

The hon. gentleman proposes to give aid to certain specified lines, all of which, I believe, have been incorporated. If the hon. gentleman were to leave to railway companies organised the freedom to build lines where they pleased, subject to certain limitations, upon the conditions that were stated in the Bill which was submitted in 1878, they would present a more satisfactory scheme than that which is now submitted. If there was anything that could tend to justify the course suggested by the Bill of 1878 it is what Ministers are proposing at this moment.

Mr. ROYAL. The hon. gentleman said that if his Bill had been passed Manitoba and the North-West Territory would be now settled, that greater prosperity would reign all over that country, that very likely each of the farmers there would have a large deposit in the bank; in fact, that the golden era would have dawned upon that country. Well, Sir, I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman's statement. He says that in the States Iowa, Missouri and Illinois—he did not say Kansas, he did not say Dakota—the increase of population has been in proportion to the increase in the construction of railways. That may be quite true; but the hon. gentleman forgets that it may not be safe to draw a parallel from the other side of the line, for the reason that the people there enjoy other institutions and are in a different political condition from ourselves. First, they are independent; and although there are two political parties among them, as there are with us, those parties do not carry on political warfare in the same manner that parties do with us. In the United States, if one party wants to settle the country the other party will not spread abroad advertisements and newspaper articles decriing their country. It is otherwise in Canada. If the Conservative party happens to be in power, and they propose a plan for building a railway in unsettled portions of the country, hon. gentlemen opposite, opposed to the Conservative party, by their newspapers and by their organisations, immediately begin to declare that the land is unfit for settlement, that it is no use for a European immigrant to attempt to settle in the North-West, because farming there will not pay. Sir, we have had that experience in Manitoba for the last three years, a most unfortunate experience, and it has done more than anything else to retard the progress of that Province. Now, it may be that the scheme of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was a wonderful scheme, but it does seem extraordinary that the wisdom of Parliament at that time was unable to appreciate it, and, unfortunately, we are still unable to appreciate it to-day. I believe that the scheme that the Government now propose to this House is the only one that will tend to develop the interests of Manitoba and the North-West Territory. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to show that the policy of the Government has prevented the construction of branch lines. Well, how is it that this very scheme is now proposed at the request of those branch line companies? Do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose that those companies do not look after their own interests? Do they think those companies forget that there is only one trunk line of railway in Manitoba and the North-West Territory? Do they forget that the branch lines will necessarily have to make freight arrangements with the trunk line? They know, as well as we do, that such is the case; and yet, notwithstanding, it must be admitted that the branch lines know their own interests a little better than hon. gentlemen opposite. They come to the Government and say that if the Government are willing to give them 6,000 acres per mile they are ready to construct those branch lines. Sir, it is proposterous to suppose that it is in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway not to encourage the construction of those branch lines. Surely the Government, in adjusting and controlling the traffic rates of the trunk line will see that they are in accordance with common sense, and will not be opposed to

Mr. MILLS.

the interests of the people. I believe that in this, as well as in many other things, hon. gentlemen opposite have erred a great deal. Now, Sir, the leader of the Opposition, at the beginning of his remarks, asked why these branch lines had not been constructed. Was it because they were afraid of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir, it is impossible to suppose that these companies were afraid of such a monopoly. The reason why they have met with such opposition in carrying out their scheme has been this: The land, which a few years ago was valued at such a high figure, all at once fell down to almost nothing. Why? Because, instead of the political parties having enough patriotism to value the lands in the North-West at their real value, one of the parties placed these lands very high, and assumed that the prospects of the farmer were very good, while, on the other side, the newspapers of the Opposition and the Farmers' Union endeavored to depreciate the value of the lands, to depreciate the condition of the country, and naturally conveyed an impression to intending immigrants that in coming to the North-West they would come to a desolate country, where hunger and ruin would stare them in the face. Is it any wonder that these gentlemen now say: Why have not these branch line companies built their roads? They must go for an answer to the farmers in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Well, Sir, when the contract was awarded to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company there was, no doubt, a monopoly clause. That monopoly clause was certainly the essence of the contract, and it had to be so, because otherwise no company in the world would have undertaken such a task upon the conditions that the Government offered them. After that charter was passed we saw the hon. gentlemen opposite asking this Government to destroy that monopoly, and to break faith with the company. Were hon. gentlemen opposite then acting in good faith? No, Sir; they merely wanted to destroy that clause, which was essential to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the extent of the patriotism exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in Ontario, Manitoba, and in the North-West Territories. Now, Sir, I could not listen to the hon. gentlemen opposite without feeling that the failure to construct these branch lines was not the fault of the Government. It was not the fault of this Government; it was the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite. They, and they alone, have done everything to depreciate the value of the North-West lands, either by their own newspapers or by advertising the Kansas country, or by the Farmers' Union; and you, Mr. Speaker, know as well as I do, that the Farmers' Union is nothing else than a political organisation, the heads of which were friends, intimate friends and inspired friends, of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman said he could not sit still and listen to the statements made on this side of the House. I was a little surprised to hear that statement by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). He has further stated that the reason why branch lines of railway could not be built in that country was because there was only one road out of the country, and that controlled by one company; and thus the local companies had to deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway to get an outlet; and that was one of the reasons why they had not been able to build the road with the land grants already received. The hon. gentleman went on to denounce the monopoly, and he also stated that the Opposition had decried the country in the past, and that was one of the reasons of its failure. Now, we have not to go far back to find out what that hon. gentleman's opinion was as to why railways were not constructed in Manitoba. I had the honor of introducing a Bill in this House, asking for a charter to build a railway from Portage la Prairie to the Lake of the Woods. The hon. gentleman opposed that Bill in the committee—it was not discussed in the House