

ashamed of anything moderate. And finding that they had made a great mistake in opposing our modest business-like and meritorious scheme, they set to work and brought down a scheme of their own. Ours is so well known that I need not explain its details.

But What Does My Hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition Propose ?

We are told by the hon. member for Marquette that he has manifested the genius of constructive statesmanship, that he is a constructive statesman. Well, I welcome to parliament any one possessed of this quality, because that is the class of men we require in Canada. If he is possessed of the genius of constructive statesmanship, we will no doubt find proof of it in the scheme that he has propounded,

Eighteen Days was all he Required,

in which to bring forth this scheme, and certainly anyone who can bring forth a scheme of this magnitude in eighteen days does manifest genius. **What is his scheme ?** It is, first of all, to get a through line from Montreal to the coast by buying up old lines and building new lines. The first part of the line from Montreal to Winnipeg is to be a government line. The intervening section to the mountains is to be a company line, and the mountain section is perhaps to be a government line. Well, we were told that our system is a mongrel one, that we had a line which was neither one thing nor the other, which was neither fish, flesh nor good red herring, that the government was to own part of the line, and that the whole line was to be operated from ocean to ocean by a company. That did not satisfy these hon. gentlemen. Yet, despite this criticism, we have a proposition that the government should build and operate a line as far as Winnipeg, that a company should then build and operate a line to the mountains, and that the government should build and operate a line from the mountains to the sea.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is not stating my proposition correctly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I shall show by the hon. gentleman's ipsissima verba the correctness of what I am saying. I say that his speech on the 18th of August, as reported in 'Hansard,' involved the following scheme: First, to build a railway from Montreal to Coteau. Second, to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour, a distance of 342 miles, or if that road could not be bought, to parallel it. He did not say to parallel it directly, but it was to terminate at Depot Harbour, and the hon. member for Bothwell to-day interpreted his meaning. He said that the policy of the leader of the opposition is either to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Montreal to Depot Harbour or build another railway which would parallel it to Depot Harbour. The hon. gentleman did not use the word 'parallel,' but the road was to begin at the same point and end at the same point. So that while paralleling in one part of the country is objectionable, in another part it is very desirable. The scheme of the leader of the opposition was to build a railway from Montreal to Coteau, to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour, and then to build a railway from Depot Harbour to Sudbury.

Mr. BELL. No, to Scotia Junction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, to Sudbury. That is what he said in the speech anyway. What he said was this :