THE EDMONTON BULLETIN

(SEMI-WEEKLY.)

DAILY—Delivered in City, $4 per year. By mail, per year, $3. By mail to United States per year $6
SEMI-WEEKLY—Subscription per year $1. Subscribers in the United States $2. All subscriptions strictly in advance.

BULLETIN CO., Ltd.,
DUNCAN MARSHALL,
Manager

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1908.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

The British Parliament once permitted the unbounded liberty of debate allowed by our Canadian procedure. The French Chamber of Deputies once allowtd any member to hold up business whenever he felt like it and as long as he could keep on talking. The United States Congress once allowed any talkative member to suspend the progress of national affairs when he felt so disposed.

It is no longer so. In London, Paris and Washington it has been found necessary to protect the functions of Parliament from the obstructionist and the garrulous. The British House of Commons, the French Chamber of Deputies, the United States House of Representatives all set bounds beyond which obstruction or dawdling cannot delay the course of public affairs. These are free Parliaments. They are the Parliaments of three of the best governed countries in the world. They are Parliaments fashioned after the model of our own. What they have found necessary we shall doubtless have also to adopt.

The privilege of unlimited speaking is really an anomaly in any gathering expected to transact business. In such gathering there are bound to be men whose inclinations or circumstances make them more willing to talk than to do business. And while these men talk their fellow-members cannot proceed. In Canada we have gone on the implied assumption that Canadian members of Parliament were different from others, that they would voluntarily hold in the oratory when business needed to be done, and that rules compelling them to do so were unnecessary. We have been undeceived. In proportion to its membership the Canadian House of Commons contains as many gossips, scandalmongers, dawdlers and time-wasters as any popular assembly on earth.

This condition is not one that commonly rights itself. It usually has to be righted by some external force. The tendency is to become worse instead of better, for the reason that idleness and chattering are insidious diseases. They both develop in their present victims and spread to others. Left to their own devices, the men who made Parliament impotent in 1903 may be expected to make it less useful still in 1909, and to keep it on the downgrade till their powers of injury are curbed. There is little hope that men who were prepared to handicap the public service, to block legislation, to refuse supplies, and to bring upon the public all the consequences of a blockade in 1908, and to do this for the sole and simple purpose of enabling themselves to manufacture campaign literature at the country's expense, will not be equally ready to do so in 1909, and in each succeeding year if the power to do so is left with them. Voluntary amendment we need not expect.

Yet if Parliament is to be preserved in condition to discharge the business of the country there must be amendment of some kind, accomplished by some means. The business of Parliament in 1908 was not properly discharged. Six months were wasted in talk which for the most part conducted nothing to the advancement of the public welfare and the business of the session was kicked through in four weeks by men whose chief aim in life was to hear the cannons boom for prorogation. If public affairs are to receive the consideration due them one of two things must be done; either we must adopt a new system of government or we must reform the Parliamentary system. The first alternative is scarcely likely to be considered seriously, but if not, the more serious the consideration that must be given the latter. The most pressing reform in Canada to-day is Parliamentary reform.

In this the electors will have a chance to take a hand on polling day. There are in the House a score of members who must bear the chief responsibility for the obstruction. They constitute a forlorn hope drafted out for the defence of Mr. Foster and his political trust-funds friends. The method of their defence is to blacken the characters of opponents against whom they have never laid a charge. To their reiterated slander attaches most of the blame for the hold-up of business. With these men eliminated there is every reason to hope Parliament would be allowed to attend to business. The public can render signal aid to the cause of Parliamentary reform by leaving these gentlemen to conduct the defence of their unsavory associates in private life.

But Parliament must adopt measures sooner or later to protect itself, and the sooner the better. The overwhelming majority of members on both sides seriously regard their duties to the public and would be glad to devote their time and attention to them. Why should these men allow their concern for the public weal to be thwarted by the mischievous activities of an irresponsible minority? It is not to be expected that the political associates of that minority will openly secede and denounce them. But there is no reason to suppose they would consider it their duty to oppose a remodelling of the Parliamentary rules which would accomplish the end without involving the humiliation of a party squabble. Unless Parliament is to abandon its functions it must put itself in position to exercise them freely and continuously.

