

by the railways. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would lead us to infer that the reason why railways cannot compete with water routes was because they were not sufficiently well constructed, and that if they only had better roadbeds and larger locomotives, the result would be different. But that is not the position which he took upon the 26th of May, and I am bound to assume that he was honest in the position he then took. Of course, he may have changed his mind, but when we remember that the railways between Chicago and New York are the best equipped systems in the world, it is difficult to account for that sudden change. And if we are going to build a railway through this north country up to Winnipeg which will be equal to the systems between Chicago and New York it will cost, not \$28,000 per mile, but \$60,000. Let me further quote a few words from what the hon. member for St. Mary's division said :

In 1902, between Chicago and New York, the rates are as follows: By lake and canal, 5'11; by lake and rail, 5'54; and by all-rail 9'88.

Or nearly double by all-rail the rates by water. Thus, notwithstanding the fact that the railways from Chicago to New York are perfect in construction, the rates are nearly twice as heavy as the rates by water although the distance is more than double, so that the hon. member for North Norfolk need never expect to build a railway to Winnipeg through that northern country which will carry freight in competition with the water route. The idea is preposterous. Inasmuch as the proposed railway route ignores and will not utilize our waterways, it cannot possibly be the cheapest route and will not alter the present rate of freight. So that after this railway is built and all this money is spent, we will be just where we were before, so far as rates are concerned, our freight carriers will be labouring under just the same disadvantages as now, and the transportation commission will still have the same problem to solve.

I oppose this government scheme again because it has not been shown that the line from Lévis to Moncton is a necessity. On Friday evening, when the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Johnston) was speaking, he made us of these words :

As this debate goes on from day to-day the policy of the government gains in strength.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how it happens but I have arrived at the very opposite conclusion. It is nothing extraordinary that doctors should differ, but in support of the position I take, let me quote from the Toronto 'Evening News,' which is not unfriendly to the present administration. In fact, its managing director and editor is a great admirer of the Prime Minister, and would not like to see him come to grief in this great scheme which he has launched on the country. When this project was first given to the country, the editor of the Toronto 'News' criticised it very favourably. But time passed on and the leader of the opposition put his scheme before the country. This editor has investigated, and has found the comparison so unfavourable to the government's project that he has become concerned for the prestige of his hero, the Premier of this country. He went out and tried to observe the way the wind was blowing, and then he came in and wrote in this strain of the government's policy :

The most doubtful feature of the government's transcontinental railway policy is the projected extension of the air-line from Quebec to Moncton. There is no doubt that construction over this route will be costly. It is not at all clear that satisfactory grades can be obtained. It is possible that the new road will hardly excel the Intercolonial in carrying efficiency, and that years will elapse before it develops any considerable local traffic. In the meantime we impair the revenues of the Intercolonial, discredit public ownership, and obtain in return neither local nor national advantages at all commensurate with the expenditure which must be shouldered.

And further down he says :

It seems, therefore, to be clear that the government's policy would be improved, although at some additional cost to the country, if the Moncton extension were abandoned, and the Intercolonial carried to Parry Sound.

Evidently he was coming to adopt the policy of the leader of the opposition. The very next day this editor returned to the consideration of this subject, showing that he is very much concerned about it. And this is what he said :

Two points stand out clearly on consideration of the transcontinental railway situation. The