

gestion in the west or of securing transportation of Canadian traffic through Canadian routes and Canadian ports. I am not inclined to view it with favour and am not surprised that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals found it necessary to part company with his colleagues on this very policy.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I listened, Mr. Speaker, with a good deal of interest to the introduction by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, of that important measure he has submitted to us. I was with the right hon. gentleman when he pictured the prosperity of our country and the aspirations of the youth of our country, and when he told us that we ought to be independent of any foreign country. But when he unfolded to us the details of this measure, I was astonished at its magnitude and at some of the statements of the right hon. gentleman. The road contemplated in this measure is divided into two sections. One is the section which is built by the government, from Moncton to Winnipeg; the other is the section from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. In his plea on behalf of the section from Quebec to Moncton, the right hon. gentleman described how the people were anxious to get in the quickest possible time to their destination, and how the Intercolonial Railway, which follows a roundabout route to Moncton, was built for military and not for commercial and practical purposes. But, what he omitted to mention, and what is very important, is the distance to be saved by the new line which he proposes to build from Quebec or Lévis to Moncton. The distance from Lévis to Moncton by the Intercolonial Railway is 489 miles. The shortest distance across through those parishes in Quebec, along by the St. Francis river, by High Falls and by Chipman, over to Moncton, would not be more than fifty or sixty miles less than the present route?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Fifty miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Less than fifty miles is the extent to which the distance will be shortened between these two points; and to achieve that gain, this country is expected to expend—how much? No road, Mr. Speaker, can be constructed up to the standard of the Grand Trunk Railway through that section of country for less than \$30,000 per mile; or the cost of building this road will amount at least \$13,000,000. From the description of the route to be taken by the new line to Moncton, I notice that it goes down north to a point on the road called Chipman. Well, from Chipman to within 33 miles of St. John, there is a railway already constructed. Does the government intend to acquire that road? Is that road to be built for the purpose of giving to the port of St. John a far shorter connection with Lévis than is enjoyed by Halifax? That road from Chipman to within

33 miles of St. John must be part of the bargain, and the right hon. gentleman should have given us the full details of his scheme? He should have informed us whether he intends to acquire that piece of road. If the road from Chipman to Norton, a station on the Intercolonial within 33 miles of St. John, is to be utilized as a government road, that will be virtually an abandonment of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as the trade of St. John is concerned, on the whole length of the railway from Lévis to St. John, and it will be an abandonment of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as the Halifax traffic is concerned, of the whole length of railway from Lévis to Moncton. With the experience we have had in connection with the Intercolonial Railway—an expenditure on capital account of nearly \$43,000,000, and a loss to the people for the last six years, putting it at a moderate amount, of \$2,500,000 per year—we are asked to build a road which will destroy the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec to Moncton. And for what purpose? For the purpose of saving a distance of fifty or sixty miles in the carrying of traffic from the North-west Territories and Manitoba to St. John and Halifax. Did a more insane idea ever take possession of any one? The ports of the North-west and the ports of Manitoba are at the head of lake Superior, and I believe will in the future be a Hudson bay. Facilities ought to be afforded for the carrying of that produce from the head of Lake Superior to our ports—Montreal, Quebec and Halifax. But the idea of making a condition in the contract with the Grand Trunk Railway that they will carry freight to Halifax or St. John at the same rate as they carry it to Portland! Does the right hon. gentleman, or does the government, imagine that a bushel of wheat or anything else exported from Manitoba or the North-west will ever go over this line to Portland, Halifax or St. John? I am with the right hon. gentleman to this extent, that the one thing that the people, and especially the young men, are interested in is the development of this country, and that the necessary steps for that development should be taken immediately. But they should be upon proper lines. The people are anxious, in these growing times, and when there is prosperity, that something should be done by the government for our national development. And nothing can be more important than providing proper transportation facilities. Proper transportation facilities are at the very foundation of our country's commercial success. But is it by building a road from Winnipeg to Quebec that our means of transportation will receive the improvement they need? The Grand Trunk Railway want a road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean; they want also a road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, and they may arrange for connection with their North Bay or Montreal system of roads. But it is no