

the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I venture to think that sections 42 and 43, to which the right hon. gentleman referred in his address this afternoon, are sections which, so far as they are intended to ensure the transportation of Canadian goods through Canadian routes, will prove to be of the most illusory character. It is absolutely impossible, it seems to me, under conditions of this kind to expect that result. Where has the Grand Trunk Railway its terminus at the present time? It has its Atlantic terminus at Portland, in the United States, upon which it has expended millions of dollars. Now, if you can, by any agreement, or by any Act of parliament, prevent the Grand Trunk from routing its freight over this line to its own terminus at Portland, I will be very glad indeed to have that accomplished. I for one venture to doubt whether, under the sections of this Bill which have been referred to by the right hon. gentleman, that matter can be accomplished. What are the sections? Section 42 reads:

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels.

Well, that sentence does not amount to anything at all, it has no legal force or effect, and a different policy would not, it seems to me, be attended with any better results.

The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through-rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Now, as a matter of practice, as a matter of every day business, I say I believe there would be no difficulty whatever in the Grand Trunk Railway departing from the spirit of that section. Further than that, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House and to the country that the violation by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of that section is not attended by any punishment under the terms of the contract. Suppose the Grand Trunk systematically violates that provision in the agreement, how are you to recover damages? Is any one to bring an action against the Grand Trunk Railway because some shipper has been induced to route his traffic via Portland instead of via Montreal or Quebec? What is the remedy under this? Section 43 is in the same line, it carries the matter no further:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely, the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

Very nice, high-sounding phrases, Mr. Speaker, but when you come to practical results, where shall we be under a clause of that kind? If we find our traffic, or nine-tenths of it, going to Portland instead of Montreal or Quebec, what is to be our remedy, and what shall we say to the Grand Trunk, and more especially what shall we do to the Grand Trunk? Why, Portland is in a state of delight already over the fact that it is to be the terminus of a great Canadian transcontinental railway. Here is an extract from a Portland newspaper of not long ago. The right hon. leader of the government indulged in some extracts from the New York 'Sun' and other United States newspapers. I wonder what he will think of this aspect of his transcontinental railway, as viewed by the eyes of the people of Portland:

Portland people will be gratified to learn that it is practically settled that this city is to be the great terminus of the new Grand Trunk Pacific line across the continent. St. John and Montreal are in a great stew about it, and the Grand Trunk people are doing the best they can do to retain the good-will of their Canadian constituents and at the same time carry out their ideas without any special change. Such is the programme, as admitted by those in the best position to know.

To-day an 'Advertiser' reporter had an interview with a prominent Grand Trunk official, who stipulated that his name should not be used for obvious reasons, as it may get him into trouble with his superior officers. This gentleman freed his mind something like this:

All this talk about Montreal and St. John being able to handle the Grand Trunk terminal business all the year round is wearisome. St. John has not the harbour facilities to do it, and the expenditure of \$5,000,000 would not make that harbour equal to Portland's. Montreal is nothing but a summer port anyway. Portland has no need to worry, for the Grand Trunk people are going to stay where they can get adequate accommodation.

Just notice that President Charles Rivers-Wilson and General Manager Hays, in their replies to the queries of the legislators in Ottawa, did not for a moment admit that they had any intention of leaving Portland. Sir Charles put it point blank when he said that the port of Montreal had proven inadequate to handle the business, and Mr. Hays did the square thing when he said that the Grand Trunk had not expended all the money at Portland, but that the people of Portland had provided the most of it.

The fact is that Portland is really going to be the great terminus of the new transcontinental railway line, that will equal in importance any in the world. Portland has the natural facilities to do the business and St. John has not. St. John may get a small share of the traffic, but, mark me, Portland is destined