

to railways because they were to the general advantage of Canada, and we found out afterwards by the Bill brought down that it guaranteed subsidies of \$3,200 a mile to roads in the province of Quebec, aggregating some \$15,000,000. Apparently, history is now repeating itself, and this belted knight is able to organize his forces and compel this Government to purchase a road, which the people of Canada, I believe, will consider an extravagance. In a debate some days ago in the House of Commons a very strong speech was delivered by a very able man, Mr. Bennett of Calgary, who has studied this question of railways, in which he suggested that Canada should scrap about 2,500 miles of the present railways, that they should not operate them at all, but pull up the rails and leave them. So I think the road it is proposed at present to purchase should be scrapped. In fact it is scrapped at the present time. I am credibly informed that nothing has been done on the bulk of the road for four years. This time of stress is a poor occasion to revive an old road on which nothing has been done for four years. We are informed that some 70,000 people will be interested in the construction of that railroad outside the city of Quebec. I have no fault to find with the hon. member from Quebec who thinks that railroad is an advantage to Quebec and to Canada. I submit this is not the proper time to do it. Coming from the West, I have never objected to money being spent to open up the province or help the city of Quebec, but if the Government have \$4,000,000 to expend at the present time they should use it in another way, which I think would be more advantage to Quebec and to Canada. I refer to the completion of their terminals in connection with the Transcontinental in Quebec. They have no completed terminals at the present time. If they would undertake to assist the Grand Trunk Pacific and Transcontinental in building terminals in Quebec, in erecting elevators to afford accommodation for traffic, they would be less open to criticism. As far as the West is concerned, there is no suggestion of scrapping any railways there. People talk about extra railways—railways that have been built and are of no use—but that talk does not apply to the Northwest. I venture to say that there is about one hundred million bushels of last year's crop still to be removed out of the West, and the wheels of all our rolling stock will be kept moving to

get last year's crop out by the time the next crop is harvested. There is no reason for saying that the construction of railways out West has been in advance of the demand. In the early days of legislation the Government were brave and bold enough to bring down legislation comparatively early, but now they bring down a Bill of this description at the last hour of the session when there is no time to discuss it properly. I say there is no occasion for it. The people of the country who are paying the taxes for the purpose of providing for the prosecution of this war, will call the Government to account for this extravagant piece of legislation brought here in the dying hours of the session, to please their political friends who demand this assistance.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—It seems to me the hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie is a little late in discussing the important feature of the Supply Bill which he most decidedly objects to, that is the purchase of these three railroads. In that particular case—not like the other portions of the Supply Bill—a Bill was brought in and put through this House.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Last night.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—And it was during the consideration of that Bill that the hon. gentleman had the most favourable opportunity to put himself on record and offer any objections, or move and motions he desired, for the purpose of testing the opinion of the House.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I did move and vote.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—When that Bill was passed despite his objection, I do not see what good can be effected by rehashing it now.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I did all I could.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—Or criticising it on the Supply Bill where it would be impossible to do anything.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I anticipated that it would be brought down here as a separate Bill. I was not aware, until a few minutes ago, that it would be included in the Supply Bill, because it went through the House of Commons as a separate Bill and was voted upon in the House of Com-