

the Ontario government is building from North Bay to Lake Temagami? Does he know that according to a return brought down to the Ontario legislature, that railroad will cost \$27,000 a mile, in addition to \$3,000 for equipment, making \$30,000 a mile in all, and it is nothing but a colonization railroad at that? It has gradients of from 1 to 1½ per 100 feet, which is equal to from 66 feet to 67 feet in the mile, and abundance of them. It has curvatures to the extent of ten degrees. If the country from Winnipeg to Quebec were as favourable as the country through which the section of railway is being built by the Ontario government, it would cost \$60,000 per mile to build a railway through it. The right hon. gentleman enters into a contract off-hand. He signs an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to build this particular line, and give that company the working of it for a number of years. To my mind a more absurd contract never was entered into by any government. The contractors themselves do not want it. They do not want to operate that portion of the road from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton. They know perfectly well that for many years that road will be entirely useless to them. I see that the right hon. gentleman has a notice on the paper of a resolution with regard to this agreement, and when that comes up there will no doubt be an opportunity to discuss the matter fully.

The only other question of importance which is dealt with in the speech is the Militia Bill. We all hope that a proper Bill will be introduced. We on this side of the House believe that Canada should do her share for the defence of the empire. We believe that we should contribute something towards the defence of our sea coast, towards which the imperial government are contributing so much. They have a fleet on the Atlantic and another on the Pacific, and the sole purpose of the garrison at Halifax and the garrison at Esquimalt is to protect this country. While we form part of the empire, which I hope will always be the case, I believe we ought to contribute our fair share towards the defence of this country and to a certain extent towards the defence of the empire. As the right hon. gentleman has said, we should have the absolute control over the expenditure of our own contributions, but having that control, we ought to do something in the way of putting this country into a proper state of defence. In our militia force we should have something more than what was described last session by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) as the shadow of a skeleton of a force. I am with the Minister of Militia in everything he can do to increase the efficiency of the force for the defence of this portion of the empire.

The speech is more remarkable for what it does not contain than for what it does contain. There is not a word in it with refer-

ence to the tariff. Surely we are not going to pass another session without some amendment to the tariff. I should judge that we are to have some legislation in reference to that matter, from the remarks of the Finance Minister in Montreal, in which he hinted at a revision of the tariff, as well as from the stronger statement made by his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), to the effect that the anomalies which at present exist in the tariff will be removed, and that higher duties will be imposed where necessary for the purpose of protecting our industries. Other members of the government spoke in the same way. I am sorry to say that the speech of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government was not exactly in the same direction. He spoke of the terrible state of affairs existing in the United States, which he called the home of combines and anarchy. He was going to guard the people of this country against any such state of affairs. What he meant, if he meant anything, was that he does not intend to afford any assistance to the industries of this country, which are gradually being destroyed. Why is it that one statement is made by the right hon. gentleman in one section of the country while other members of the government make other statements in other sections of the country? Is it for the purpose of catching all classes, or being all things to all men? The right hon. gentleman, wherever he is, suits his language to the feelings of the people of that section. The majority of his colleagues, or a great number of them, preach protection, while some of his supporters are against that villainous system, as it was described by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). I tell the right hon. gentleman that the people of this country are in favour of protection to Canadian industries. They know that these industries are suffering. They know that the redundant revenue of this country is partially due to the stoppage of these industries. Take, for instance, the woollen industry, one of the oldest in the country, established about forty years ago, an industry which gave to the people about as good value as was furnished by any other industry to any other people on the face of the globe—that industry has had to enter into competition with the shoddy goods manufactured entirely out of cotton in Yorkshire, and which are sold in this country at prices with which our woollen industry cannot compete, despite the fact that what the purchasers gain in price they more than lose in value. Thus the effect of the policy of the right hon. gentleman has been to close up one of the oldest and most important industries in this country and one which was giving to the people the fairest value for their money. What this government should do is to raise the tariff and thus prevent the importation of cheap, shoddy goods, and save our people