

it is going to cost less, though my own belief is that it will give a large return in the increased prosperity, not only for that part of the country, but for the whole Dominion, and that the cost may really be called insignificant in the face of that return. And must we not pay for the Transcontinental railway? And is it too much to say that we require \$200,000,000 for that? Here we have \$400,000,000 of urgent, necessary expenses, if we are going to carry out the policy of economic expansion which is absolutely necessary for us if we are to fulfil our destiny.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). I had no intention of speaking, and should not have done so had not I been prompted by the very partisan speech just delivered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). In the first place, I desire to congratulate most heartily the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) upon the comprehensive, broadminded and non-partisan manner in which he has explained the resolution which he has placed in your hands. As he has well said, the question under consideration is not in any way a party question, any more than it is a local or sectional question to be treated or considered from a local standpoint. It is in that view that I rise to give my hearty endorsement to the views which have been so ably presented by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) this afternoon. This is indeed a national question, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) himself, in his opening remarks, admitted it to be so. Unfortunately, however, in the next breath he put forth arguments which controverted entirely what he had just advanced previously. Why are we confronted to-night with the report of the Transportation Commission, and with the statement that this government has done nothing to carry out any of the suggestions of that commission? Why, the hon. gentleman himself was forced to the conclusion that some of the works which have been carried out by this government were wholly along the lines suggested by this very commission. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked what this government had done to advance the great national scheme of the Georgian Bay canal? The answer, Sir, is very plain; this government is the only government which has done any thing to give effect to the ideas which have been advocated for fifty years in favour of the Georgian Bay canal. It is true that this question has been before the public for over half a century. A few days ago I happened to read some of the speeches delivered on this very question by Sir George E. Cartier, and I was pleased to observe that that great statesman, during the whole course of his public career, was one of the greatest champions of this project; and hon. members of this House

Mr. MONK.

will remember that Sir George Cartier was a member for Montreal and for Hochelaga. Now, what was done under the late Conservative regime?

Mr. MONK. I did not pretend that the previous government had not been remiss in its duty, but that the question has not become more urgent.

Mr. RIVET. But that is no reason why the hon. gentleman should charge the present government with neglecting its duty, in view of all it has done, as every well informed man knows. When this government came into power in 1896 one of the very first projects it dealt with was the Georgian Bay canal scheme; and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has admitted that Mr. Tarte was an energetic champion of the execution of this undertaking. Later on, the Transportation Commission was appointed, and I am sure my hon. friend will be willing to give this government the credit for having appointed that commission, and if the recommendations of that commission are now before the country it is due to a certain extent to the initiative of the government in appointing that commission, a commission of eminent men such as the late Robert Reford, Mr. Fry, and others. Surely this is a very important step towards carrying out the great transportation system of Canada.

Now, the hon. gentleman has said that none of the suggestions or conclusions of that commission have been carried out. When I asked him what he thought of the improvements which had been carried out in the port of Montreal he was very indignant and denied that this government was in any way responsible for those improvements, for those great permanent works which may be seen in Montreal today, and which have contributed to place it on a first-class footing as compared with other great ocean ports on this continent. The hon. gentleman deplored the state of inferiority of the port of Montreal at present. I differ with him in that respect. I live in Montreal, as does the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Although he is an older man than I am, and I willingly defer to his grey hair, at the same time I cannot agree with his conclusions as to the state of the port of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend is misrepresenting me. I admitted that great and creditable improvements had been made in Montreal, but I attributed them to the work of the commission and to local effort. But I am not aware that the government has carried out the suggestions made in the report of the commission.

Mr. RIVET. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, and I think other gentlemen around me understood him as I did,