

These are extracts from the report of Mr. E. B. Borron. Then we are told about climate and game, and about track surveys checked. We are told a little about the physical features of the country:

The most noticeable feature of the west coast of James bay is its extreme flatness. Looked at from a distance there is no distinct shore line, but the water and land seem to merge into each other. A strip varying in width from one to three miles and partly covered with grass and low shrubs extends along the coast from the Kapiskau to the Moose river, except for a few miles north and south of Cockispenny point, where the shore is fairly high and dry and the trees come to the water's edge.

Then we have 'clay, sands and shells.' It is well we should know about the kind of shells to be found in that country, about 'surveys and instructions.' We come then to 'fish,' 'the kind of timber,' 'soil,' 'mountain ranges,' 'crops,' 'coal,' 'clay escarpments,' 'fish and minerals.' This report contains a selection of items of that character from the reports of geologists and a great deal of it is the imperfect information derived from the Indians. A great deal of it is only guess work, and very little is definite and can be relied upon. Yet, these are the mountains of information which have been given us in regard to the country through which this railway must pass. I have given a good many items from this report, and I do so because I think it desirable that we should know the character of the information which is given to this House to enable it to judge whether it is wise to pass this Bill or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read pages 42 and 46.

Mr. SPROULE. I will leave the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) to get up and read the rest of the book if he likes. I have read from page to page so as to give what may be taken as fair samples of the information afforded us, to show how indefinite it is and to show that practically there is no definite information at all; that the data is not reliable, that most of it is collected from the Indians that it is guess work and that it has no relevancy to the information that we want to enable us to judge as to whether it is wise to build this railway or not.

This all important measure that we are dealing with now should have, in my judgment, been referred to in the speech from the Throne. I want to draw attention to one of the features of this session that I have not referred to before. Constitutional government means that the government of the day, when they propound any great policy, refer to it in the speech from the Throne when parliament is called together, and draw the attention of the country to the fact that they propose to deal with the question. It does not matter whether the policy involves a heavy expenditure or is far-reaching in its importance, but in so far as it is interesting or important to the country or

Mr. SPROULE.

is important in other respects, whether it relates to transportation, or to the economic pursuits of the people, or to any other lines of activity in which the country is engaged, our form of constitutional government demands that it should be referred to in the speech from the Throne. Yet, we are asked to commit the country to an expenditure of \$100,000,000 or \$150,000,000 in carrying out a policy which is not of sufficient importance to be referred to in the speech from the Throne. Is that constitutional government? Coming from the Reformers, who always pride themselves upon living up to the principles of constitutional government, it seems to me that it is more objectionable still. I say that they have abandoned constitutional government in that respect. They have refrained from taking the people as well as the representative of the Crown into their confidence and they have failed to disclose in the speech from the Throne the important policy which we are now dealing with in this House at the tail end of the session. It was not sufficiently important to be referred to in the speech from the Throne, but they can bring it down at the tail end of the session and ask us to deal with it in the dying hours of the session. This policy looks as if it were designed for the destruction of the trade of Ontario as far as I can judge. Taking a comprehensive view of the government in power, it would appear to me that they have a sinister design against Ontario, because it is evident that they are striking at Ontario by taking an unfair census of the country, a census which allowed them to reduce the number of the representatives of the people, and thereby reduce the strength of the voice of Ontario in this House. They struck at Ontario again by the Redistribution Bill, by which they have endeavoured to lessen the power and influence of Ontario in this House. Ontario gave a majority against this government and they cannot forget that. They keep that in view, and their desire is to curtail her strength, to destroy her power, to leave her helpless, to manacle her, first by the census, second by the Redistribution Bill, and third by this great transcontinental railway. If successful this railway would mean the destruction of our fleet of merchant marine which now plies on the great lakes. We are told that if this railway is built up to the standard announced by the railway expert of the government (Mr. Charlton) it will be capable of handling all the produce of the west. If so, it will destroy our lake marine, and in proportion as it is successful it will starve out the existing carrying routes that are so valuable to the province of Ontario. If successful, it means the destruction of our inland shipping; it means the destruction of our ports on the Georgian bay; it means the weakening of the financial strength of Ontario, and it means the decreasing of the population of that province. Our towns,