

to damage Major Leonard's reputation, the Telegram desires to affirm that his work as head of the commission has been a distinct failure. The Telegram believes a mistake was made in choosing Major Leonard for this responsible position. He is not a railway builder, however good he may be in locating mining propositions. It is a pity, therefore, to spoil an excellent 'prospector' at the expense of the National Transcontinental project.

It is not necessary to go into details to indicate Major Leonard's unfitness for the position he occupies. The impression is growing that more progress would be made on the work if the youngest engineer in the employ of the commission were in charge.

Hon. Frank Cochrane, the Minister of Railways, is a busy man. He is an overworked Minister, and he will continue to be overworked as long as he is burdened with incompetents like Major Leonard in control of great undertakings like the Transcontinental. The suggestion is freely made that either Mr. Cochrane should take over the important work or a commissioner be appointed with the ability and skill to expedite the work. The East as well as the West is vitally interested in an immediate improvement, and will be satisfied with nothing less.

Apparently after two years experience of Major Leonard, the Minister of Public Works does not see Mr. Leonard with just the same eyes that the Minister of Railways does.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Does the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Leonard refuses to acquiesce in, or adopt the plans for the terminals in the city of Winnipeg, which brought forth the condemnation of that paper?

Hon. Mr. POWER—I did not know.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am quite sure my hon. friend did not or he would not have read it.

Hon. Mr. POWER—And by the way, with respect to this Transcontinental, there was a Commission of Inquiry appointed to inquire into the maladministration of the old Transcontinental commission. Perhaps some other hon. gentleman may have the advantage of me, but I have not yet had the pleasure of seeing the report of that commission although it was appointed, I think, two years ago. I think the probabilities are that they have discovered a number of 'mares' nests.' I may be allowed to refer to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman in reference to two or three steep grades on the Transcontinental, one I think in the province of Quebec, and one or two in the province of New Brunswick. I cannot speak about the Quebec grade, but I do know, with respect to the New Bruns-

Hon. Mr. POWER.

wick grade, that there was practically a range of mountains to be got over which could not possibly be got over without adopting what they call a 'pusher' grade. These things, I understand, are not uncommon on railways, the mountains were too thick to be tunnelled through, and the engineers of the railway resorted to the expedient of using a pusher grade, and having a second engine put on to help the train over the grade.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Only a one per cent grade anyway.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Then something has been said with respect to the Hudson Bay railway. I am free to admit that after reading the report of the engineer making the surveys for this road, I laboured under the impression that, on the whole, the Nelson river terminus was the better, that it was preferable to Churchill. But since that time—that is two years ago now—we have had practical experience, which teaches a different lesson. It is quite clear that no ship can come within, at any rate, less than about five miles of the shore at Port Nelson, and every cargo that is put aboard a ship, or landed from a ship, has to be transferred by lighters. That is a very serious inconvenience and involves a great deal of additional expense. The harbour of Fort Churchill is a good harbour. It is not a large harbour, but I fancy it is large enough to accommodate all the ships that would be there at any given time. It is a good harbour; it needs no large expense to enable ships to resort to it, and what may surprise a good many of the hon. gentlemen, there is less ice in the harbour of Fort Churchill than at the mouth of the Nelson river. So I asked the hon. leader of the Government, when speaking on this subject, whether the road was completed yet to the mouth of the Nelson river. I understand that the surveys of both the Nelson river line and the Churchill line would go over the same route from the Pas to Split Lake. If the road has not been constructed east of Split Lake, I think the Government would be wise in considering whether it would not be well to adopt the line running from Split Lake to Fort Churchill instead of the other. It is perfectly clear from the experience that we have had, that if we attempt to locate a terminus at the mouth of the Nelson river, in addition to the fact that ships cannot get to the shore, we will need to have dredging going on there continually. The river brings down a great deal of silt.