

submitted by the government with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was an infinitely better proposition than that which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had, so far as the prospects in the Northwest were concerned. He pointed out that this railway was going through a better country and going through it at a time when the country was being rapidly settled; and he showed, to his own satisfaction and, I think, to the satisfaction of every member on both sides of this House, that the proposition was one which must result in very great financial profit to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the people interested in it. And he said this also:

And yet, we are asked to believe that after a little while the Grand Trunk will fail to carry out its contract, and it wont go on. What does that argument amount to? What is the Grand Trunk going into this scheme for? It is because it has a magnificent system of railways in the eastern portion of Canada, because there is an enormous and growing traffic in the west, the Grand Trunk wants to get in there, and by means of this railway is going to get in. Moreover, its thousands of miles of railway all over Canada are going to be connected to the growing trade in western Canada, they are going to do a large and profitable business in consequence.

* * * * And it is only by carrying out the terms of this contract that they can get any business from the west, or over the western line. So I think it must be clear that we may feel ourselves reasonably safe and reasonably well protected.

And the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) who spoke late in the debate and after mature consideration, said:

Sir, we make a clean-cut proposition embodied in a contract signed and sealed with a reputable corporation of great resources, which is going ahead with the project as rapidly as possible.

And what did my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) say? I have no doubt he has forgotten it by this time. Let me remind him:

The government's plan is there, in black and white, duly signed—signed by men of repute, signed by the ablest railway men of the world, I believe.

Why did not the government call upon these men of repute to carry out the contract without change? For—not to go into the details of the contract—every one knows that every single change proposed to be made in the contract is a concession to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If this is 'there in black and white,' and signed by these able men, why has the government seen fit to throw away a good bargain and make it worse for the people of this country than it was before. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs continued:

These men are not mere promoters. Mr. Charles M. Hays was declared by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) two years ago to be the ablest railway man on the continent. Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson is known. Mr. Wain-

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

wright is known; Mr. John Bell, of Belleville, is known. These are the men who have signed that contract, and under that contract there is to be provided a line from ocean to ocean, with its steamers on the Pacific to trade with the Orient, with its steamers on the Atlantic to carry the products of our western fields and of all portions of the Dominion to the furthestmost portions of the earth. That is what our scheme means.

Why was it not carried out? These prophecies sound much like the prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the fast Atlantic service six years ago. There is a marked similarity between the words of the Minister of Customs which I have quoted and the words of the Prime Minister in Toronto, in 1897, when he declared that the fast Atlantic service was an accomplished fact.

But that is not all, Sir. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is on record; when I desired to incorporate into that measure a provision making certain provisions of the contract binding on the Grand Trunk Railway, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said:

We have no assurance of officials that is not expressed in the words of the contract.

That is to say that everything in the words of the contract, relating to the Grand Trunk Railway represented the assurances of the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway. The language of my hon. friend means that or it means nothing and there are other quotations from the words of the Finance Minister which I have not under my hand even stronger in that regard than those I have just read.

And what did the Prime Minister say? He said:

I do not deny that the Grand Trunk Railway is at the bottom of this enterprise, and that being so if the Grand Trunk Company undertakes to manage that line and pay a rent for it, it seems to me that any man of intelligence must see that they must use that road or otherwise they would have to operate it at their own loss. Why should the Grand Trunk go into that enterprise if it does not mean to carry it out? * * * It cannot default upon the eastern part, because if it defaults upon the eastern part, it defaults upon the western part. It cannot default upon one part without defaulting upon the whole, and therefore we hold them tight to their bargain and they cannot deviate from it.

If that provision of the contract was binding surely the whole contract was to be binding and surely the Grand Trunk Railway Company could not deviate from one single provision of the contract if they proposed to carry that out.

Well what happened? It seems that about the time the government intended to bring on the elections, from which, as I have already said they afterwards shrank, it was considered desirable that the deposit required by the contract should be put up. Accordingly, an official statement was handed out by the government on the eighth-