

on with this project. All I hope, Mr. Speaker, is that in considering this railway which is about to be built—and I am satisfied that it will be carried in this House, I am satisfied that if the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition should both explain to the House their different policies and the vote should be taken then and there that would be the result—all I hope is that this Georgian Bay canal project will not be lost sight of. I trust that if this railway is constructed parliament, ratifying the agreement and the country approving of it, its construction will not retard the building of the Georgian Bay canal.

Now, Sir, I do not know that it is necessary that I should take up the time of the House at greater length.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has not touched the railway scheme yet.

Mr. MURRAY. I think I have. I have said that I think it is a national necessity and that we cannot move too fast. I endorse the sentiments of my leader; I say it is the time for action, not the time for delay, that we should not delay in order to hear what that section of the country is like. We know that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway people, as business men, are giving the project due consideration and are undertaking it as a business enterprise. The government has met them and met them in a businesslike way. I do not want to talk at as great length as my hon. friend who has just interrupted me (Mr. Sproule). I could talk all day on the railway project and on the absurdity of the proposition of his leader. Why, Sir, this may be a project which is not very much matured, but I consider the project of the leader of the opposition abortive. The idea of utilizing the Intercolonial Railway! Have we not got the Intercolonial Railway already? The idea of utilizing the Canada Atlantic Railway! Have we not got that already? And the idea of utilizing the Lake Superior section of the Canadian Pacific Railway! The thing is monstrous and an absurdity and if the leader of the opposition and the hon. gentlemen behind him think that the people of this country are going to support such a proposition they are making a great mistake. If the hon. leader of the opposition had come down and said that, considering the efforts and the surveys made in connection with the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, considering what the present government has done in making surveys of the French river, no question of transportation should receive precedence over the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, then I would be with him and there would be some sense in that. But there is no sense under the sun that I can see in the proposition that he has submitted to the House. The leader of the opposition may be a very clever man, I respect him, and I am sure that he has the respect of every other mem-

ber on this side of the House. So long as he retains the position of leader of the opposition, he is a credit to Canada. I believe hon. gentlemen could not have selected a better man as leader of the opposition, and I hope the country will keep him there for many years, and I think they will. He has brought forward a duck-and-drake proposition which I as a business man look on as absurd. What good will it do in the way of opening up the back country? What we want to-day is a policy for opening up territories which are not yet opened up. We know by experience that that is a national necessity, and that is the kind of policy I am in favour of. Mr. Speaker, I will not say any more.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, we have just been entertained to a very forcible speech from the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray). He was careful at the opening of his speech to assure us that he was retiring from public life. He was most particular to emphasize that before he made the statement that he supported this scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. His speech certainly had the merit of brevity, and I will endeavour to follow him in that respect. But, Sir, while he got up to speak in support of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, he devoted his whole time and attention to the Georgian Bay canal. He told us nothing whatever in regard to the merits of the scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, except that the road was to run through a country which was entirely unknown. He said that he himself knew nothing whatever about the wealth of the country through which this line was to go. It was refreshing to hear one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House give the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) credit for honesty in his convictions. We have heard repeatedly in this debate hon. gentlemen who have been followers of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, instead of meeting by argument the very able arraignment which that hon. gentleman made of this transcontinental railway scheme, meeting it by abuse. We had the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and other hon. members on the other side of the House, standing up in their places, and, instead of meeting the arguments of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, devoting their time to abusing the ex-minister; and I say again that it was refreshing to hear the statement coming from the hon. member for Pontiac that he considers that Mr. Blair was thoroughly honest in his convictions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all acknowledge that during the past two or three years there has been a discussion in regard to the congestion in the North-west Territories. We on this side of the House take no pessimistic view as to the future of this great country. We as a Conservative party have