

expenditure of money in the Ottawa Valley. I am glad the hon. gentleman from Belleville persisted in bringing his motion before the House. It is only by bringing it continually before the country that the country can be aroused to the wastefulness of the expenditure that is being made in proceeding with the Georgian Bay Branch Railway. It is incredible to the people of the country that so wasteful an expenditure should have been perpetrated by Parliament. The hon. gentleman from Montreal says repeal the Act of Parliament. There is no Act of Parliament requiring the immediate construction of this road. It merely authorizes it. Here we are with a diminished revenue and other unfavourable prospects, and yet we persist in making this large expenditure. No one attempts to defend it on the ground of necessity. I consider that some of the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite leave it to be inferred that there were personal reasons for going on with the expenditure when national considerations would forbid it.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—I had no idea of saying personal obligations, but public obligations, which every Government has felt.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD—My hon. friend has made some allusion to the expenditure on the Chats Canal. It is true this work was undertaken, and when the appropriation was expended the Government concluded, in view of the difficulties which were met with on every hand, to suspend the work for the time being. Then some of the improvements on the Ottawa have been of great benefit to the whole country. There is the expenditure made for slides and other improvements which have paid double and treble what the canals ever paid. They have been greatly self-supporting. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the subservience of members from this section.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON—"Influence" was the word I used.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD—If he did not use the word I withdraw. I have no hesitation in saying I believe this is a part of the Pacific Railway, and I believe the Government is right in its policy, and on this ground I am going to support it.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—If this line were a portion of the Pacific Road, I would like to see it gone on with, but inasmuch as it seems not to be a portion of that road, and as gentlemen opposite do not say it is, I am opposed to it. It would seem to me that the line is not a portion of the

Pacific Road, and that it is not necessary to undertake it for the present. The policy of the present Government seems to be retrenchment, and unless these works are necessary for the benefit of the country they should not be proceeded with at present until the main line is in course of construction. The only great inducement to build the road at the present moment is that, as is stated, there are some one hundred inhabitants in that country. Now, if there are one hundred inhabitants in that wilderness, will that justify the Government under the present circumstances in laying out \$6,000,000 I cannot see why they should do so. If it were understood it were a portion of the Pacific Road, I would consent to its being proceeded with *pro rata* as the other works progressed. That such is the case has not been shown on the floor of this House, and I hope it will be shown more clearly than it has been. If that is the case I say go on with the road when the main line is advancing, but until then, inasmuch as there are several outlets from that point—There is the Midland, the Toronto & Nipissing, the Northern Railroad, the Toronto, Grey & Bruce, and other facilities to the Georgian Bay. Then why build this road? For whose benefit do you build this road at present? Is it for the benefit of the Ottawa Valley? If it is I can only say the Ottawa Valley has had a great deal of public money laid out upon it already. The hon. Secretary of State says "hear, hear." There is no one who has endeavoured to throw more money into the lap of the Ottawa Valley than the hon. gentleman himself. I do not say I shall go against anything in any section of this country that I regard as beneficial, but I do think we are not in a position to proceed with this work now. I believe the Government has been going too far in granting large tracts of land which will have the effect of impoverishing the timber limits of this country. I do not think the whole Dominion should be taxed for the purpose of enriching the Ottawa Valley, that it should be stripped of its timber fifty or a hundred years ahead of time. The immediate effect of this is to throw a large amount of money into the Treasury at present, but the result in the future will be to impoverish the people of this country. Wherever the land is fit for settlement, I hold that it is unwise and unjust to strip it of its timber, and that on the contrary every effort should be made to preserve and economise it for the