

Mr. CALDWELL. About 12 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you are not extending into a new country very far.

Mr. CALDWELL. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in asking a renewal of the charter, said a part of this line would be paralleling their own line and it would be unwise to continue it to Sharbot Lake, but if the line were from a point between Bathurst Station and Sharbot Lake, that would save the building of ten miles of road. Crossing from there by an angle to Carleton Place, the distance is possibly 25 miles. In doing that, they would reach a distance north of the main line of about 12 miles and would serve that portion of country which is without a railway. It is not possible for us to have a road where we would like it. To save 12 miles in the drawing of our stuff would be a great advantage and we ask that the grant be given a railway which would cross that part of the country and relieve us from the stress we are in. The country people there have suffered and it is not fair that they who have contributed to the building of every road in Canada should be deprived of this accommodation. We ask therefore that this grant should be given, as it is absolutely assential in order that we may get this road.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will it shorten the route to Toronto?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, about twenty miles.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood from a declaration by the government some years ago that they had two purposes in view in subsidizing railways. The most important one was to open up a new country, where there was not sufficient inducement to attract capitalists to build a road on account of the probable small earnings for years after the construction of the road. This is not a new country through which this road is proposed to run. The hon. member (Mr. Caldwell) says it has been settled. I think he said—

Mr. CALDWELL. Eighty-five years.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it can hardly be called a new country.

Mr. CALDWELL. It is so far as railways are concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. It can hardly be called a new country. The member says that the average distance the people have to go to a railway is twelve miles. That is no very great hardship—many people in Canada and even in Ontario are in no better condition. This of itself is not sufficient reason why the country should be taxed to build a new line. I draw attention to the fact that the effect of this line will be to shorten a through line owned by a great corporation which would be glad to build it without any subsidy. But, of course, so long as this

system of subsidy giving is continued, so long will the companies be ready to ask for subsidies and to refrain from building railways until they are given. This is one of the cases in which a subsidy should not be given if the government fulfil the promises and carry out the policy declared by them before they got into power.

Mr. EMMERSON. Every community now served by a railway is naturally ready to have the subsidy system done away with. But there are sections that are worthy of recognition in the way of assistance. In the case under discussion, while the average distance people have to travel to a railway may be twelve miles, there must be many who have to travel very much further. From that standpoint this matter is worthy of favourable consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. This is merely another evidence added to the many others that we have that the government is entirely unfaithful to its declarations and inconsistent with its policy. They must remember, as I do very well, that when the Patrons of Industry were numerous in this country and the Liberals desired the support of that important body, they adopted the whole policy of the Patrons, one of the principal planks in whose platform was no more subsidies for railways. That was a part of the Liberal platform.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where does the hon. gentleman find that in the Liberal platform?

Mr. SPROULE. I say it was in the platform of the Patrons of Industry—

Mr. EMMERSON. But not in the Liberal platform.

Mr. SPROULE. If given reasonable time I can quote the declarations of men who had the right to speak as representatives of the Liberal party to the effect that every plank in the Patrons' platform was a plank in the Liberal platform also. For instance, there was Sir Richard Cartwright. He went over the Patrons' platform plank by plank, declaring that every one of them were identical with the policy of that of the Reform party: 'Economy in the expenditure of public money'—'That,' he declared, 'is ours.' 'No more subsidies to railways.'—'That is ours.' And so he went through the whole platform declaring every plank of it to be a part of the Liberal policy. Now they have no more use for that platform and no thought of keeping their promises to the people. But, as an hon. friend behind me suggests, that platform was intended to get in on, and not to stand on.

Mr. HAGGART. To carry out the object suggested by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Caldwell) the best way would be to subsidize a line from Carleton Junction to some point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, wherever the road would find it