MORE ABOUT THE WONDER

The volume of damaging information about the new Alaska-Idaho 200-bushel to the acre wheat grows apace. The following paragraphs from the Monetary Times convey the opinions of Professor Elliott of the Department of Agriculture, Washington State College, regarding the supposed marvel:

"The wise farmer will wait. That is the opinion and the advice of Professor Elliott, head of the Department of Agriculture at Washington State College, regarding the latest wheat monstrosity. Away in Idaho, famous for mining and agriculture, sprinkled with a little lawness, a farmer claims to have discovered wheat, a perfect prodigy in the agricultural family. It will yield 222 bushels to the acre of Number One Hard, so the story goes. A name was soon given it—Alaska wheat. With much judicious advertising it sold as high as twenty dollars per bushel.

"The farmer's imagination is seldom tickled with agricultural get-rich-quick schemes. You may tell him in vain of beets you have for sale, some that will grow as long as the giraffe's neck and provide enough sugar to sweeten the whole town's teeth. He turns away from your story—for a good reason. He knows what you are. With mining schemes, it is different. Bring forward an assertion that from a hole, ore has been taken assaying fabulous wealth. Arrange a statement of dividends paid by the really rich mines of the country. Say something of the properties which immediately adjoin the new bonanza. And the best suspiciousness immediately gives place to mineral confidence. That is because the farmer knows a beet when he sees it, but ore and agriculture are not of the same family.

It is thus the more remarkable that a large sale of Alaska wheat should have been effected. The seed was advertised to grow in any climate; hail and frost mattered little. Alaska wheat was proof against the whims of the elements. The discoverer of this stuff toiled on like the inventors of old. Finally, after planting seven pounds in the spring of 1906, 1,555 pounds were brought forth, or 222 times the original sowing. And it all graded Number One Hard. The Canadian grower has bitten the bait with the rest. Much Alaska wheat has found its way across the border from Idaho. The Alaska brand was to have revolutionized wheat growing in the United States; probably—if results and advertising permitted—in Canada also. This particular wheat is said to have one single central head, around which are nine other shorter heads. Professor Elliott, quoted above, says he knows of a seven-headed variety, grown extensively twenty years ago. It yielded no better than other common varieties. He has visited some of the fields of the so-called Alaska wheat, which are located in Whitman and Latah counties. The wheat, he says, was studied while growing and ripening in the field and a large selection of heads taken for closer study in the mentary and opposed to the principles of orderly government was manifest; and on the 25th of July, 1887, it was declared by the Speaker: "That any member wilfully and persistently obstructing public business, without just and reasonable cause, is guilty of a contempt of the House, and would be liable to such punishment, whether by censure, by suspension from the service of the House, or by commitment, as the House may adjudge."

A more faithful portrayal of the situation created by the Opposition in the Canadian House of Commons last session would scarcely be possible, though unfortunately the Speaker did not feel himself free to deal with the situation after the precedent here recorded.

To more fully cope with this situation a select committee considered the matter in 1878 and a standing order was passed for the summary suspension of a member for committing the offence of disregarding the authority of the chair, or of abusing the rules of the House by persistently and wilfully obstructing its business or otherwise. The suspension of a member under this standing order continues for the session unless the House terminates it sooner. During suspension a member is excluded from the precincts of the House. Had such rule been in force at Ottawa the ranks of Mr. Borden's followers might have been woefully attenuated about the end of March, but the business of the country would not have been held back two full months longer.

Another salutary standing order provides that, with a few specified exceptions, "the Speaker leaves the chair forthwith for a Committee of "the House." This cuts out the mischievous practice, developed into a daily habit in the Canadian Parliament, of certain members rising to address the House "before the Speaker leaves the chair." The range of subjects discussed under this guise is as unlimited as the number and length of speeches made upon them, and the net result of the performance is that day after day passes when the House does not get into committee until midnight and frequently not then. This privilege opens the door to any half-dozen speakers to prevent the House getting into committee as long and as often as they wish—and as long as the House can be kept out of committee business cannot proceed.

