

the \$38,000,000 which did mature within the last ten years, and the \$25,000,000 which we have just put through averages 4½ per cent. So that in reckoning the cost of the National Transcontinental railway to the people of this country, I am justified in saying that it is costing us 4 per cent. If we had the money we could pay off a portion of our national debt and save 4 per cent; if we have not the money we have to pay 4 per cent to get it.

According to the statement of the commission, which the hon. member for South Renfrew does not deny, the cost of the Transcontinental, with interest computed to date of its completion, will be \$181,000,000. I placed it at \$180,000,000 before I got these revised figures. For the first seven years, as we all know, we make an absolute and complete gift to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway of seven years interest on \$180,000,000, which, compounded at 4 per cent, amounts to \$56,867,000. In addition to that, we pay interest on the bonds of a portion of the cost of the mountain section at 4 per cent for seven years, making a direct gift to the company of \$13,473,000. Then, because of a blunder which was made by the late Administration by reason of the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific being improperly drawn up, we were led into another expenditure in connection with the implementing of the bonds of the western section which, notwithstanding the efforts made by the Finance Minister, will cost us \$10,000,000. At the end of the ten year period we will be getting three per cent on that \$180,000,000 and paying four per cent. If you capitalize the difference of one per cent on the cost of the railway—because we get only three per cent rental—you have \$45,000,000 more. What does it all mean? It means that instead of the \$13,000,000 which the present leader of the Opposition said this railway would cost the country, taking it upon his own basis the amount is \$125,000,000. I defy any member on the other side of the House to say that these figures are wrong. \$125,000,000 is the pure gift which we make to this company, which we do not get back, and for which we have no recourse. I hope hon. gentlemen will all understand that this amount does not represent the cost of the railway; that is the figure which the hon. member for South Renfrew said was a bonus or subsidy. Did you ever hear the question of bonus or subsidy mentioned when hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country in 1903? Did they tell the people at that time that they were

going to give the company a straight gift of \$125,000,000? The hon. gentleman said that we should consider that as a bonus or subsidy to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Taking his own argument, we have a subsidy of \$125,000,000 for 1,800 miles of railway, \$75,000 a mile. Hon. gentlemen will see, therefore, that my hon. friend has not been fair; he had not figured it out; he did not think what he was saying when he said we were giving that interest as a subsidy to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. He did not know that he was telling the people of this country that we were giving them a subsidy of \$75,000 a mile, besides building the railway ourselves.

I now propose to deal with the cost of the railway. In order that there may be no mistake about this matter, I will quote again from 'Hansard.' On July 30, 1903, the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), spoke as follows in this House:

It is our duty to provide immediate means whereby the products of these new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost.

'At the least possible cost' solves the whole question. If these means are not obtained at the least possible cost, you cannot get the volume of trade; if your rates are too high you will not get the traffic. The means of transportation, must, therefore, be obtained at the least possible cost if the railway is to fulfil the purposes for which it is being constructed. He goes on to say:

To those who would advise to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate, and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood of tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass, it may never recur again.

That is what M. P. Davis said when he got contracts 16 and 17: The flood of tide is upon me that leads to fortune; if I let it pass it may never recur again. So he kept hold of contracts 16 and 17, the flood of the tide of fortune. For eleven months the tide was dammed back, and when it receded it left upon the sands of time the sum of \$740,000 for M. P. Davis. The flood of tide was indeed upon him; if he let it pass it might never recur again. Then my right hon. friend went on to say:

We cannot wait, because time does not wait.

But M. P. Davis waited for a year.

Time lost is doubly lost—