

bility of \$2.50 per head and retain that great undertaking for the advantage and for the benefit of the people of Canada? I cannot believe it possible, Mr. Speaker, that when this matter has been thoroughly discussed and considered, the people will not condemn the government if they persist in what I believe to be an unwise, an extravagant, a foolish proposition, that will call into life another gigantic corporation in this country, and that will permit to pass out of our hands the golden opportunity which is now offered of exercising by our own railway, by a railway owned and controlled by the government of Canada, a beneficent influence upon freight rates from west to east and from east to west for all time to come in the history of this country.

Consent
 Sir, if we adopted the suggestion which I make of assuming all the responsibility which the president of the Grand Trunk Company attaches to that corporation, if we burdened ourselves with the additional responsibility of \$2.50 per head, we could save more than that amount by abandoning the section which it is in contemplation to build from Quebec to Moncton, and depending upon the Intercolonial for the carriage of freight to and from Quebec and the Atlantic ports. We would succeed in adding to the business of that road, we would succeed in wiping out the deficits which have occurred from year to year upon that road, and we would guarantee that for all time to come every pound of freight intended for export that passed over this new transcontinental line would find its exit at a Canadian maritime port. Under present conditions it is to the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to send every pound of freight intended for export that it can possibly control to the city of Portland; but by utilizing the Intercolonial from Montreal and Quebec eastward that condition of things would be impossible, and the people's road in which we have invested \$70,000,000 would become a valuable factor in solving the transportation problem of this country which it never can become if its western terminus is permitted to remain at Montreal where it is at the present time. The more I consider and examine this scheme the less likely it appears to me is it to commend itself to the judgment and good sense of the Canadian people; and I say again, I am satisfied that if they can be made conversant with the facts, overwhelming condemnation will follow the government if it persists in forcing this legislation through the House.

Sir, I propose to devote a few minutes to the comparisons which hon. gentlemen opposite have made between the terms given to the Canadian Pacific Railway when that road was constructed and the terms which hon. gentlemen are giving to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It has been a favourite argument of hon. gentlemen opposite that the

terms granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway were lavish and unreasonable. The right hon. Prime Minister, the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whose absence we all deplore, describe as enormous the advantages which the Canadian Pacific Railway received at the hands of the parliament of Canada when it undertook the great work of constructing the first transcontinental railway on Canadian soil. They agree that the company got \$25,000,000 in cash, \$35,000,000 in constructed railways and 25,000,000 acres of land which they valued at the modest sum of \$3 per acre. Surely a proposition to make comparisons between that contract and the present one is very unfair and unreasonable. The conditions in western Canada to-day are totally different from the conditions which obtained in western Canada then. Western Canada then was practically an unknown land. There was no settlement there except on the Pacific coast and a small settlement at Fort Garry. And is it fair or reasonable to compare the terms made for the construction and maintenance of a transcontinental highway 25 years ago with the terms which we are making to-day for a road that its promoters say is rendered necessary by the fact that the business in that country is increasing so rapidly, that its own trade between east and west is increasing so rapidly that it desires to obtain a greater part of it, and to get access to that country so as to assist in carrying on the business which has been developed in western Canada as a result of the construction and operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

If we desire to make comparisons it would be a fairer plan to compare the terms under which the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed with the terms which hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends offered when they were in power to anybody who was willing to construct a transcontinental road. In 1874 the government of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie made an offer of a subsidy of \$10,000 in cash per mile, a land grant of 20,000 acres per mile, and interest at 4 per cent for 25 years on a sum to be named by the contractor over and above that offer. The Canadian Pacific Railway contract was declared to be an improvident arrangement because, as hon. gentlemen urged, 25,000,000 acres of land at \$3 per acre, along with the cash and completed roads, would amount to \$135,000,000. But how would the offer of the Mackenzie government have worked out? If you assume the length of the line at 2,542 miles between Nipissing and Vancouver, and it is the actual mileage, the proposition offered by the late Mackenzie government involved an expenditure of \$25,420,000 in cash and an expenditure of \$152,520,000 in land to be given away; in other words, the government of hon. gentlemen