

That means that even after one-half that reduction took place he would have a smaller following than any hon. gentleman who ever led a party in this House. What does that mean? It means that the people in this country were opposed to the bargain as it came before the House last session. How much more then will they be opposed to it when the bargain is made much less advantageous to the people of Canada? What right has the government of this country to bind the country to this bargain which they must see the people do not want? What is the honourable course, the evident duty of the government? It is to appeal to the country before the question is finally settled and before the seal is placed on the bargain. They should appeal to the country and let the people say whether they approve it or not. Who asked for this bargain and for improved railway facilities? There is no doubt that this country, growing as it is, with an expanding commerce, requires and demands, as time goes on, improved facilities. But it has never yet been shown that the railways now in existence, if properly equipped and with a proper system of branches extending from them, could not carry on the trade of the country. The difficulty is that they have not the equipment of cars and power, and have not apparently the executive ability. But leaving that aside, and taking it for granted that railroad facilities are required, what are the requirements? Two chiefly and almost entirely; first, that the people of the west should have greater and better and cheaper facilities to convey the products of their farms to the east; and, second, that the manufacturers and fruit growers in the east, of Ontario and Quebec, should have cheaper, quicker and better facilities to get their products into the west. These are the only things called for. The province of British Columbia has never asked for a transcontinental railway running across the northern part of that province. It may be desirable, but there is no great call for it, nor is there a great call for a colonization railway to Northern Ontario and Northern Quebec, while there are hundreds of millions of acres of magnificent land, yet undeveloped, ready for the plough in the west. There is no call from the people of the maritime provinces for a second line there. The only call has been from the people of the west for cheaper facilities for the shipment of their grain, and from the people of Ontario and Quebec to get their manufactures to the west. Is it necessary, in order to accomplish this, to construct a railway from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton? Not at all. The Grand Trunk Railway Company came before the government and offered to build a road from North Bay to Winnipeg and to extend it through the Territories simply for the ordinary bonuses, which would not have amounted to more than \$12,000,000 all told. For \$12,000,000 in cash we might have got all

the country asked for or will demand for many years to come, instead of having an expenditure of over \$100,000,000, which will be required to construct a road from Winnipeg to Moncton. A large part of this \$80,000,000, or \$90,000,000, of unnecessary expenditure, might have been expended to infinitely better advantage, if we have this great amount of money to expend, if it is absolutely necessary that this country should expend this enormous amount of money or any part of it, or in any case let us expend some small part of it in doing some things that are really necessary. One of these things is the provision of better transportation facilities for the commerce of the whole country from Montreal to Britain. What is the condition of affairs to-day? We are subsidizing lines of vessels at enormous expense to come to our ports. Ostensibly we are subsidizing them for carrying the mails, but really to get the vessels to come to our ports. We pay one line \$150,000 ostensibly to carry some fifteen tons of mail matter, which could be carried for \$300. We are doing that to get the vessels to come to Montreal, and for that alone. In addition to that, we are paying out of the public treasury large sums of money to equip these vessels for the carriage of our products. We are equipping them with cold storage facilities with cooling plants and with ventilating apparatus. One half of this equipment is paid for by the country instead of by the steamship lines. One would think when we are doing this that we should get as low freight rates from Montreal as from Boston or New York, which are farther from Liverpool and Glasgow and London than are the Canadian ports. But is that the case? No; instead of getting lower rates on the boats which we subsidize, and which have a shorter haul, we are paying thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars more on the freight shipped from Montreal than would be charged on the same freight going from Boston or New York. Let me read to you some of the freight rates, lest I may be said to drawing the long bow. The following table will show the difference in the freight rates in the autumn of 1903:

	Per ton.	
	s.	d.
Flour, Montreal to Liverpool.....	9	9
" Boston	7	6
" Montreal to London	9	9
" Boston	7	6
" Montreal to Glasgow	8	9
" Boston	6	6 to 7
	Per bushel.	
	s.	d.
Wheat, Montreal to Liverpool.....	0	2½
" Boston	0	1½
" Montreal to London.....	0	2½
" Boston	0	1½ to 2
" Montreal to Glasgow.....	0	2½
" Boston	0	1½ to 2