

his very words. They will be found on page 7691 of 'Hansard' of 1903, third volume :

The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 and not a cent more.

Further on he says :

What is \$13,000,000? It is a bagatelle. It is about the surplus of our revenue over the expenditure. The surplus for this year will pay for the construction of the road.

There is the complete statement within itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that a preposterous statement?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether those are or are not the words of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has read them out of their context. Everybody knows it would be ridiculous and preposterous for any body to say that the many hundreds of miles across the mountains and prairies could be built for \$13,000,000. If he did, he would be a proper candidate for a lunatic asylum.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is pretty hard on the First Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. He never said anything so ridiculous. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have been delighted, could they have caught him saying it. If the hon. gentleman wishes to be candid, he would know that these figures had reference, not to the cost of the road, based on so much a mile, but to what would be the obligation on the people, which they would have to pay, when the accounts came to be adjusted in the end. For example the construction of the eastern division alone costs a number of millions of dollars, but the Grand Trunk Pacific was to rent that eastern division, and after a period pay interest upon its cost. When they pay the interest, the country is at no expense; and the calculation of the First Minister had reference to what the road would cost the country when all these considerations were taken into account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman read it again?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Finance Minister has accused me of reading it out of the context. Well, I would like to read the whole speech but it is too long. I have read the speech through myself and I cannot find that the First Minister mentioned anywhere in it any other figures. His statement was very explicit. He said :

The surplus of this year will pay for the construction of this road.

Can any words in the English language more clearly and completely express that idea? It is all very well for these hon. gentlemen to try and withdraw these figures now. That is the way they always proceed. They make fine promises but give no performance. The figures are there in 'Hansard,' in black and white, in four or five different places, and they are \$12,000,000 to \$13,000,000. My hon. friend and everybody knows that the road cannot be built for any such sum. And when the right hon. gentleman said it would, he was misrepresenting its cost, as I would be if I made a similar statement. I would like to ask the Finance Minister what amount has already been expended in the construction of the road and when we are going to get the balance expended over the \$13,000,000 back. It was just such preposterous statements which caused Mr. Blair to leave the government. When the First Minister said the road would be built for \$13,000,000, Mr. Blair replied that it would cost \$120,000,000 and he thereupon threw down his party and came out like a man. He said to his leaders: You may be a party to misrepresenting the country but I will not. I do not wish to use any figures on the public platform which I am afraid to repeat in this House, and that is why I have quoted those figures and that statement from the speech of the right hon. gentleman. I only regret he is not here to-night, but I do not think that if he were, he could offer any better justification, than the Finance Minister has given for him. But I will say this that the Finance Minister endeavoured to disentangle the First Minister from that statement before he was through with his speech, but he was too late and the First Minister persisted in that mis-statement. What the First Minister said was that \$13,000,000 would be the cost to the country. What is the use of playing on the word 'obligation'? Let us have a straightforward, manly statement as to what the cost to the country will be. When is the balance of the cost over the \$13,000,000 coming back to the country? I understand that we have voted \$41,000,000 for the road already. I may be mistaken but I understand that those are the figures that we have voted. It is preposterous to say that \$13,000,000 will build the road when we have already voted \$40,000,000 for its construction and have not a mile of it running yet. Then because we criticise the conduct of the government, we are told by the Finance Minister we are opposed to the road. Sir, we never opposed the building of another transcontinental road. The same party which built the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the backbone of the country to-day and of which our people are so proud, is quite prepared to build another transcontinental road or two more if required.

We are not, and never have been, opposed to the building of another transconti-