

the railroad pay or help to pay under existing conditions. You fix it, and once fixed you can never alter it until the day arrives at which the Company is getting \$9,000,000, or \$12,000,000 a year profit, after paying all the expenses of the road. Nor is that all. The hon. gentleman has taken the Union Pacific as his standard, and there may be a construction company, there may be a Canada Credit Mobilier, there may be arrangements which would easily swell the nominal capital account to the \$150,000,000, so that it may appear that the \$150,000,000 had been expended on the construction of this railway, though it may have cost only \$50,000,000 to construct it. The hon. gentleman has himself shown us how men are deceived. He, the man who is chiefly responsible for the making of this contract, who submitted it to Parliament, who inserted this clause that the Union Pacific should be the standard, actually did believe that the Union Pacific did cost the \$130,000,000 he mentioned. I have shown you it cost nothing like that sum, that the amount was a nominal one made up by fraud, by all the devices which can be resorted to in such cases. If the hon. gentleman did not know that the actual cost of the Union Pacific, built as it was, as I have said, was much less than the nominal cost, how will his friendly eyes ever open to the conception that it is possible a similar result may be reached in the case of the Canada Pacific Railway. We have yet to take hold of another, the lessons of experience. A few years have pointed out the real dangers that exist in this connection. Within a few years past the people of the neighboring Republic, having the greatest development of railway enterprise in the world, having, I suppose, in round numbers, some 90,000 miles of railway running there, have had the opportunity of knowing, and, by sad experience, do know, what the difficulties and evils are which are incidental to those great benefits to humanity, railway corporations, and railway enterprises. The peculiar circumstances favoring with us, the growth of the evils of monopoly, render it still more necessary that we should see what those evils are which are experienced elsewhere, and devise some means of averting them instead of blindly going on as if there were no evils, or as, if there were evils, that were not capable of being averted. Sir, these people will become the landlords of the North-West. They will take such a share of the profit of every farmer in the North-West as they choose to demand, consistently with there being any stimulus on the part of that farmer to raise grain for the market. They are not entitled to ask, Sir, for the privileges given to men who build railways at their own risk. They do not occupy that position. You are giving them the money to build up a monopoly of trade, and giving them statutory security for that monopoly, and you are bound to restrain them. Their exceptional position obliges you, if even the general evils did not, to restrain them. Talk to me of this thing standing. It will not stand. If you pass this law, and if the country of which you speak so glowingly is what you depict it, if its prospects of settlement are such as you hope they are, I say you are blighting these prospects by passing this law; and if those prospects are measurably realized, notwithstanding the passing of this law, I say the people of that country would be less than men if they suffered such a law to exist. Talk of the immigration of Irishmen to the North-West. You are proposing to them to substitute the scorpion for the rod. You are proposing to those who are suffering under the tyranny of individual landlords, to expose themselves to the soulless tyranny of a gigantic corporation. You are telling them that their chance of profit is to depend on what this corporation thinks they ought to pay as tribute before they can take their produce to market. I have referred to some of the acts of railways that are in this position. I have referred to what the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway do. I do not believe they are an exception. They all

Mr. BLAKE.

do it when they can. I believe it to be the standard of morality of railway men throughout the United States that they are to take whatever the traffic will bear so long as they do not take so much as will prevent the continuance of traffic. I believe they take just as high rates as they can get everywhere, and I will prove that by good evidence in a few moments. I said the other, the quotation for wheat from Emerson to Toronto, was forty-five cents. The rate at a fair paying rate would be $1\frac{1}{2}$ cent per hundred miles, or $17\frac{1}{2}$ cents for the distance, 1,300 miles. In point of fact, I believe the rates from St. Paul down to be much lower than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cent a bushel, and consequently a much larger proportion than that would amount to, goes to the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway. But, assuming there will be, according to that calculation, a just compensation of $5\frac{2}{10}$ c. you have $27\frac{3}{4}$ c. per bushel over a fair transport charge; and if you give 25 bushels to the acre, for the early years of the fertile Red River Valley, it means, after paying a fair charge for transports, a tax of $\$6.82\frac{1}{2}$ c. an acre on the farmer for every acre he puts into wheat. And the rate quoted at the largest mill in Minneapolis, perhaps in the world, on the 14th December last, a special rate, and it is one of the clauses of their creed to do business largely in special rates—the very best available was from Emerson to Minneapolis 21c. per bushel. Ample payment would be 5:20 at the average. The result is, the surplus charged 15:80, for that special rate. That would be a rent of \$4 on every acre in wheat after payment of the fair charges for transport, and that is the position of the man at the boundary. In what position will be the man 200, 300 or 400 miles inside the the boundary or further west? Of course the railway men cannot go on charging at this rate for the greater distance, because there is a limitation to their charges, which cannot exceed what the traffic will bear. But that is the only limit. But how does this rate act on the frontier? For a long time a great deal of the furniture needed will be imported—a point not more important to the farmer than the manufacturer. A car load of common furniture is worth, on board, in Ontario, \$700. The freight all through, from any point in Ontario to Winnipeg, will be about \$280, or 40 per cent. on cost. Add merchant's profits on that, \$280, or 25 per cent., and you have an additional cost to the consumer of 50 per cent. That is rather an alarming statement. In addition to this increase of 50 per cent., to get the furniture into Winnipeg, how much will be laid on it to carry it into the interior at those rates? But dealing only with Winnipeg, if the same rates, proportionately, are charged on furniture that are paid by agricultural implements, the settler would be seriously oppressed; the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway, having a monopoly, is charging on the furniture, after payment of fair rates for transport, a tax of $18\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on value. If that rate is not charged, I have no doubt it will be found that one will be charged amounting to $12\frac{1}{2}$ to 15 per cent on the value of the furniture over a fair rate of transport. No wonder you want a very high duty to keep out furniture made near the border on the American side. I have here quotations of the rates on the general classes of freight, showing the rates of freight between Toronto and Winnipeg. For first-class freight from Toronto to Chicago, 515 miles, 60 cents; from Chicago to St. Paul, 409 miles, 75 cents; from St. Paul to St. Vincent, the monopolists line, 390 miles, \$1.50; from St. Vincent to St. Boniface, 67 miles, 25 cents. Second-class freight: from Toronto to Chicago, 50 cents; from Chicago to St. Paul, 60 cents; from St. Paul to St. Vincent, \$1.30; from St. Vincent to St. Boniface, 21 cents. Third-class: for the first distance, 515 miles, 40 cents; for the second, 409 miles, 45 cents; for the third, through the happy region to St. Vincent, 390 miles, \$1.10, and the fourth, St. Vincent to St.