

greater attention than has the Bill now before us. It was discussed during three entire meetings of the Railway Committee, and because of the length of that discussion my remarks now shall be very brief. Among the members of this House few have been stronger in their advocacy of Canada for the Canadians than I have been. I am not going to discuss now whether the members of the Government have agreed among themselves as to their policy in regard to this railway. They have disagreed on more than one occasion, and we are accustomed to their disagreements; but if this measure is one which commends itself to the judgment of those who take an interest in the matter, that their disagreements is no reason why we should not consider the Bill upon its own merits. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has twitted an hon. gentleman on the other side with having spoken of a fight having been put up by the Canadian Pacific Railway against the present Bill. Well, I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for putting up a fight against this Bill, nor do I blame the Grand Trunk Railway for taking the other side. But we all know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company opposed this Bill as strongly as it was possible to oppose it. We know that the president of that company, whose voice, I believe, was never heard before within the precincts of the Railway Committee, came up and addressed the committee against the Bill; and we know that the vice-president of that great corporation also came up and addressed the committee against it. So that we must admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company put up a very strong opposition. But, Sir, without going into the history of the Bill, which has already been gone into very thoroughly, the reason which induces me to support the Bill is that I believe the future of the mining interests of that region is intimately connected with railway competition. It is all very well to say that within the year the Canadian Pacific Railway, in extending the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, will construct a road more perfect and complete than the Kettle River Railway. But what is to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway, who will have expended a much larger amount of money upon the building of a much more expensive line, coming to the Government and saying, "How can we reduce the rates which we are now charging to the mining interests, when you know the large amount of money we have expended to build our line?" Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway would urge upon the Government this consideration or not, there is a check against the possibility of the miners being overcharged for the transport of their ore in the fact of having a railway like the Kettle River Railway, which is a competing line against the Canadian Pacific Railway. Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway line will have

cost a large or a small amount of money, that railway will be compelled by competition to make its rates as low as those of the other line; and, Sir, it is impossible for me to comprehend how any man who has at heart the interests of Canada at large, can object to the Grand Trunk getting a footing in that country. The representatives of the Grand Trunk interest, as well as Mr. Corbin, stated openly before the committee that the Corbin line was to be run in connection with the Grand Trunk; and an hon. gentleman on the floor of Parliament to-night stated that some machinery used in the great Le Roi mine was taken from Sherbrooke, in the Eastern Townships, into that country over this line.

I believe that I am supporting the best interest of the miners of that district when I say that if one line does not treat them properly, another line cannot fail to operate to their advantage, since it will afford competition, and the miners can avail themselves of the one which treats them best. I do not altogether agree in the opinion expressed that because the promoter of this line came from a foreign country, we should treat him as an alien who has no interest in this country. Sir, the alien who comes into Canada and spends \$1,600,000 of his money in building a railway to accommodate Canadians is, it seems to me, almost as good as a naturalized citizen. In any case, he is displaying his great confidence in the future of our country, and it cannot be denied that were it not for this road that country would not be in the position in which it now is, and would not be offering to the miner and investor the great opportunities it now does. This road has been the pioneer of that region. Even those who oppose this charter do not deny that were it not for this road that district would scarcely be opened at present. If I could convince myself that through the building of this line, for which a charter is asked, the trade that should legitimately come to Canada would be diverted to a foreign country, I would oppose this Bill; but from the evidence adduced before the committee, from telegrams received from collectors of customs in the various districts traversed by this line, it has been established, to my satisfaction at least, that 95 per cent of the trade which has come into that country is trade that was furnished by Canadian industry and sent forward by Canadian merchants. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood), who knows more about that question probably than any of us, because he does a very large business in that section, confirms the statement that 95 per cent of the trade came from Canadian sources. Under these circumstances, I find it impossible to believe that this Parliament will refuse to grant the charter asked for, especially in view of the fact that the promoters do not ask a shilling of subsidy from the Gov-