The advantage of this species of obstruction is that the blockaders do not have to assume an attitude of open hostility to the business before the committee. They merely prevent the House going into committee and say nothing about the business. Under the British rule the obstructors must assume responsibility for delaying or opposing the particular item before the committee if they wish to delay or prevent its passage. Under the British rule the blame is put where it belongs. Under the Canadian lack of rule the country is left to put the blame on the whole House.

The time has come for the Canadian Parliament to adopt the rules found necessary in the British Parliament. The abuses which made them necessary there have made their appearance here in ever-increasing prevalence. There is every reason to suppose they would be found as wholesomely effective here as there. To neglect them would be to abandon the elementary principle of responsible government, to ignore the rights of the public and to surrender the dignity, the authority and the usefulness of Parliament.

WOULD THESE RESTITUTE?

Politicians large and small hold 608 square miles of timber limits given them by the late Conservative Government on which not a dollar bonus was paid into the public treasury. This bad man Burrows, according to Mr. Ames, bought 534 square miles of timber limits from the present Government for which he paid $59,000 in to the public treasury. If our timber resources have been "squandered," who squandered them, the Government which gave them away or the Government which sold them? If the public interests have been neglected in the disposal of timber was it by the Government who collected no bonuses or by the Government who collected $59,000 bonuses from the man who is represented as their particular ward? If the public have been "plundered" by grafters who did the plundering, the man who got timber limits without money and without price, or the man who paid $110 per square mile for every mile he got? Are these limit-holding, non-bonus-paying friends of Mr. Ames the advocates of restitution?

Mr. Glen Campbell, Conservative candidate in Dauphin, is a member of the Galway Horse and Cattle Company, the owners of the Brown-Beddingfield grazing lease. Mr. Campbell then must be one of the gentlemen whom Mr. Ames says the Government has been helping to get rich at the public expense. If Mr. Ames is correctly understood he regard the Brown-Beddingfield lease as a particularly outrageous sacrifice of public interests. Presumably, then, this is one of the cases in which restitution is in order. Is Mr. Glen Campbell making restitution the burden of his campaign song? Does he seek a seat at Ottawa that as a member of Parliament he may insist that as a member of the Galway Horse and Cattle Company he should be forced to "disgorge"? If Mr. Glen Campbell is the malefactor Mr. Ames seems to think him, it is a trifle odd he should want to go to Ottawa to help Mr. Ames recover the "loot." Or is it to be understood that restitution would be tempered with discrimination, that the avenger would pass in mercy the doors whose lintels bore the emblem of the faithful?

"COMRADES."

Mr. Fowler, M.P., has been campaigning with his friend, Mr. Rufus Pope, ex-M.P., in the constituency of Compton, P.Q. Whatever the result, it must be admitted they have certain complementary qualities which make them a well-matched team. They have hunted in pairs before, and if they are as successful in Compton as in the former venture it will go hard with the Liberal candidate there. They were the twin-orators who took the trail of the railway magnates a few years back with results that have won them abiding distinction. They tracked Sir Thomas Shaughnessy to his lair and secured from him certain assurances which warranted them in anticipating the best that gentleman had it in his power to confer. Then they hiked away to Toronto, cast the charm of their presence over Mr. Dan Mann and carried off a grist of promissory notes ornamented with the signature of Mackenzie & Mann on the reverse. Mr. Fowler himself is the historian of the expedition. He says in a communication to Mr. Lefurgey, M.P., then his prospective partner, later his associate de facto and still later his alleged victim:

"Dear Lefurgey—We have succeeded beyond our wildest hopes. We wired D. M. and he met us at the train at Toronto and took us to his office and gave us the route so far as located, of course under cover of the strictest secrecy, so keep it mum except to Borden, Bennett and yourself. We expect a wealthy Englishman named Lister, the head of the Canada Chemical Company, and Col. Pellatt in the combine with us. We have increased the thing to 200,000 acres. On arriving here we interviewed Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, and have every reason to expect most generous treatment as to terms and price. He said we should get the best that was going. We want to arrange for a meeting there when the party returns to Montreal. Tell Borden and Bennett about the meeting. It will be necessary for at least two of us to go this fall and locate, as it could not be done in the spring, and that is one of the things that must be arranged at the meeting.

