

the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and therefore nothing is left for me to add to what has already been said. I do not need to say another word upon it. My hon. friend says that he looks upon this scheme as an alternative one to the water route? If the plan which my hon. friend proposed some few days ago were adopted would that be an alternative to the water route? Suppose we were to acquire control of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, as my hon. friend proposes in order to establish communication between the east and the west, would that be an alternative to the water route? No, Sir, the water route and the railways have to go together. One is not an alternative to the other. They are a necessary complement to each other. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that we must have water communication. Since we have been in office we have done more than any other government have done to improve our water communication. We have spent in the neighbourhood of \$16,000,000 in improving the water communication and as a result up to this year, up to this moment, there has been more grain transportation upon the St. Lawrence than in any year for the last thirty years. No one proposes that if we open this new railway, of which we are asking a grant, that water communication shall be closed. They depend upon each other. It is true that the water communication will be closed for six months in the year; but the people will have the rail communication, and their business will not be closed down as it was before the railway era. There was a time when the merchants of Quebec, of Montreal, and of Toronto at the close of navigation were obliged to close up everything, and sit with their arms folded until the following spring. But as soon as the railway era came in it was possible to make every day a working day whether it was summer or winter. My hon. friends from the North-west Territories and Manitoba understand the situation better than I do and I appeal to my hon. friends from Manitoba on both sides of the House to say if in the winter time the business of forwarding their produce is not closed down just as was the business of the men of eastern Canada many years ago. From the time that navigation is closed the people of the west are helpless. They have to wait until the following spring. At the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway can take a certain amount of grain out of the west in cars, but when we have another railway opened it will be possible for the farmers to ship their grain all the year round. Some of my hon. friends believe that railway transportation will be as cheap as water transportation. That is a problem of the future, but at all events, whether it be as cheap or not as cheap, the farmers of the west will have the benefit of this railway all the year round, and not only the farmers of the west

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

will have the benefit of it but also the producers of the eastern provinces. It must not be forgotten that this railway is not designed to transport only the grain of the west. There is something else to be carried than grain. This railway will transport everything that civilized man wants. It will transport the produce of the west which is largely cereals; but it will transport also the commerce of the east.

I do not propose to say much more at this stage when we have had this scheme debated for two months. My hon. friend said to-day at the opening of his speech that he had not much to say which was new and in so far as that goes he said what was perfectly true. He had not much to say that was new and I shall not have much to say that is new. But, what I want to impress upon the people of Canada at this moment is that the policy which we have proposed is one which is imperative and that we would go back upon our own record if we were to go back upon the policy which has been devised for the construction of this transcontinental railway. And, that is not all. My hon. friend a moment ago derided my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and I think derided also my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who stated that within the lifetime of some of us here there would probably be two or three transcontinental railways.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not deride them. I cited them as evidence in my own behalf.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend cited them as evidence in his own behalf he should sit down and say no more. He had better support our scheme then. If my hon. friend thinks that we must eventually have more than one line why should he not accept this immediately? If he thinks that, why should he throw cold water on this scheme? We must have more railways than one. We are just on the fringe of our obligations if we want to be true to our destiny. The nineteenth century has been a century that has been remarkable for the marvellous development of the United States. During the whole period of that cycle of time the United States has been the great centre of attraction for all the world, but a new star has arisen upon the horizon, a star not in the orbit of the American constellation but a star standing by itself resplendent of the western sky, and it it towards that star that every immigrant, every traveller, every man who leaves the land of his ancestors to come and seek a home for himself now turns his gaze. We have now a duty in consequence to perform, a duty which is imperative. We must commence here and now, not to-morrow, nor the day after to-morrow, but at this moment, if the Canadian people want to be true to the destinies of the Canadian nation, the construction of this railway. It will cost some money, but