

*Trans-Canada Highway*

period in the session to delay supply, but I believe there are a few points which should be brought out and which I shall attempt to do in a very few minutes. The hon. member for North Timiskaming spoke in a very moderate tone, and I shall copy him in that regard. He pointed out that there was a great deal of unemployment in northern Ontario, a fact of which I am well aware. But it must be remembered that the unemployment in northern Ontario is largely the result of the over-expansion of the pulp and paper industry which, to put the situation mildly, is not in a very good condition in the Dominion of Canada. My own city of Fort William and the neighbouring city of Port Arthur are to-day suffering grievously from unemployment just as are other sections of northern Ontario, of which my hon. friend spoke. Therefore I am entirely familiar with the conditions that exist in that section even though it is early summer.

The hon. gentleman suggested that in order to relieve this unemployment the government should go into the question of aiding or co-operating in some manner with the province of Ontario in building a trans-Canada highway. In a trans-Canada highway, I, like most people who live in northern Ontario, have been interested throughout. Long before we occupied these seats I put myself on record on a number of occasions, both in the house and elsewhere, as being favourable to the building of a trans-Canada highway. I realize, as the government does, the importance of highways for the encouragement of the great tourist industry, because it is really one of our industries to-day from which we profit a great deal, particularly during the summer months. Unfortunately, however, on the eastern end of northern Ontario, the section whence my hon. friend comes, there is a good deal of difference of opinion as to the route which should be followed by that trans-Canada highway. Into that controversy I do not intend to enter as I come from the western end and we have enough troubles of our own there without my dealing with any of the differences of opinion of the people on the eastern end. Therefore I shall not offer any suggestions as to what the decision should be. At the same time, as my hon. friend and others pointed out, the fact remains that there is a very strong difference of opinion as to the northern or the southern or the central route which might be followed by the trans-Canada highway across that portion of northeastern Ontario.

In the discussion this afternoon both the hon. member for North Timiskaming and the [Mr. Manion.]

hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan) used the argument that it has been stated by the Hon. Charles McCrea that the revenues from northern Ontario were about ten times the expenditures in northern Ontario, and they quoted a speech which he made. I do not question the quotation in the least, but I should like to point out that I have no doubt what Mr. McCrea meant was not that the government of Ontario was receiving in revenue ten times as much as it was spending in northern Ontario, because many times I have seen the contrary proven, not only by ministers of the government that is in power at the present time, but by the Hon. Harry Mills who was a minister from my city in the government of Mr. Drury and who, I remember well, gave me figures some years ago when the question came up, to prove satisfactorily to me that much more was being spent in northern Ontario than was being derived in taxes from that section. Although I have not seen the speech referred to, no doubt what Mr. McCrea meant in that regard was that there was taken from northern Ontario in timber wealth, mineral wealth, in the wealth of fisheries and so on, much more than was spent there by the province of Ontario in the development of that section. Therefore it is not quite logical to argue that because the wealth is taken from there, the province of Ontario gets it, and consequently should spend it on a road through that section. I mention this simply to clear up what Mr. McCrea meant, because I do not believe he would take the attitude that they have received ten times as much in revenue from that section as they have expended in it.

What I wish to point out particularly—and I do this in the kindest spirit and in justice to this side of the house—is that the hon. member for North Timiskaming who introduced this question this afternoon is highly inconsistent in the attitude he takes now as compared with that which he took when he was on this side of the house supporting the government of my right hon. friend the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), because not only in 1930 but in 1929 resolutions were introduced into the house by the then member for Athabaska, Mr. Kellner, distinctly advocating the spending of money by the dominion government in assisting the provinces to build roads. I have not under my hand the resolution that was moved in 1929, but that moved in 1930 is, I believe, practically the