

I come from a district where we need more than highways. We need railways. I could take you out to places where farmers have to haul their grain from 25 to 60 miles, sleep out two nights under their wagons and spend four days on the trip in order to get their grain to market. I had a telegram to-day stating that a petition is on its way down asking for a branch line. That petition is signed by 1,632 farmers who have under cultivation 293,000 acres of land, who, in the years 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918 averaged 22 bushels to the acre and who have to haul their grain from 24½ to 42 miles to market. If we have money to spend to build highways, for the purpose of giving employment to the people in Canada, and, as the minister said, to bring people into Canada, I can tell the minister and this Government that if they do not supply some of these branch lines they will not be able to keep men in Canada who are here now, because they have stayed just about as long as they can afford to stay and haul grain that distance. We would like to have highways but we must give those settlers who have been eight or ten years in those districts some facilities for marketing their grain. The money spent on railways will give the same amount of employment to men as if spent on highways. We are expecting our returned soldiers to go out into the western country and take up homesteads; and yet in many of those districts there is not a railway within twenty-five or thirty miles of settlement.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Use motor trucks.

Mr. ARGUE: They cannot use motor trucks, because we have not the money to build the roads, and this money is not supposed to be used to build anything but main highways. I want to make these few remarks at this stage of the game, but when the Bill comes before the House I propose to have something more to say on the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Argue) says. I think we all realize the importance of railways. I do not know if the Estimates state the locations where we expect to build railways during the coming year, but my recollection is that \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 is going to be provided to build new lines of railways and every mile of that railway construction is west of the Great Lakes. We appreciate the need as well as my hon. friend does. If the Government had \$100,000,000 to spend it could not satisfy all the demands for

public works, and I do not say that offensively. The demands are so great—and they are necessarily great—that the Government must pick out what in their judgment would be the best places in which the money could be expended. I do not know whether the district represented by my hon. friend is included in the provision for branch lines or not. He may or may not have investigated it.

Mr. ARGUE: Yes I have investigated it.

Mr. CARVELL: There is something to be said further. When all the money for the construction of branch line railways is being expended in Western Canada, you cannot run away from the fact that the people in Eastern Canada have some rights as well as the people in the West. During the last three or four weeks I have listened to so many demands for public works that, while many of them may be necessary, I am still driven to the conclusion that there is a good deal of provincialism about the ordinary member of Parliament. Not a few of these requests have rather surprised me. I have had members of this House in the last three or four weeks tell me frankly that they wanted a work constructed because they wanted the money spent in their constituencies. I do not accept that doctrine at all. I believe that the Government should spend money where it is necessary, and not for the purpose of expending money in any particular constituency. I have no doubt that a railway is necessary in my hon. friend's constituency, but if we attempt to build a railway in every section of Western Canada where it is necessary I suppose we would require to have \$100,000,000 or \$150,000,000 in the Estimates instead of \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000. The whole country must be considered to some extent in the expenditure of public money. I hope my hon. friend will appreciate the point and I think he will see the reasonableness of the position that the Government takes.

Mr. BOYCE: I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) is to be congratulated on this move for the improvement of roads. We have heard some speakers say that the money should not be expended if it is going to be spent for a purpose other than the building of highways. It is for the Government to take care that the money shall be properly spent. We have heard hon. gentlemen from the cities tell us that we do not want the roads but that we would have been better off if we had some public buildings in our cities. I was very broad-minded when I came into