"GEORGE W. FOWLER."

Important results followed this tour. Thanks to Sir Thomas' giving them the best that was going and to Mackenzie & Mann backing their notes, the Fowler-Pope-Bennett-Lefurgey combination swung their deal in 200,000 acres of C.P.R. land, clearing up $1 per acre. From them the land passed to Hon. Geo. E. Foster, M.P., and a party of associates. These gentlemen either didn't want the land or couldn't pay for it. They tacked another 50 cents per acre on it and passed it on to the Great West Land Company. Mr. Foster was manager of the Union Trust Co., a concern floated as an investing agency for the Independent Order of Foresters. These successive changes of the land ownership gave them ample room to invest. Wherever money was to be put up the Trust Company put it up. The Fowler-Pope quartette had no money worth speaking of; the Foster syndicate had no funds of consequence; the Great West Land Co.'s assets were mostly in their high sounding name. But behind all of them was the Union Trust Co., managed by Mr. Foster. It produced the cash, in all $958,000 to pay the C.P.R. for their land and the various syndicates their profits. If Mr. Fowler and Mr. Pope can draw votes from the electorate as readily as they drew "the best that was going" from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, credit from Mackenzie & Mann and money from the Independent Order of Foresters, they should be amply gratified.

THE BURDEN LESSENED.

The Weekly Sun, an aggressive farmers' paper published in Toronto and by no means inclined to friendliness to the Government, commenting on the tariff said a year or so ago:

"When the grand aggregate is made up, and the new duties on household necessities, clothing and implements, it will be found, we think, that there is a sensible lessening in the burdens resting upon farmers. This is particularly true of the Northwest, because in that section of the Dominion, owing to the fact that the country there is in process of settlement, the implement bill is relatively larger than it is in other sections of Canada. The fact that there is a decrease at all, in view of the strenuous efforts to secure an all-round increase, is cause for sincere gratification. The protest—begun by the unorganized farmers of Quebec, headed by Mr. Sellars, strengthened by the partially organized farmers of Ontario as represented by the Farmers' Association and Grange, and supported by the aggressive farmers' organizations of the West—has had its effect. The course of legislation, which had for a few years been steadily tending towards Dingleyism, has been turned in the other direction. If the offer of reciprocity contained in the intermediate tariff proves as effective as hoped for, the turn will be all the more decisive. Not a little credit for the direction that has been given is due Mr. Fielding and his colleagues, who instead of yielding to the concentrated pressure of the selfish few, heed has rather been given by them to the needs of the scattered masses."

HIGH TARIFF PLANKS.

A contemporary says: "There is not "such a plank in the Conservative "platform," as high tariff. True there is none so labelled, the party having not quite fallen into the folly of notifying the appointed victims of the intended hold-up. But if there is not such a plank in the Conservative platform then that structure is decidedly different from the one Mr. Borden and Mr. Cockshutt packed about the country last fall. Perhaps this is so. We have taken the liberty of saying that Mr. Borden had no authority to speak for the Conservative party and of venturing the opinion that on several points he did not express their views. It is reassuring to have the same hinted by one of his loyal supporters. If it be true, however, that beside the edifice reared by Mr. Borden there be another somewhere in hiding the moment would seem opportune for hauling it into public view and showing its points.

This much is clear—that Mr. Borden knows what his own platform means, and he thinks he understands the tariff views of the Conservative party. More, he is convinced that the party's views and the tariff plank in his platform are in thorough accord. Likewise he is certain that both his plank and his party's ideal is thorough-going high protection. Speaking last year at Halifax and elsewhere, Mr. Borden prefaced his tariff policy by a few words on the traditional tariff views of the party, thus demonstrating that he considered the two thoroughly harmonious. If Mr. Borden is mistaken in thinking he speaks the fiscal views of the party it would be the part of candid friendship to tell him so. If Liberals err in thinking the Opposition stand for high tariff they err in the society of the Opposition leader.

