

### WHAT THE NORTH BAY SCHEME MEANT.

The inconsistencies of the Opposition in this matter are so numerous, that it is almost monotonous to point out the whole of them. Still, it is a serious matter, and the public should know just how the Opposition stands. What was it that the Opposition, speaking through Mr. Northrup, member for East Hastings, was willing to do? It was willing to aid the Grand Trunk Pacific to construct a line from North Bay to Winnipeg, and thence to the Pacific Coast. Every person who is acquainted with the question knows that such a scheme would have meant the hauling of the grain and other produce of the West to North Bay, there connecting with the Grand Trunk system which has its outlet and terminus at Portland, in the United States.

More than this, look at the cost of a proposition of this kind, which would shut out the construction of a through road over Canadian territory, and close Canadian seaports to that enormous and growing trade from the Northwest. From North Bay to Winnipeg the distance is 1,050 miles, and from Winnipeg to the Pacific Coast, 1,442 miles, or a total of 2,492 miles. Mr. Northrup declared that the Opposition were, and always had been, perfectly willing to adopt this scheme. Part of the scheme was a subsidy of \$6,400 per mile, equal to \$15,948,000. Another part of the proposition was, an additional subsidy, or grant, of 5,000 acres of land per mile. This meant 12,460,000 acres of public land, which, at the lowest valuation, would be worth \$3 per acre. That amounts to \$37,380,000, and along with the cash subsidy of \$6,400 per mile, meant public aid for a road from North Bay to the Pacific Coast amounting to \$53,328,000. That is, over \$50,000,000 for a road which began in the middle, and which had for its natural terminus the seaport of Portland, in the State of Maine. That was the original proposition of the Grand Trunk Pacific promoters to which the Government would not listen, and which the Opposition, by the mouth of Mr. Northrup, declared it was in favor of, and would have supported. It may be said such a proposal is so crazy that no organized party would back it up, but in reply to this, a Hansard of the House of Commons will show that a declaration of support for it was publicly made by a leading member of the Opposition, on the floor of Parliament. They steadfastly criticised and opposed the scheme that forced the Grand Trunk Pacific to build clear across the continent, from a Canadian port on one ocean to a Canadian port on the other. That is a truly national Canadian railway.

### WILLING YET UNWILLING.

In their better moments, some of their best men acknowledge that this is the only true national Canadian policy. For example, Mr. Monk, speaking after the session at a public meeting in support of Mr. Bergeron's candidature, in the county of Beauharnois, said: "The Conservatives are willing to give to the people of the Northwest another transcontinental railway, but they want the new road to come through the valleys of the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence. That outlay would give the older provinces, which had to pay the bills, some return for their outlay." These were his words, according to a report in the *Montreal Gazette*. As has already been said, Mr. Haggart, another Opposition leader, took the responsibility of saying on the floor of Parliament, that if another road was to be built, the route proposed by the Government, somewhere along the height of land, passing through Northern Ontario and Northern Quebec, would be the best possible route. Then, Mr. Monk gets up and says that the road should come through the Ottawa Valley and the St. Lawrence. The Canadian Pacific Railway now runs through the Ottawa Valley, and the old Grand Trunk Railway runs along the St. Lawrence. How is it possible to have a new railway opening up and developing this country if it is simply to go over the route of existing lines? Such a policy would be absolutely childish, and no representative Parliament could possibly sanction it; yet, we have one of the prominent Opposition leaders publicly advocating such an absurd proposition.