

rifices. I am sure that parliament agreed as to the desirability of having a trans-continental railway entirely on Canadian territory extending from tide water to tide water, and not only from tide water to tide water, but from tide water on one shore to tide water and open navigation all the year around on the other shore. If this is desirable, and every body will agree that it is desirable, then it is most desirable that the shortest possible line between an all the year around ocean port on the Atlantic and an all year round ocean port on the Pacific should be chosen. It is necessary that this should be in the interests of the people who require to use the road, and it is just as necessary on the part of the people who are to own and operate the road. Every mile of length more than is absolutely necessary means increased cost in the building and increased cost in the operation. Somebody has to pay for that. It may be that the company is willing to agree to an unnecessary lengthening of the line, believing that the country will pay for the extra cost of building and operating that unnecessary length. And the company are perfectly right in believing that it is the country, either the national treasury or the producer who is to use the road in order to get his products to market, who actually has to pay this extra cost. If that should be the case, then when parliament is defining the route and the terminal points of this road, it is the duty of parliament to define the shortest route and the most available and suitable terminal points. I cannot support the section as it stands, which provides that the eastern terminus of this great trans-continental road shall be at a point where there is no ocean port; where there is no possibility of making an ocean port, and which will entail an unnecessary construction of 100 miles to reach a Canadian winter port, and a consequent increased cost of hauling. Owing to the number of rulings which have been made here to-day, I cannot tell whether I would be in order in moving a motion or not, but I propose to lay before the committee the suggestion that the word 'Moncton' be changed to 'St. John,' so that parliament shall become responsible for indicating the eastern ocean port of this trans-continental road at the nearest and best port that Canada has in consideration of distance and other matters. I do not see how parliament can justify itself if it gives assistance towards the construction of a railway, the whole purpose of whose existence shall be to give Canadian ocean port facilities the year round, and then allow that road to be constructed to a point where there is no ocean port, and which is 100 miles from the nearest available ocean port, the construction of which to that point would increase the haul by about 200 miles.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to move an amendment to that clause 12.

Mr. McCARTHY. I object.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then I beg to give notice that on the third reading of the Bill I shall move that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of inserting the following amendment:

Provided that in the event of the company receiving from the government of Canada any assistance, either by way of subsidies, moneys, land grants, guarantees, loans or in any other manner whatever, the work of construction on the eastern section be commenced simultaneously with the work on the Quebec, woodland and prairie sections and be completed and put in operation simultaneously therewith and before the company exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by section 33 of the present Act in respect to lease and running power over other railways.

I can assure the promoter of this Bill that all we in the maritime provinces are desirous for is that we shall be assured that this Grand Trunk Railway, which has received from Canada enormous grants of money, shall have a Canadian eastern terminal, and so far as I am concerned I am willing that it shall receive more aid, provided it shall become a national highway in the true sense of the word. I would suggest to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that he should leave to the maritime members to determine upon the question of the eastern terminus. I would be perfectly willing to take his judgment with reference to the terminus in Alberta, but he ought to reciprocate, and take our judgment as to the eastern terminus. We do not propose that the road should stop at Moncton, because there is no very great sea-port there, but what we do wish is that there may be some common point in the maritime provinces upon which we can agree, and if the Grand Trunk Railway comes to Moncton we shall take chances afterwards as to which is the best port, whether it shall be Country Harbour, St. John or Halifax. I am not sectional enough to be wedded to any of these ports. All I want is that the products of this great country shall be sent to the markets of the world through a Canadian port, no matter which it be. I want the gentlemen from the west to be Canadians first. At this time in the history of Canada we should not know that there is a west or an east. For my part, I do not know that there is any boundary between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Ontario; I know nothing about provincial boundaries, excepting as regards little provincial affairs with regard to the administration of mere local funds.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. There are no boundaries in this country for me except the Canadian boundary from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the 49th parallel to the Arctic ocean. This is all the country a Canadian should know, and every Canadian must reach that standard and be prepared to do everything that will develop Canada as a whole. We must understand that this railway company has already a large system of