

railways to be competitors with the waterways of the country. When the waterways are frozen up, the railways can distribute the grain from the elevators, so that the traffic will go on in the winter as well as in the summer.

This scheme attacks the credit of our country; it will be a fatal blow to our credit if hard times come again, as no doubt they will come in due time. The undertaking is too great for us. It will heap up the debt of our country to an enormous extent. It will minimize the power of the government to assist other important railway projects. The government tell us that the federal parliament must always in the future grant subsidies for the building of railways, not only in the newer provinces, but in the older provinces as well. If we are obliged to borrow so much money for the construction of this road, where is all the money to come from to assist other railway projects in the future, in Ontario, in Quebec, in the maritime provinces, and in Manitoba and the North-west Territories? I am afraid that our debt will be piled up so high that the government will find themselves very much crippled when demands are made upon them for other railway subsidies in the future.

For these reasons we are justified in asking the government to go slowly. For these reasons we are justified in supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition in preference to the proposal of the government. For these reasons I support the resolution. It is right that we should delay in order to get more information. It is important that we should have surveys made. It is important that we should not commit the country to such a heavy expenditure. It is important that we should not destroy the influence and power of the province of Ontario, that portion of the country which must pay the greater bulk of this money. In every dollar of indebtedness incurred for this undertaking forty-five cents must be paid by the province of Ontario, according to her population. That province must pay \$45,000 in every \$100,000. She must pay \$45,000,000 in every \$100,000,000. I want the people of Ontario to know this, and to realize what it means to them in the future. I want them to know what they are committing themselves and their children to in supporting the government in this undertaking. I want the members of this House from Ontario who are supporting the government to be prepared to defend their conduct of to-day when they go back to the electors and when this subject is under discussion. The province of Ontario is sometimes spoken of as the milch cow of confederation. I want the people of Ontario to know that they are paying forty-five cents in every dollar of the cost of this undertaking, so that they will be able to estimate whether the government have done right or wrong

Mr. SPROULE.

in committing the country to the heavy expenditure which this Bill will involve if we consent to its third reading at the present time.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the criticism of the right hon. leader of the government and to the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition in moving his amendment to the third reading of the Bill. The leader of the government said that after all there was not much difference between the scheme of the government and that of the leader of the opposition in the matter of expense, though he claimed that the government's scheme was the best on the whole. His first criticism of the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition was in reference to his advocacy of the extension of the government railway from Montreal to the Georgian bay. He criticised that because it involved obtaining possession of either the line of the Grand Trunk Railway or that of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Montreal and Coteau, or the building of a rival line. As our policy involves utilizing portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway around Lake Superior, we could in the same way obtain running rights over the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Coteau. Why should we not do that, without building or purchasing another road? Perhaps in that respect the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman has a certain advantage over the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition. However, the important thing is to have a government road from Halifax to the shores of the Georgian bay, with means of communication with the western prairies. It means the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. That could be all done for \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000, or at the utmost \$15,000,000. As to that portion of the proposed government road from Moncton to Quebec, we hear very little of it at the present time. It seems to have dropped out of sight altogether. I wonder at our hon. friends in the maritime provinces allowing themselves, like the little boy, to be told by the government: Just close your eyes and open your mouth and we will drop a plum into it. Just say nothing and we will build that section from Quebec to Moncton. But I think that section has passed out of the probabilities that are likely to occur for a generation or two in this country. It is not at all likely that the next generation or two will see a road built from Moncton to Quebec.

The right hon. gentleman criticised my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, because he proposed an alternative scheme to his proposition to build a road from Quebec to Winnipeg. The proposition of my hon. friend was to build colonization roads into that country, according as its requirements demanded, with moderate gradients and equipment. In criticising that scheme, the right hon. gentleman did not seem to