

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I know, but the honourable gentleman is supporting the Government that did it. The very Government he is supporting introduced those bills. This honourable House rejected some of them, and the honourable gentleman's own leader has instituted a campaign against this honourable body for the reason that we did not approve of the building of more lines in the West. Because this Senate had thrown out two lines of railway the Prime Minister of this country started an agitation throughout Canada for the reformation of the Senate. How can the honourable gentleman reconcile that? He says there are too many lines of railway in the West. We threw out two proposed branches because we thought they should not be built, and the very Government of which the honourable gentleman is a very servile supporter—and I say it without offence—want to build more lines. Do be consistent, do be logical, when you make a statement of that kind.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: The honourable gentleman has not contradicted the statement about the \$8,000 and the \$11,000 gross receipts per mile. That was the argument, and he has not yet answered it. Will he contradict it? I give him a chance to make another speech and contradict it.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: What is that?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: The honourable gentleman does not speak to the subject matter. What about the \$8,000 and the \$11,000 per mile?

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I am sure the honourable gentleman does not know.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: But what about the \$8,000 and the \$11,000 per mile? Does the honourable gentleman contradict that statement?

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I have not—

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Does the honourable gentleman contradict that statement?

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: You know, the same thing—

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Does the honourable gentleman contradict that statement?

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: The same thing occurred at the last Session of this House. The honourable gentleman made similar remarks, and he demanded of me an apology, but the honourable gentleman from Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff), who had the facts and figures—

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Well, he had not.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I have not the figures with me to-night.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Sit down, then.

Hon. Mr. L'ESPERANCE: Question! Question!

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: Now, do be a little careful, please.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Well, as I was saying, in the Province of Quebec we have 500 persons per mile, and the Prairie Provinces have 120 per mile. Anyway, if railway rates are decreased and in consequence there is less money taken by the railroads, what will happen? Somebody will have to make up for the loss; we must tax somebody. Now, the point I was trying to make was that in Quebec you will tax five persons per mile for every one who is taxed in the Prairie Provinces; or, to be literal, say you will tax four in Quebec for one in the Prairie Provinces. So where will the bulk of the money come from to make up for those reductions in rates? It must be done by taxation. The money must be found if you reduce one source of supply, that is, the freight rates. Everybody knows that the freight is the main source of revenue from a railway. Out of every \$5 taken in by the Grand Trunk system there was \$4 earned from freight and \$1 from passengers. On the C.P.R., for every \$4 there was \$3 from freight and \$1 from passenger service. So freight is the main thing. Now, if you reduce the freight rate you must find the money to make up the deficit. I claim that Ontario and Quebec will have to make it up, because if Saskatchewan pays other taxes as it pays the income tax, it will contribute \$2 a head, whereas Quebec will pay \$10 and Ontario \$9.25. That is the situation. There is no disgrace about it, but that is the way it appears. So we are paying for Saskatchewan, and I do not blame that province if we are willing to let this system go on.

In Quebec we want some railroads this year, and we want them very badly. There has been discovered in Northern Quebec something which is said to be equal to the mines of Ontario. There are in Northern Quebec no railroads. Now, there is some talk about our having railways built there. In the Quebec Legislature Hon. Mr. Patenaude, at one time a Cabinet Minister in the Borden cabinet; said: "We have too many railways; we do not want any railroads there." The proposal is to build from Mont Laurier up by Rouyn and those other townships which are supposed to be full of valuable minerals.