Grand Trunk Railway, with \$46,000,000 of debt. The right hon. Premier smiles at that. When he was asked about it, he said it was a first-rate asset—a railway stretching all through Canada. We may follow it up with the canals; and when we get a distribution of money for railways or other public works, what do we find? Where we get a dollar, \$10,000 goes to Ontario—save and except Nova Scotia, because when Sir Charles Tupper was here he always looked after its interests; and when one of these important works which our Province demands is under consideration in this House, we find all kinds of obstacles put in the way to cause delay and procrastination, and to throw it over for another year. Now, I am just going to conclude with one piece of advice to the Government, and it is this: I find in these resolutions, in addition to the short line, that we are going to take over the North Shore, and we are providing for a line to be built to Edmunston. That is all right enough; I do not object to that; it goes to New Brunswick. But in this North Shore deal I do not know what terms the Government have made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company; but I find, in the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, that the Government take over this line from the Grand Trunk, and, as near as I can make out, they give \$592,000.52. They also take over the \$250,000 of stock which, I suppose, they pay for at par. Then I find such terms as expenditure on roadway and buildings, \$176,000; expenditure on rolling stock, machinery, furniture, etc., \$7,609; Palais harbor, \$30,000; Jacques Cartier line, \$150,000; and sundries, \$19,000. Now, I want to give the Government a little bit of advice about this matter, which, I suppose, they will take kindly, though they very seldom do. If they are going to let the Grand Trunk Railway Company cover up any little steal in this matter, I pledge my word that I will look after it. I do not want the Grand Trunk, under cover of getting paid for any improvements on the road, which I am willing they should get, to make a steal of \$200,000 or \$300,000 into the bargain: and I want to warn the Government. Let any man see what improvements the Grand Trunk has put on the North Shore. They have wooden bridges, with only ten or twelve years of life, and the cars have not seen a paint brush for years. You can see the same thing all through; and I would ask the Government to have these things properly investigated before they give the Grand Trunk half a million dollars, without knowing what it is for. In conclusion, I intend to support these resolutions, and to vote against the amendments.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to give an answer to the statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) when he took my friend the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) to task, because he had stated that the Government were responsible for the selection of the route