

which was originally intended. I am still of the opinion that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company has been willing to accept the charter as amended it should be passed. Ultimately the government will be held responsible for the manner in which it deals with this railway. If it shall be found necessary to change the course of the line and to reduce the bonding power, that responsibility, I take it, will fall upon the government, and whether we vote for this charter now or whether we amend it, ultimately the government will have to assume the responsibility of looking after the interest of the country with respect to this railway. It is almost a waste of time for us to discuss the matter here, assuming that I am correct in my contention that the government are prepared to make recommendations and changes and enter into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway whereby on certain conditions they must build such a road under such capitalization and under such bonding powers. That responsibility they will, as a government, have to take. They must look to their supporters and to the sympathy of members on the other side to assist them in carrying it through this House. I am exceedingly desirous that a railway should be built across this country at the cheapest possible cost, so as to do the most good to the people of Canada and in order that freight may be carried at the lowest possible rate. The people of Canada will expect the present government to see that their interests in this matter are conserved.

Mr. BOURASSA. To my mind the doctrine announced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) is simply monstrous. He asks parliament to abdicate its responsibility in a matter of this kind and to saddle it on the shoulders of the government. Well, the government is nothing but a committee of this House, and to hold that it should take the responsibility of doing what it likes, after legislation has been passed by this parliament, is a monstrous doctrine. As a matter of fact, such a thing has been done too often in the past. I regret to say, I cannot agree with the Minister of Railways and Canals that we should deal with this charter just as we have dealt with other charters, because, even supposing that we have been in the wrong in dealing with other charters, that is no reason why we should perpetrate wrong doing. But, Sir, this charter is out of comparison more important than any other charter which this parliament has been called upon to discuss for the last fifteen years, and it is the imperative duty of this House to examine the whole question, and to insert such conditions in the charter as are needed in the interests of the country. So far as the capital is concerned I will not venture to express any strong opinion on that, but I do think that the contention raised by the leader of the

opposition is perfectly sound. The Minister of Railways and Canals said that we should allow all facilities for these people to raise money, because, leaving aside the question of government aid they may have some difficulty in getting the money. It is a fact, however, that this Grand Trunk Railway Pacific road has much more assurance than ever the Canadian Pacific Railway had at its commencement, that it is going to be a paying investment after some time. Then the company will have a capital of \$75,000,000 and it will have to pay a dividend on that. Surely when the people of the west or the people of the east will come before the Railway Commission and ask for some relief from excessive rates, the expenditure on the road will have to be considered and the dividend that will have to be paid above and over that expenditure must also be taken into account. Therefore the fact that there will be an exaggerated capital will work to the detriment of the people at large. I beg to move seconded by Mr. Angers :

That the capital of \$75,000,000 be reduced to \$60,000,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question raised by the leader of the opposition is no doubt an important one, and if it be discussed on its merits apart from other considerations, I think it should receive the careful attention of the House. But, Sir, I do not know of any reason, and I have heard of no reason why this charter should be treated differently from any other charter that has been considered by parliament. The question as to what should be the bonding privileges and the stock capital of any company to which we are granting a charter is an important one. But, comparing this with other charters that have been granted in the past, and even during the present session, the Railway Committee considered that in giving bonding powers of \$30,000 per mile on the most difficult sections, and \$20,000 per mile on the prairie section, it was going to the fullest extreme possible that they would be warranted, in reducing the privileges granted. Notwithstanding the wild statements that are made in the House and out of it as to the cost of railways, if we take the experience of railway building in Canada and the United States, no member of this House who is conversant with the subject will pretend to say that this road could be built, equipped, and put in proper condition for commercial business at anything like the amount we are granting as bonding privileges. There is no person who can point to a railway in existence that has been built and equipped as a road of this description would have to be, for \$20,000 a mile on the prairie section and \$30,000 on the other sections. It has been customary in the Railway Committee of this House to grant \$40,000 a mile at least in districts such as are tra-