

cluding Boston
r the last few
ws—and those

\$7,500,000
8,250,000
5,500,000
5,400,000
5,300,000

of what it was
grain and pro-
g to the crops

1,920,000
1,150,000
2,400,000
2,120,000
1,920,000

n 1880. So, if
the continent
ermin on the
by the traffic
excess of the
by the traffic
n truth that
of, if not for
the demands
to the Pacific
figures—you
two years in
h some of the
rt of freight,
fic roads, the
traffic on these
ase of these
veloped, but
able increase
ere has yet
excess of the
ere is a very
al traffic both
no longer be
painted the
r-borne from
to Victoria,
highest class,
e means at
are involved
e number of
ental traffic,
always consi-
munication.
ont and of
ea on land;
to the diffi-
St. Lawrence
ing at the
f they ascer-
stuff from a
al and to the
t from the
to Europe,
derations of
shipment, to
y upon the
ke the case
numbers of
np's resort.
have accu-
he western

world, and therefore you find it is a low rate ocean port, through the free application of the principle of competition. These are considerations we have to grapple with, and we have also to grapple with our dependence for a cheap through rate upon the existence of a large local traffic to which I have alluded. All these things point to that to which the hon. the Secretary of State pointed, and in that part of his observations I entirely coincide, that is the great importance to this line of a large local trade. The Pacific roads which were for a long time inclined rather to ignore that, recognise it now. All roads recognise it more fully than they did before; it behooves us to recognise it too. It is a consideration upon which, I think, much will turn. Now take the thousand miles of this road west of Callander and the thousand miles east of Port Moody, in round figures, and I ask this House what the present development is and what the immediate future is for the local traffic on that 2,000 miles of the line. I do not need to put the question, certainly do not need to give the answer. There are capabilities in both ends of the line; there is a future for both ends of the line, but built as this road has been, rushed through as it has been, in the insane haste which has characterised the policy of the Government, what to-day are the prospects of a local traffic for the 1,000 miles from Callander and the 1,000 miles from Port Moody east, say 2,000 out of the 2,550? On this 2,000 miles, there are a few thousand souls of white population. From Callander to Port Moody, 2,500 or 2,600 miles, there is a population of perhaps 150,000, perhaps 200,000 white men. Therefore, when you look to those figures of a couple of hundred thousand white men, you find in a moment the vast importance of settlement to the future of the country and the future of the road. You cannot have a trade without having people to trade with; you cannot have traffic unless there be persons to traffic with; you cannot send goods unless there be those who will receive the goods; you cannot sell unless there be people to buy. What you have at present is about a couple of hundred thousand souls for your local traffic. Now, the hon. gentleman compared the immediate prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway with those of the Northern Pacific. The Northern Pacific has, over a large section of its road, owing to the adventitious circumstances to which I have referred—and which give to all railway companies, more or less, the command of the situation, and a practical monopoly, to a certain extent, within a certain range—the power of exacting very high and unreasonable rates for a very considerable part of its traffic; and to that circumstance are due the large profits, compared with the amount of tonnage moved, which you find the Northern Pacific realises. But the Northern Pacific has about 2,000,000 of people tributary more or less to its road, while, from Callander to Port Moody, the Canadian Pacific Railway has about 200,000 people tributary to its road. That is the difference, and we want to adjust that difference by an increase of population which will be tributary to the road, before we can expect results such as those to which the hon. gentleman has pointed. Thus the Canadian Pacific has a traffic, so far as its local population is concerned, of somewhere about 80 souls to the mile, while Minnesota has a railway population of about 300 to the mile, Dakota about 350, Montana 350, and Illinois 370 to the mile. Unless you lay down the proposition that you are going to take as much toll from 200,000 people as the Northern Pacific can take from 2,000,000, you cannot fairly compare at this time the traffic prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, as regards local traffic, with those of the Northern Pacific. The problem is, what is the price you can exact for the traffic you have to take? How far have the prospects for local traffic changed since 1883? Have they greatly improved since then? I deny it, and I will proceed to prove it conclusively and incontrovertibly when I come to deal with the question of the land.

If that be so, I refer once again to the language of Sir Charles Tupper, delivered only two years ago, in which he said:

"I do not hesitate to say that the tariff which is now on the Table of the House cannot pay the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will not pay them for a considerable number of years."

There was the utterance of the Government two years ago. Now why?

"It would be impossible, until a large number of people go into that country, to construct a tariff which would pay them."

A very sensible observation, one in which I entirely concur, but which the hon. gentlemen opposite seem almost to repudiate—

"Because the climatic difficulties of the country are such that I have no hesitation in saying that the cost of hauling per ton per mile would be four or five times as great in the North-West, in the present sparsely settled condition of the country and the small amount of traffic, as it would be on the Grand Trunk railway with the enormous amount of traffic which I am glad to say it is carrying, and the milder climate in which it operates."

I do not think the climate of the North-West has changed much since Sir Charles Tupper made that speech two years ago. I do not think the settlement of the country has improved enormously since that time. I do not think its prospects of immediate settlement have very much brightened within the last few months. Therefore that speech as to climatic difficulties, as to the tariff of the railway company, however high, being not high enough to make the road pay, for how long? for a considerable number of years; until what? until that sparsely settled condition of the country was changed by a large population being brought in; that argument, that until then, you could not construct a tariff which would pay, why? because, if you constructed a tariff which would pay on the assumption that the goods would be carried, you would put it so high that you would prevent the goods being carried; you would kill the goose that laid the golden egg; and you would interfere with the settlement of the country. That speech and argument are true to-day. One must consider the prospects of settlement. The prospects of settlement, so far from the seaboard, where the farmer's produce has to pay so large a toll in any case in order to get to the market, depend upon low rates, and therefore you must have low railway rates if the country is to prosper. Therefore, Sir Charles Tupper was perfectly correct when he said we cannot construct a tariff which would enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay for some years to come, that we must have a large local traffic, the essential for which is a large population. I hope the respectable authority to which I have referred will cause me to be saved from charges of want of patriotism because I have told a few plain truths. I hope that I shall escape under the mantle of Sir Charles Tupper, who was speaking as the exponent of the views of the Government, who was speaking in his Ministerial position and upon his responsibility as a Minister, with his present colleagues, excepting the Secretary of State, sitting beside him; I hope his statements will not, now that he is in England, be altogether repudiated by hon. gentlemen opposite. They cheered them then, they affirmed them then, they confirmed them then, they assented to them then. Do they repudiate them now, and, if they do not, how do they accord with the statements given yesterday by the hon. gentleman the Secretary of State? Real progress required, then slower apparent progress than hon. gentlemen made. It required more branch lines in order to induce more people. It required a policy which would satisfy the people that were in the country. But, instead of attending to the settlers who were in, instead of recognising the great cardinal fact that the best advertisement you could give to the world for the North-West was so to handle the men who were in the country that they would send back word to the places from which they had come that this was the