

count. There are some new conditions undoubtedly that should be taken into consideration. For instance, when the government of that day by the bargain with British Columbia in 1871, committed the country to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we had a population of 3,547,000. To-day we have a population of about 5,500,000. That is a consideration that ought to be kept in mind in considering the ability of the country to undertake this great work. When the government committed the country to the building of a transcontinental railway in 1871, the revenue of Canada was about \$19,250,000. We are asking the people to undertake the construction of a second transcontinental railway when our revenue is \$70,000,000. When the government of that day committed the country to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the total trade of Canada was \$170,000,000. We are asking the country to commit itself to another transcontinental railway when the trade of Canada has reached \$457,000,000. The late government committed the country to building a transcontinental railway when the bank deposits of the country had reached the large sum—for it was a large sum—of \$62,500,000. We are asking the country to accept the responsibility of a second transcontinental railway when the bank deposits are \$439,000,000. When the arrangement was made by the late government with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of a transcontinental railway—no, not for a transcontinental railway, but for a railway which began away up in Ontario and ran thence to the Pacific, and not a scheme like the one now before this House—they gave that company \$25,000,000 in hard cash. We are proposing as I have shown by the statement I have read to assume an obligation equal to a present payment of between \$13,000,000 and \$14,000,000.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS GIVEN AWAY.

That is the whole transaction; when we tell you that, we tell you the beginning and the end of the obligation which the people of Canada are to assume. When the late government entered into the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company they gave up about \$37,750,000 worth of completed government-owned railway as a free gift to the company. We do not give up anything of the kind—there is no such item on our side of the account. When the late government made that contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they gave them 25,000,000 acres of land. We give this company not a single acre. When the late government made the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they gave the company freedom from customs taxation. We give this company not a dollar of such aid. When the late government made that arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company they gave the company exemption from railway competition for twenty years. There is no monopoly in the contract which we put before parliament. When the late government made their contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they gave them exemption from taxation on the land of an empire for twenty years, and the people of the Northwest Territories know to-day to their bitter sorrow what that exemption means. There is no such exemption in this contract before the House to-day. We are not afraid to compare our transaction with theirs. We are not afraid to compare it either as respects its money expenditure, its exemptions from taxation, its grants of land, its freedom from monopoly. In all these things we present to the people a contract which may well be compared with that which hon. gentlemen opposite made years ago. I am quite willing that due allowance should be made for the changed conditions, but, making that due allowance we must reach the conclusion that we are arranging for the carrying out of a great enterprise at a comparatively small cost.

A MISLEADING OPPOSITION COMPARISON.

Well, another comparison has been made. My hon. friend, the railway expert of the opposition (Mr. Haggart) made a statement in debate that has been taken up and repeated in the press and in this House. Speaking on the 6th of April, he said as reported in "Hansard":

The Grand Trunk Company came to this government for the purpose of getting the ordinary subsidies given to railways for the purpose of extending their railway from North Bay to the Pacific coast, and the present scheme was foisted upon them by the government.

He says the Grand Trunk came to us and offered to build the road from North Bay to the Pacific for the ordinary subsidy. I quote also from the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) in this House. Speaking on the 15th of April in this House he said:

The Grand Trunk Railway Company were willing to build a railway from North Bay to Winnipeg under the ordinary conditions. Why this government did not wish them to do so is more than I can understand.

The hon. member for Compton thought this should be done—nothing about government ownership in his mind then. He spoke to us for an hour or two the other night in favor of government ownership, but only a few days before he had rebuked us because we did not allow the Grand Trunk to take this as a private enterprise and build from North Bay to the Pacific. But the point I wish to make at this time is that these two gentlemen, prominent members of the opposition, and they have been followed throughout this whole discussion in parliament and the press—declared that the Grand Trunk came to us and offered to build the road from North Bay to the Pacific for the ordinary subsidies? What are the ordinary subsidies? From \$3,200 per mile to \$6,400 per mile according to the cost of construction of the road. It is a variable figure. As spoken of it is commonly \$3,200 per mile, but there is a sliding scale by which if the road is a costly one, the subsidy may run up to \$6,400 a mile. That is the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, a statement on which they have founded a large part of their criticism. They have made figures to show that by the payment of the ordinary subsidies allowed under our railway grants, we could make a contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to build a railway from North Bay to the Pacific. They complained that they did not accept the offer, and with that statement for a foundation of their argument they go through the country, making comparisons between that scheme as they say it was and the cost of the scheme we are presenting to the House. We find ourselves in this difficulty: The Grand Trunk Pacific made a proposition to the government marked "confidential." As it was not accepted, we did not think

it was in earlier st who made tion of t

We bring do writers to offer wtl the ordie CONFIDE TO

Sir,—Yo railway fr coast, for t 1st. Tha Bay, a seco facilities r through A 2nd. Th a line fro at or near rd. Th to be calle 4th. Th concession both at th 5th. Th been mad 6th. Th and in op 7th. Th 8th. Th territory; of traffic, as the go 9th. Th Grand Tr and open 10th. T the propo (a.) Th in addit (b.) Th contract (c.) Th free, if g (d.) Th other pr capital st establish they are the Crov pation. And y

No tween t you, Si ask the Pacific tion fr which i refuse t acres o but wh mile is he mad with th given i genera acre w grants to such Ti miles. \$6,400 acres.