

posed by the terms of this Bill, there cannot be that interchange of trade, commercially, politically, and socially, that there should be. I am sure that the cities of Halifax and St. John are suffering, and have been suffering since this country became a Dominion, for the want of that interchange. Certainly the province of Nova Scotia has been suffering in a way that cannot be adequately described here. The province of New Brunswick has had advantages which the province of Nova Scotia has not enjoyed. The city of St. John has been connected through the state of Maine with the city of Montreal by a short line; but the other sections of the province of New Brunswick and a great section of the province of Nova Scotia have not enjoyed that advantage. Now, there is no doubt that the antipathy and antagonism shown by hon. gentlemen opposite is injurious to the interests of the maritime provinces. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), yesterday afternoon, in a spirit which was most sectional and narrow, and in a way indicating a small-bore idea of the needs of this Dominion, complained of the disadvantages of the province of Ontario. That province has had advantages and has enjoyed them, and she certainly should not now complain if other sections of the Dominion are to have some advantages. Under these circumstances, the amendment of the hon. member for Peel, based as it is upon his antagonism to the line through New Brunswick, is unwarranted, and I have a right to assume that his objections to the other sections of the line are equally faulty.

Mr. F. H. HALE (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of this committee, and I did not intend to say anything on this subject; but in view of what my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has quoted from the pamphlet he had in his hand, I desire to say a few words in regard to the county of Carleton, which I have the honour to represent. It is well known that Carleton county is one of the most fertile districts in the Dominion of Canada, and all that the hon. gentleman has read from the pamphlet is no doubt correct. It is a very productive county, but I am sorry to say that not one pound of the produce of that county will ever be carried over the proposed road. It will pass so far to the east and through so poor a section of the county that it will be impossible for us to reach it. I am sorry that the government propose to locate this road where they do. In that location it will never be of any use to the county of Carleton or to the province of New Brunswick. It is a great pity that the road, if it is to be built, is not to be taken down the valley of the River St. John, where it would be of some benefit to the people of New Brunswick, and where it would find a good outlet in the harbour of St. John. I am sorry that this road is to be forced along

without any survey or any knowledge of the country through which it is to go. I can speak from personal knowledge of the section of the country through which this road is to go. So far as the county of Carleton and the county of York are concerned, it is going where it will never be of any use to that section of the country.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member for Westmoreland has just stated that these petitions do not make any reference to the alternative policy of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. One would surely expect that a prospective cabinet minister would be intelligent enough to see that in a case like this, the alternative policy submitted by the leader of the opposition is not usually referred to in petitions against the legislation introduced by the government. However, the hon. gentleman has evidently not read all the petitions. He has probably taken up one of them and concluded that all the others were counterparts. But if he had looked at some of the petitions he would have found that not only is the government scheme condemned in unmeasured terms, but that practically the scheme of the leader of the opposition is endorsed, and parliament is asked to take it up instead of the other. I happen to have a petition which is the same as that which is being circulated throughout Manitoba.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not the same as that circulated in the eastern provinces.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I am speaking of the petition circulated in that portion of the country which this projected railway is particularly supposed to benefit. It is that portion of the country to relieve the congestion of traffic and lower the freight rates this government measure was introduced, and it is the people there who are protesting against the government scheme and asking, in effect, that the scheme propounded by the leader of the opposition be adopted in its place. Let me read the petition:

The petition of the undersigned electors of the Dominion of Canada humbly sheweth:—

1. That western Canada is vitally interested in questions of transportation and that its progress will be checked by inadequate facilities on the one hand, or, on the other, by excessive transportation charges.

2. That it is of the utmost importance to the prosperity and development of western Canada that transportation facilities be afforded at the lowest possible rates, upon both products exported and merchandise imported.

3. That in this connection it is absolutely essential that the combined rail and water routes to the east should receive proper development.

The people of the west realize that it is by the combined rail and water routes they will get the required relief.

4. That ample and extensive railway construction in the west should be, and can be,