

every part of this broad Dominion the greatest possible good in this crisis of our country's history.

But, Sir, who are these gentlemen who are loudly asserting that they are ready for the fray in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces? Are they going to be in the fray? Sir, I should be sorry to use any language that would offend any hon. gentleman, but it is a notorious fact—you know it, Mr. Speaker, probably better than I do—that both these gentlemen are slated for positions of emolument, just so soon as the smoke clears away from the gunfire which announces the prorogation of this parliament. And, Sir, it is so frank and so brave of these men to say: We in the maritime provinces are for ever indebted to the government for what they have done for us—and no doubt for what we expect them to do for us—in this grand transcontinental railway scheme, and we are ready for the fray as soon as it may come.

I am going to try to establish, if I can, from the mouths of hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches that the interests of the maritime provinces and the well-being of the people of the maritime provinces have been the constant care of the leader of the opposition. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, speaking last year, was trying to answer the criticism of the leader of the opposition, and he said: (Hansard, page 9016.)

Now, we have the Intercolonial Railway with a mileage of 1,500 or 1,600 miles, which has cost this country about \$70,000,000, with net deficits resulting from its operation of \$5,281,000; and still hon. gentlemen opposite want us to go on extending it to Parry Sound. These figures speak for themselves, and furnish a complete answer to the suggestions of the hon. leader of the opposition.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was proving himself a traitor, he was proving recreant to the maritime provinces because he desired to see the Intercolonial Railway not side-tracked, not paralleled to Moncton, but extended to the Georgian Bay and westward to Manitoba and the Pacific coast. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), referring to the hon. leader of the opposition, says:

And it is the only objection he has been able to raise—that it should be built as part of the Intercolonial and not as part of the Grand Trunk Pacific line.

That is the extension from North Bay eastward. Out of the mouths of these two hon. ministers whose utterances I have quoted I demonstrate to the hon. gentlemen who are assailing the hon. leader of the opposition that the result of his policy would not be inimical to the interests of the maritime provinces, because instead of paralleling the Intercolonial Railway he was striving to build it up and to make it the important factor it was intended to be in carrying on the business of the country.

The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) is in his seat now, and I want to make another quotation from the speech which he delivered. He said:

The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) endeavoured to demonstrate in the House that grain had this winter been carried by the Intercolonial to the port of Halifax and the port of St. John at a profit. An attempt has been made during the past winter to induce the shipment of grain from these points which have been carried over the Intercolonial. It resulted in failure, because although there was ample steamship accommodation, it was found that the Intercolonial Railway had not sufficient western connections to secure the wheat for transportation over its line.

That is what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was assailed for by the member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and hon. gentlemen opposite. He has been assailed because he desired to secure for all time to come, by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into the west, all the traffic that road could possibly handle to enrich the ports of St. John and Halifax, and that is the reason probably why the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has been so bitterly attacked by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade). Does he not know that the proposal of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) would secure for the Intercolonial the connections which would enable that road to handle this traffic properly? If he believed that, how could he vote against the policy of the leader of the opposition and in favour of a policy the benefit from which to the ports of the maritime provinces is very questionable, although, no doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) desired to see them built up?

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) said:

He professes to want an agreement under which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will be obliged to carry grain, no matter whether routed or un-routed, over Canadian territory and through Canadian ports into the markets of the world.

We may allow this quotation to rest at that, because if it interprets correctly the position of the hon. leader of the opposition, how can that gentleman be charged with acting against the interests of the maritime provinces, how can any appeal be successfully made to the electors of the maritime provinces to vote against the leader of the opposition?

He professes to want an agreement under which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will be obliged to carry grain, no matter whether routed or un-routed, over Canadian territory and through Canadian ports into the markets of the world.

If that object can be attained, if that agreement can be made, what would be the effect, beneficial or otherwise, on the ports of the maritime provinces? Would it not tend to divert trade to those ports?