

tions. Has the minister requested the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to engage in the operation of the road pending its completion, and pending their entering into a formal lease? I told him two years ago, and he seemed impressed with it, and he told me he would act upon it, of the terms on which the company were willing to engage in the active operation of the road. It must be borne in mind also, and this is another reason why we should not pass the resolution to-night, that by section 3 of the supplementary agreement of date the 2nd February, 1904, this Parliament provided that pending the completion of the whole line, arrangements might be made between the Government and the company for the operation of various sections. That clause of the supplementary agreement says:

Pending the completion of the eastern division by the Government, the company shall be entitled to lease from the commissioners, to be appointed under the said Act, and to operate such portions of the said eastern division, as may from time to time be completed, but upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the company and the said commissioners which terms are not to be more onerous than those of the lease of the whole division by the said contract provided for.

Eleven years ago, this Parliament recognizing the importance of having the Grand Trunk Pacific Company enter as quickly as possible upon the operation of the different sections of this road, provided for the operation by the Grand Trunk Pacific of the completed sections from time to time.

Notwithstanding, as I have said, that the late Government had a definite proposition from the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry out their arrangement as provided in the statute of 1904, as far as this Parliament has been informed, the Government has never taken the slightest step to have that arrangement carried out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What section?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Section 3 of the agreement of the 18th of February, 1904, which will be found on page 193 of the statutes of 1904.

Surely some regard ought to be had to what has been the view of this Parliament and of the country in the past. When we find that that view was that the company and the Government should endeavour to come to terms as to the operation of the different sections from time to time, surely the Government is not treating this Parliament or the people of this country rightly.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

when, instead of endeavouring to make a fair and reasonable arrangement pending the completion of the whole line of railway under the specifications and pending the arrival of the time when the company will be obliged to enter into a lease under which, after a definite period, they will begin to pay rent, the Government acts here to-night as if it were looking to the company not leasing the line and as if it contemplated taking over the whole system east of Winnipeg and the Grand Trunk Pacific branch and all the terminals at Fort William, which action will involve this country in an expenditure which I do not think will be counted at one dollar less than from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000. That is an enormous expenditure in which to involve the country when there is no necessity whatever for it, when if the company were approached in a proper manner, they would enter into a fair and equitable arrangement to carry out the aspirations of our people to have one company operating the entire system from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we were not so accustomed in this House to the alarmful speeches of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), we might perceive a possible revolution in Canada if this fearful resolution should carry; but we are accustomed to his seeing in every proposal of the Government something dreadful, some awful ghost behind the door, some tremendous debt on the part of Canada, and, last of all and most fearful and most to be dreaded of all, a possible injury to the port of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And Halifax too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), who was Minister of Railways and a colleague of the hon. member for St. John, openly and frankly stated at the commencement of the discussion that it was in the interest of the people of Canada that provision should be made now for the operation of this line in the event of the company not taking it over. The hon. member for South Renfrew went further than that. He stated that in his judgment it would be a blessing for the people of Canada and nothing to be dreaded if we took over the Transcontinental line permanently and operated it. Yet the very fact that we take power to operate it in the only way in which it can be operated, that is, by securing the line from Fort William to Lake Superior Junction in some way or other, makes the hon. member for St. John