

they are possibly preventing a market for Canadian products which otherwise would certainly exist. On that point, as to the possible absolute necessity of transporting Canadian ore to the United States smelters, I would recall to the memory of the members who attended the Railway Committee, the utterances of Vice-President Shaughnessy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who stated to that committee that the silver ores of Sandoz had to go to the United States smelters in order to be smelted economically, and that that was why his company carried those ores to the United States smelters. Now, I do not suppose for an instant that Mr. Corbin will do any differently from what the Canadian Pacific Railway would do. If it will pay to smelt Canadian ores in Canada they will be smelted in Canada. But if it will not pay to smelt them in Canada, just as we prefer to see the Sandoz ores go to the States to be smelted rather than to see the mines lie idle, so the food producers would prefer to have the ores of the Boundary Creek country go to the States to be smelted rather than that those mines should not be worked. The ores will not go to the States to be smelted unless it is necessary that they should go there in order that the mines may be worked. In regard to the trade that is going to the States from this Kootenay country and Boundary Creek country. The district of Alberta, as hon. gentlemen have themselves said, is in a position to supply the food products of the Kootenay country. As a matter of fact I beg to say that the district of Alberta does supply those products. Three years ago the district of Alberta did not supply those food products, they came almost entirely from the United States. Now, these food products come in large proportion, that is to say, the largest proportion of both cattle, oats and flour, come from the district of Alberta and Manitoba. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen if that is an indication that Canada is losing trade in that country, although Mr. Corbin has his two roads in there. I say it is not. It establishes beyond question the fact which I stated, that Canada is in a position to hold the trade of that country in food products. Under present conditions she is holding it. What she wants now is the further development of the country in order to increase the market; and that development cannot be secured except by the very best and most improved facilities. That is acknowledged on all hands.

As regards the money voted last year for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, hon. members seem to rather misapprehend the position. We paid \$3,500,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway to enable that railway to get into the Kootenay country and compete for the trade there. We are asked this year to burk legislation which would allow another company to enter that country to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It does not seem to me that because we paid

\$3,500,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway to put them in a position to compete for certain trade, we thereby bound ourselves to burk legislation that would enable another company to compete with them. It seems strange that this company, which came to Parliament, last year, declaring that if they did not obtain \$3,500,000 from this Parliament, the trade of that country would be lost to Canada, should, after getting the money on that understanding, now come forward and declare that the same trade will still be lost if we permit this 30 miles of railway to be built.

In regard to railway competition, I have heard some hon. members argue that competition on railways does not compete. What do we expect in railway competition? Do we consider that, so long as two railways are running along side of each other and are charging like rates, there is no competition and no necessity for both roads? Let us apply this argument to other business interests. In the city of Ottawa there are mercantile establishments in which the same classes of goods are sold at practically the same prices. Do those hon. gentlemen hold that that competition does not compete? Although those different mercantile establishments do sell goods from time to time at very much the same prices, we know there is competition, and keen competition, and it would be a bad thing if competition between mercantile establishments here was destroyed. It is the same in respect to railways. If the railways should at the moment charge the same rates, it does not follow that we were not the better for having the competition, or that there is no competition. It is a notorious fact throughout Canada, that wherever there is a railway point that has competition, that point is thriving, and wherever there is a point that has not railway competition, no matter how many railways it possesses, it is not thriving. It is not very long since the manufacturing city of Hamilton, which had three or four lines of railway, they being all under Grand Trunk management, felt it necessary, in order to protect its business interests, to vote to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a quarter of a million dollars in order to get railway competition; and they have not regretted their bargain. It is all very well for hon. members who live at points where there is railway competition, to say that competition does not compete; but no hon. gentleman who lives at a non-competing point will make such an assertion. Take the North-west Territories, and it will be found that it costs as much for passengers and freight from Montreal to Calgary, or Edmonton, practically as it does to Vancouver. Why? Is it because the road to Vancouver is shorter or there are less difficulties to be overcome? The railway has to cross three ranges of mountains to reach the coast and is hundreds of miles longer, but the rates for passengers and freight are