According to the Toronto News, Mr. Borden said in Halifax: "The fiscal "policy of the Conservative party has "been announced on many occasions "since 1878, and while consistently adhering to the principles laid down, "it necessarily has given considerations to new conditions arising out "of the development and progress of "the country." If this is not the N. P. what is it? If the "principles then laid down" were not the principles underlying the tariff from 1878 to 1896, what were they? These principles Mr. Borden says have been consistently adhered to by the party. Mr. Borden is clearly confident that the party platform, whether his own or not, contains the high tariff plank.

As for himself, Mr. Borden had no doubts where he stood. The Toronto World says he "declared" in Chatham (Ont.) that he was "a strong protectionist." Mr. Cockshutt, who did the tariff declaring for him in Western Canada was surely "a strong protectionist." The tariff plank Mr. Borden advanced was "A fiscal policy which "will promote the production within "Canada of all useful articles and "commodities that can be advantageously produced or manufactured "from or by means of our natural resources, having due regard to the interests of the consumer as well as to "the just claims of our wage-earning "population." If this does not mean higher tariff what does it mean? The present tariff? Then where is Mr. Borden's quarrel with the Government? A lower tariff? Then why does the Government have to fight every tariff reduction through the House?

Whatever the party stands for Mr. Borden says he stands for higher tariff and he ought surely to know. He declares too that the Conservative party stand for the same. If he is wrong in this the members of the party will have an early opportunity to correct his views by voting against him. If he is right in it, then the specious assurance that "there is not "such a plank in the platform of the "Conservative party" is merely a disguise donned in the constituencies where consumers have the majority vote.

ONE OF THE "LEGITIMATE TRANSACTIONS."

Mr. Fowler describes the processes by which he and his associates got their private interests inextricably twined about the money of the widows and orphans of the Foresters as "legitimate transactions." This looks pretty much like begging the question, to put it mildly. It is understood a suit is now pending in the courts to decide whether or not the transactions coincided with the law. Its outcome will decide whether or not they were "legitimate" in the legal sense; their moral legitimacy does not need the inquiry of a judge.

Meantime as Mr. Fowler presents his side of the case, suppose a director of the Union Trust Co. and the Supreme Chief Ranger of the Foresters gives us the other view. Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson says. "We have been "swindled out of $55,000" and those "who swindled us have got to account "for it. We are waiting the results "of this investigation to ascertain who "the parties are, aside from Mr. "Fowler."

Mr. Stevenson's allusion was to the Kamloops sawmill and timber limit deal. In this "transaction" Mr. Fowler acting, according to Mr. Stevenson under oath, as agent for the Union Trust Co., secured from Mr. Peter Ryan two agreements for sale on the same property. One purported to sell him the mill and limits for $225,000; the other undertook to let him have it for $170,000. Mr. Fowler showed the first to the Union Trust Co., and they paid over the money, $225,000, to Mr. Ryan. Mr. Fowler then came on Mr. Ryan for a refund of the $55,000 difference, got it and shared up with Mr. Foster, the manager of the Union Trust. This Mr. Fowler regards as a legitimate transaction with which the Foresters should find no fault, and from which the public should gather no uncomplimentary notions of his personal integrity or his faithfulness as a representative of other people.

COLLAPSED.

For an alleged party platform the programme outlined by Mr. Borden at Halifax a year ago seems to be getting just about as much attention from the supporters of Mr. Borden as they cannot conveniently get out of giving it. Aside from the Toronto News, which has been playing the role of Friday to the honorable gentleman for a couple of years, the allusions to it are rare in the party press. On the stump Opposition speakers seem willing to discuss almost anything from the nebular theory down, except the platform on which Mr. Borden says they stand. This marked coldness is not without reason. The programme has little enough in it to enthuse anybody, and less to enthuse Conservatives than many other classes. Its single constructive proposal of practical consequence is an equivocal pronouncement on the question of government ownership of telegraph and telephone systems. In this the followers of Mr. Borden are neither deeply concerned nor do they intend to try to concern others in it. Besides, even the traditional defenders of the divine right of rulers do not in this century take kindly to the idea of being themselves ruled without consultation or consent. If the edict had in it the elements of political potentiality they might indeed forgive it for being an edict; but they decline to display gladness in being coerced into fighting for a platform in whose potency they have no faith. The cold fact is that the Halifax platform has tumbled into ruins, and its supposed friends do not consider it valuable enough to undertake the job of re-erecting it.

