

ment came into power, Sir Charles Tupper went to the city of Quebec, and made a great public speech, in which he declared that it was the policy of the Conservative party to build the Quebec bridge; and more than that, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition himself last session, went down to Quebec and made a speech when he wanted to please the electors of that city, and this is what he said: "Moreover, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway coupled with the completion of the Quebec bridge, to which both political parties are committed, may mean much for the future of Quebec."

AN UNWARRANTED CHARGE.

If both political parties are committed to the Quebec bridge, what right has my hon. friend to charge it as part of the transcontinental railway? The most that anybody can say in relation to the Transcontinental Railway and the Quebec bridge is that the adoption of this great transcontinental scheme has created an additional reason for the Quebec bridge—not only an additional reason why we would build it, but an additional reason why when built it shall be a self-sustaining public work. Was that all? The hon. gentleman came back from his Quebec speech and sat in this House and let the Quebec bridge Bill go through without opposition. The members of the opposition voted for the Quebec bridge Bill, and they share with us the responsibility for every dollar of that expenditure. What, then, are we to think of the hon. gentleman who treats it as part of this abominable transcontinental scheme which he wants to defeat by his amendment? Sir, if it is a part of this transcontinental scheme, the hon. gentleman and all his followers have an account to settle with the people of this country, because when they go on the public platform and condemn this scheme, men will rise up and say, 'Why do you condemn it? You voted for a part of that scheme, that is, the Quebec bridge.' The hon. gentleman will say that has nothing to do with the transcontinental scheme at all. The answer will be, 'Why then do you charge it up against the transcontinental scheme? I venture to say that my hon. friend, with his attention drawn to it in this way, cannot show the shadow of a reason why he should add six or seven millions of dollars to his calculation on that account.'

THE ALARMIST MR. OSLER.

But the hon. gentleman started out with only a little less zeal than the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who made the cost of the eastern division \$120,000,000. He started out to make up an alarming statement to the people of this country; and, not content with adding \$10,000,000 to the fair cost of the eastern division, he adds six or seven millions more by including the Quebec bridge, which he voted for himself.

Now, the government's obligations in this matter, as I have already stated, is confined to the seven years' interest. Let us not get away from that. If the Grand Trunk Pacific Company fulfil the obligations which they have undertaken by this contract, then the only obligation that this government will be called upon to meet will be seven years' interest on three-fourths of the cost of the mountain section and seven years rental on the eastern division. It admits of no debate. Can we safely assume for the purposes of the calculation that the scheme is to work out successfully, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will fulfil its obligation? I believe we can do so, for several reasons.

WHAT MAKES FOR SUCCESS.

First we have the engagement of eminent, responsible men of honourable reputation, who entered into the agreement with the full confidence and belief that, in the great development of this country, the scheme will be made a success. Secondly because each one of us, as he looks at the expansion of Canada which is going on now, as he sees the evidences of new life, hope and confidence which have come into this country since the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfred Laurier) became First Minister, must have an abiding faith that this scheme is going to prove successful. Then there is a third reason which my hon. friends opposite are bound to accept. Every argument they have made as to the profitable character of the enterprise to the Grand Trunk must be based on the assumption that the Grand Trunk Railway has fulfilled its obligations and paid every cent. If the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway, as holders of the common stock, are to make one cent out of this enterprise, they must fulfil every obligation they are under to this government. They cannot make a cent until they do so. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific must see that the interest is paid on the western division, and that we are not called upon to pay it. They must see that the rental is paid on the eastern section and that we are not called upon to pay it. And until both these obligations are discharged, not one dollar can be made by the promoters of this enterprise. Therefore I am justified in saying that the whole argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have labored so hard to prove that the promoters of this company in the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway are going to make a lot of money, can only be based on the scheme becoming a success and the government fully protected.

FULL OBLIGATIONS OF THE COUNTRY.

On the assumption therefore that the company will fulfil its obligations, I want to make a summary statement of the obligations which the government is assuming. In the first instance, the government must build the eastern division, but it has a tenant who will pay the interest on the cost. The government then has to assume the obligation of guaranteeing the bonds on the prairie section to the extent of \$13,000 a mile, but no one doubts that that section will pay its interest from the beginning. Then we are bound to guarantee three-fourths of the cost of the mountain section, but we believe that there again the interest will be paid, and that we are not going to be obligated in the proper sense of the word. Assuming then that all these obligations will be met, our sole obligation is the seven years interest. Last session my right hon. friend, the leader of the government, made the statement that we could provide for the obligations entailed by this scheme out of one year's sur-