

it was not a very great exception—absolutely moderate and non-political. The exception I fear I shall have to point out was that of the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh)—

Mr. McINTOSH: I thought that was coming.

Mr. MANION: —who finds it difficult to get away from politics at any time, even on an occasion like this, when two-thirds of his time was used in speaking for his own constituency, and one-third for the Peace River outlet. He permitted himself to get into the political field rather extensively.

Mr. McINTOSH: Killing two birds with one stone is pretty good work, isn't it?

Mr. MANION: Attempting to kill a number of birds with one stone was what the hon. member was trying to do. The hon. members for Peace River and Vancouver Centre have pointed out that in the past all parties have promised some relief to this new land or last empire of northwestern Canada. On a number of occasions the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie) stated that this is an obligation of honour upon both parties, and in his statement I think there is a good deal of truth. After all, however, it must not be forgotten that during the last four years conditions in this country have been of such a character, due to general world conditions, as to bring us to the realization that circumstances alter cases and, therefore, may sometimes be permitted even to alter promises. While it is true that in that northwestern section of our country my right hon. leader made promises—at least, it is so stated, and I have not found anything to justify a contradiction—I must draw to the attention of the house the fact that conditions have been such that I doubt if any government would have been justified, heretofore, in spending money upon the construction of the road.

I was particularly interested in the speech of the hon. member for Cariboo. I am not saying this simply because he spoke from this side of the house, because it is a fact that members from all quarters of the house have supported the project. But the hon. member did bring into the picture a number of very interesting new points, and described vividly and in most interesting fashion the north country of British Columbia, leaving the description of northern Alberta to the hon. member for Peace River. In my view the hon. member for Cariboo delivered a most inspiring address, from the standpoint of that section

of the country, in support of the resolution of the hon. member for Peace River. The hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) did what so many hon. members from Quebec do to inspire the rest of us—although, not always with success—when he delivered in English an excellent speech in support of the resolution. He did say in his remarks that he did not suppose we would give even sympathetic consideration to the resolution. Well, I shall at once dispose of that by saying that the hon. member for Peace River has always had my sympathy, coming as I do from a section of Canada sparsely provided with railways and, like the Peace River country, in proportion to area not well supplied with population. I feel that I am particularly qualified to sympathize with the hon. member in his desire to have these 40,000 people served by a railway.

Of course in a country of such vast proportions as Canada railways are very necessary. The fact remains however that the money required to build them reaches such large amounts that even a few miles of railway constructed through a section of the country such as would have to be traversed in building this outlet runs into huge sums of money. The various estimates as to the cost of building the outlet run all the way from \$13,000,000 to \$80,000,000, according to the number of branch lines constructed. Various investigations have been made into the proposal now before us. References have been made to some of them this afternoon. Four routes have been mentioned as possible methods of getting out of the Peace River territory into other parts of Canada. One, which was more or less generally condemned by at least two or three hon. members, was the so-called Aggie-Obed route, where there would be a back haul of some considerable distance. But the routings which were recommended in some of the earlier investigations made by the Canadian National Railways—although I do not think the Aggie-Obed route was supported in the earlier investigations by the Canadian Pacific Railway—were the Monkman pass route, the Pine pass route and the Peace pass route. The latter, I believe, is the one which has received the greatest amount of support from hon. members this afternoon. In connection with that outlet it is only fair to say that the late Sir Henry Thornton and Mr. Beatty discussed the matter with me on various occasions. They took the attitude that now would not be an appropriate time to spend a large sum of money upon this project, because—at least some of them took this attitude—it would take at least ten times the