FAITH WITHOUT WORKS.

The Toronto News has developed a theory that on the fall of the old government in 1896 the camp followers and hangers-on flocked over to the victors in hope of continuing under cover of Liberalism the plunder they had practised under cover of Conservatism. Well, if Conservatism in power breeds and rears such vultures and jackals this would seem a pretty good reason for keeping them out of power. The News, however, does not attempt to prove its faith by working to that end.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The Canadian Churchman, the official paper of the Church of England, adverting to the work of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in allaying inter-racial distrust, said in a recent issue:

"To speak frankly, we distinctly remember the time when the accession of a French-Canadian to political leadership would have probably hopelessly disrupted his party on the racial issue. We may be treading on somewhat dangerous ground, but we feel sure that our readers will not misunderstand us when we say that the advent of the present Premier to office was in one respect a most fortunate occurrence, in that it has demonstrated once and for all the absolute political equality of the two races by finally banishing the bogey of 'French domination,' which a generation ago, at all events, haunted the imagination of the average English-speaking voter of whatever political stripe. Now we know that a French-Canadian Premier can be as staunchly loyal to the British Crown and to Imperial solidarity as any Premier of Anglo-Saxon extraction."

MR. AMES' UNFAIRNESS.

Strathcona Plaindealer—In a speech at Calgary the other evening in a political campaign meeting, Mr. T. W. Quayle made a passing reference to the Ames charges and said that the member for St. Antoine wasn't as intellectually honest as he might be, nor as great a purist as his friends claimed. Mr. Ames was criticized as lacking in fairness in not crediting Hon. Mr. Oliver with changing the timber regulations complained of, and which had been framed by the Conservative government. Mr. Oliver has changed the form of sale from tender to open auction, has given abundance of time for investigating the value of the limits and imposed an obligatory clause requiring the establishment of a saw mill and the employment of a certain number of workmen. If Mr. Ames were as honest as he professed to be he wouldn't have so conveniently have forgotten to give Mr. Oliver the credit due. As to the charges that favoritism had been shown the speaker said it rested on surmise and suspicion, and in any event the sales made had gone to the highest bidder under the system of selling provided for by the Conservative government. If it were a rascally piece of work for Burrows to tender at $11,000 it was equally so for the other tenderers to put in figures much lower, and yet Mr. Ames never hinted that these men were doing anything but what was strictly honest.

MUST HAVE MONEY.

Ottawa Journal: In view of the comparative scarcity of employment for newcomers in Canada during midwinter it was found necessary last year to take such steps as would prevent the influx of immigrants who were not possessed of sufficient means to keep them until work could be found and with this object in view a regulation was enforced that no man should enter who had not at least $50 in cash on his person in addition to his railway ticket to his point of destination. Later on his money qualification was lowered to $25 and stands at that figure at present. An order-in-council has now been passed which provides that the $50 limit is to be restored from the 1st of January next till the middle of February.

A CANUCK ABROAD.

Toronto Globe—Mr. Norman E. Mack, the Buffalo newspaperman, who is cutting a conspicuous figure in American politics as Mr. Bryan's general manager and the financier of the Democratic campaign, is a Canadian by birth, an American by naturalization, and a "Mack" by act of the state legislature. He is a Middlesex man, born in West Williams, near Parkhill, of Highland Scotch descent, and his name was Norman E. McEachran. He probably found nasal-toned Yankees unable to pronounce his name with the true Gaelic gutteral and rather than have it lose its Highland flavor he had it changed. "Mack" can still ask for subscriptions either for the Buffalo Times or for the campaign fund in "the language of the Garden."

