

dollar of cost to the people of Canada. I see it stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway is double tracking its line both east and west from Rat Portage, and they hope in the near future to have a double track from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. That affords practically another railway into the country, because when they reach Lake Superior, the great distributing centre of that western country, it is taken by the lake fleet of steamers and transported to the Georgian bay, where there are a dozen railways ready to carry the produce to the east, and distribute it to the markets of the world. That double track line will give to the people of the North-west, without the expenditure of a dollar, all the advantages that the most sanguine could hope from the government scheme, which is bound to cost us millions and millions of dollars. Let me ask the right hon. gentleman, if the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition does not contemplate giving additional railway accommodation to the people of the western country? In what light does the right hon. gentleman regard the purchase of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Sudbury, or Port Arthur. If three railway companies used that one track which is only used by one company now, would there not be three railways going into that country, instead of one as at the present time, and we can secure all that for less than one-third of the cost entailed by the scheme of the government. The right hon. gentleman has asked if the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition is cheaper than the plan proposed by the government. Well, the data furnished by the leader of the opposition to-day ought to be satisfactory evidence on the point that his scheme would cost at the outside \$60,000,000 to bring it to its full fruition, as compared with at least \$120,000,000 which the road proposed by the government would cost. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, have calculated that the government proposal will cost all the way from \$13,000,000 to \$120,000,000. Of course the \$13,000,000 estimate is only the interest upon the expenditure involved in the undertaking, but if you apply any reasonable calculation, you will find that it will cost \$120,000,000 of somebody's money to build that road. It will, therefore, be seen that the cost of the scheme proposed by the government will be at least double the cost of the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition, and will afford no greater advantages. Indeed, in my opinion, the government scheme at double the price, will not be so advantageous for the people of the country as that proposed from this side of the House. I believe, Sir, that the more the people understand the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition, the more it will meet with the approval of the people.

The line proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, the right hon. gentleman says,

Mr. SPROULE.

is through a barren, rocky, country, while the other is through a fertile country. It is well enough to say that it is a fertile country, if you judge the whole by a few miles here and there where a traveller, a trapper, a pleasure-seeker, a trader or a timber seeker has been. I do not think the right hon. gentleman has a sufficient data regarding the country through which this road is to run, to speak of its character with confidence. There must be at least 400 or 500 miles of that territory of which we know nothing. We have comparatively speaking no information about the country; we are going it blind. It may be full of muskegs, rocks, and mountains of rock, like a portion of the country through which the Canadian Pacific Railway runs around Lake Superior. In the one case we have overcome the difficulties, we know what the railway is and what it has cost; but we do not know what the other will cost. The right hon. gentleman says railways must always be the complement of the water stretches—that the two must work together. Well, surely, the two working side by side are more likely to work together than when one runs through the interior of the country. He says of the scheme of the leader of the opposition that for six months of the year part of it is frozen up. It is true, the water stretches are frozen up, but the railway will run all the year round. If the scheme of the leader of the opposition is carried out, there will be three railways carrying grain around Lake Superior where there is only one at the present time. If we had grain elevators on the ports of Lake Superior and the Georgian bay, the grain coming from Manitoba would be carried around Lake Superior by these three railways in the winter. Surely these railways would be the complement of the water stretches, and the people would have more benefit from them than they would from a single railway running through the interior of the country, where there are no elevators and will not be for years, for the storage of grain. The right hon. gentleman said that the policy of the opposition is a psychological study—a study of a struggle between conscience and duty on the one hand and policy on the other; a study to decide whether they will follow the dictates of conscience or the dictates of expediency. Well, I regret that I cannot return the compliment to the right hon. gentleman, because there seems to be neither conscience nor expediency in his policy. It is a matter, as he said himself, of imminent haste, of going it blind, without any debate between right and wrong, between conscience and expediency, between wisdom and unwisdom; but he has mapped it out, and he is going to force it through. There is no psychological study in that. The right hon. gentleman says that we have all the information in regard to the character of that country that we want; we have mountains of it. I have