

expense. Though the road is tolerably well managed by the hon. gentleman, still it did not pay running expenses the last six months, and we do not know that it will for the current six months. But we do know that if other roads are to be subsidized to compete for the traffic which rightfully belongs to the Intercolonial Railway, all hope of its paying running expenses will be gone. Is that the policy which the hon. gentleman pursues with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway? The other day, when asked if he would sacrifice the interests of the other Provinces to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he said: "Yes," in his emphatic way. He has one policy for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, to a certain extent, a reasonable one, and another for the Intercolonial Railway. On the one hand, he is going to feed and nourish a great railway monopoly, and on the other he is going to starve, as far as competition can starve, another great railway to the East. That is a policy which, I think, the House will not approve. It strikes me as being a suicidal policy—as being one which the House should not adopt, because it is the beginning of a series of competitions which may result more disastrously than we can foresee. But that is not all, for while he is subsidizing that road to compete with the Intercolonial Railway, he is subsidizing others, as for instance the International, which is to divert the trade in another direction. I cannot state whether it will divert it into the State of Maine, because I do not remember. But if it does, where is the propriety of subsidizing the Sherbrooke Railway to the extent of \$156,800? What is the condition of that railway? It is nearly completed at the present moment. The hon. Minister's proposal is to lay that road with steel rails in lieu of iron rails, with which it is laid at present. Now, who is most interested in that road? One of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). He is one of the largest stockholders in that road, and shall we be uncharitable if we say that the hon. gentleman's colleague is going to profit from this subsidy. Not only is it wrong to subsidize a local railway with Dominion money, but this fact of the hon. gentleman's colleague being interested, is in itself a suspicious circumstance. Then going West, I come to a railway in the Province of Ontario, the Napanee, Tamworth, and Quebec Railway. This is of all others perhaps the greatest outrage in the whole list of subsidies. Where does that road lead to? What is the object of the subsidy? The hon. gentleman says to connect the Quebec and Ontario road with the water on the front, as if that road could have no connection without the subsidy. If that principle is to hold good, why not subsidize the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, the road running from Belleville to Madoc, or the road running from Cobourg to Rice Lake? I can find a dozen instances in which the argument of the hon. gentleman will be just as strong as it is in this case. If he could show that he was developing some great industry or the resources of the northern parts of the counties of Lennox and Addington, as he has shown in the Gatineau Valley Railway there would be some ground for assuming that his subsidy is proper; but it is just to connect by a short railroad twenty-eight miles long, the back part of the country with the front part. Are there any local difficulties to prevent the construction of that road? Is there not something a little suspicious in this case also? That railroad had applied repeatedly to the Ontario Legislature for a subsidy; for some reason it was refused. I fancy on the ground that the company could not show that they had the means to build the road and carry it on successfully. Were there not promises made during the last Election that if certain things were arranged politically, that road would be subsidized? Were there not certain rumors that if the hon. the First Minister were elected for Lennox, and certain things were done in the local election, that road would receive all possible consideration? And

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

on the back of these rumors we have this subsidy placed before us for the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway. Put this and that together and they confirm the suspicion that political considerations have been made to override all other considerations. Going further west, I come to the railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, and I will tell the hon. gentleman that I approve most cordially with that subsidy, just as I would approve of a subsidy to the Cape Breton Railway, if it was shown to be an essential link of our national railway system. I think the hon. gentleman's argument on this point was unanswerable. The argument was that inasmuch as the Canada Central Railway was subsidized to the extent of \$12,000 a mile, and that the Canada Central connected the Canadian Pacific with the Quebec system of railways, therefore the Ontario system should be similarly favored. That position is sound. You have a great system of railways placed by two similar subsidies in connection with two other systems of railways; both are treated alike. So far as that subsidy is concerned it is one that this House could not well refuse, for it rests on national grounds; it is not for a local road, but for one for the development of the whole Dominion. Now, after having referred to the different subsidies which the hon. gentleman proposes, allow me to call his attention to the dangerous step he is taking. I was unavoidably called away before the close of last Session and did not hear the argument used in favor of the subsidies for railways then granted; but I notice, on referring to the Votes and Proceedings, that this House granted \$1,500,000. This year it is proposed to grant \$2,138,000, an increase of one-half a million dollars in one year; and that increase is not the worst feature in the case. What the hon. gentleman began is going on grandly. What amount shall be required next year if hon. gentlemen opposite pursue the same course? The very argument the hon. Minister used to-night in favor of the different subsidies proposed will be invincible in the mouths of the deputations and lobbyists who will come down with demands for railroads in future years. He has opened the flood-gates, and close them he cannot. He has laid down a precedent which too many in different parts in this country will be disposed to act upon. And what is the most dangerous side of the precedent is this: That he has stepped entirely outside of what is purely national and Dominion, into what is purely Provincial legislation, and instead of leaving the Provinces to develop their resources according to their discretion, he takes the surplus of this Dominion and subsidizes local railways with it. What is it but another mode of subsidizing the Local Legislatures, to do for them what they should do for themselves. Every grant to the Province of Nova Scotia, or to the Province of New Brunswick, is an additional subsidy to that Province. We have some 274 miles of railway subsidized in the Province of Quebec. We have heard something of "better terms" for the Province of Quebec. Better terms were refused, so far as I can learn; but we have here another form of "better terms." We know that when the Province of Quebec could not get a subsidy for the North Shore line, the people of that Province built it out of their own resources. They have now exhausted their resources, and the hon. gentleman fearing to give them a subsidy directly, gives them this subsidy indirectly. The same with reference to the twenty-eight miles from Napanee to Tamworth, in Ontario. The other Ontario road I do not look upon as being in a similar condition, for it is not a local but a Dominion road. Since the hon. gentleman has subsidized one railroad in the Province of Ontario, a local road, will he be surprised if deputations from various parts of the Province next year should wait on him and ask him to subsidize their railroads. I will not be surprised if he should be waited upon by deputations by the score, but I will be surprised if he should succeed in resisting their claims, and refusing them subsidies. He