WOULD HE HOLD UP T TRANSCONTINENTA

Winnipeg Free Press—Yes the Conservative leader, M Borden, has made a start a in his undertaking of le party on a fresh expeditio the wilderness in which he piloting them about for ei This time he has had our R. P. Roblin by his side o form to help hold up his ha he attacked the policy of th government in providing th ion with a new ocean-to-oc way. He and his party in p opposed that undertaking their might when, in 1903, nounced by the government proposed a broken-backed, p alternative scheme, of which and most significant feature the Dominion should take the C. P. R. the portion of line running around the no of Lake Superior. They hav the National Trans-continen since; and in his speech a on Monday night Mr. Borde himself to outrageous exagge the cost of the new national "They vowed," he declared, " 000,000, placed at interest, w the cost of the whole unde And he went on to say: "The reason to believe that the pu will be nearly doubled befor pletion. The cost of the will amount to nearly $1,0 "every constituency in There are 221 constituencies i minion. So that Mr. Borde revised version of the cost o tional Transcontinental is $221,000,000."

He has come down a litt figure since his speech in th of Commons in July last, in t of which he submitted a tabu ment (Hansard, 1908, pag which showed to his own sa that the total cost of the Transcontinental would be 823. He explained afterwa there was one item which he der-estimated, and he there creased the total to $250,963,7 was his figure two months a figure of Mr. George E. Fo March last, was $129,000,00 Borden's figure now is "near 000,000." But through all th ing monstrous exaggerations cost of the National Transcon Mr. Borden and Mr. Foster a party in parliament have b changing in their hostility to struction of the National T tinental. Their method of upon the undertaking is to r sent its cost as being so gr the undertaking should not b to completion; that is to say tions already constructed c made use of in the Borden al proposal, further constructio transcontinental to compete C. P. R. being abandoned. S pears to be the Conservative

As for Mr. Borden's assert the government "vowed that 000,000, placed at interest would cost of the whole undertaki can only be rightly character deliberately misleading. Wi Wilfrid Laurier said was t government would, under the build the 1,860 miles from Winnipeg, and guarantee th on the prairie section constru the Grand Trunk Pacific west nipeg, and pay seven years on three-quarters of the cost mountain section, and that first seven years the Grand Tr cific is not required to pay on the government-owned sect from Winnipeg, but that afte seven years the Grand Trunk pays for fifty years a rental per cent. of the cost of const of that section. And Sir Wil timated that the accumulated during those seven years wou count to $13,000,000. Nothing c plainer than the statement Wilfrid Laurier made it. He speaking of cost of construction the cost which the people of will have to bear ultimately regard to what the country pay. Which is an entirely d matter.

This $13,000,000 myth is unwo a gentleman of Mr. Borden's sions. Does he really imagin anyone believes Sir Wilfrid Lau anybody else ever said that a 3,558 miles in length, from M to the Pacific, could be cons for $13,000,000, or at the rate of per mile? Does such an assert Mr. Borden indicate that th proaches the discussion of th tional transcontinental undertak a fair spirit? The estimates pre by the government in 1903 of t of construction between Winnip Moncton were the estimates Collingwood Schreiber, then the engineer of railways and can men of the highest character an ity in his profession. The actu of construction is proving to be er than these estimates, but, evidence before the public ac committee at the recent sess parliament showed conclusively system provided for keeping th of construction down to the possible figure consistent with ing a first class road bed is w out so as to attain the object at. The interests of the Grand Pacific are identical with the in of the public in securing a firs road bed from Winnipeg to M at the lowest cost; as the co has to pay interest for fifty ye every dollar of the cost. Ever ment before being made must j tified to the company's eng as being a proper charge for co tion work done; and the statut vides that in the event of the co sion's engineers and the com engineers being unable to agree gard to any payment, the qu shall be settled by judicial a tion. This is the system which ing carried out; and the work o struction between Winnipeg Moncton is being done at the possible figure. The objection Borden to it is an objection to ing done at all.

The measure of the cost of the new ocean-to-ocean highway t people of Canada is not the co construction, but the seven year tritted rental on the government ed section east of Winnipeg, an Railway issues 6