

that it was uttered or written by Sir Henry Thornton. It dodged details at every turn. I want simply the details. Put them on record, and let us have something to try out the capacity of the board. Then we can vote with at least some semblance of intelligence. If we proceed on the present path we vote simply on the romance of Hansard.

Mr. HANSON: One sympathizes with a county the size of Guysborough, on account of the fact that it has no railway communication, but I think that we cannot afford to spend the large sum of three and a half million dollars on the mere question of sentiment, strong as sentiment may be. I should like to call the attention of the committee to a statement made by the Minister of National Defence to the effect that the road was not proceeded with in 1916 because of the financial condition of the country, and I should like to put this question to my hon. friend: Does he, or do the members on the Treasury benches, consider for a moment, that the financial condition of this country is comparably as good as it was in 1916? Does he think that a burden that was too great in 1916 is a small burden to-day? I do not think the taxpayers of the country consider that it is. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman himself gives the best reason why this vote should not be given in this year of grace 1924, when he says that the burden was too great in 1916; and I think it follows, as night follows day, that everybody will agree the burden is too great to-day, if you are viewing the matter from the standpoint of national economics and national burdens. What is said in favour of this resolution? My hon. colleague from St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) has, I think, with a great deal of force exposed the fallacy of the argument which has been used in support of the proposal, but he has not given all the local conditions. It is true that the people living in the interior of the country are without railway communication, but he forgot to tell the committee that the people who live along the coast line of that county—and I venture to say that the great mass of population in that county live along the coast line—are for the most part served, and fairly well served, with a subsidized steamship service which this government and the country help to pay for and maintain.

The fishing industry has been referred to, and I say that the strongest argument that can be used in support of this line is that the fishing industry can be developed and well served by the establishment of a steam-

[Mr. Baxter.]

ship service to and from Canso and along this coast.

Something has been said with respect to the great timber resources of that country. I happen to know a little about the timber resources of that country. A company in which I am interested owns in fee simple a very considerable portion of the area covered with timber. I say to hon. members of this House that, in so far as soft-wood lumber is concerned, I doubt if any of that lumber, except for the purely local market, will ever be moved by rail. You have only to go to a good-sized atlas and observe the fact that that portion of the province of Nova Scotia, and in fact I might say all portions of Nova Scotia, are very well watered, that there are numerous drivable and floatable streams, and that the timber will inevitably be brought to tidewater by the floating process, and there manufactured and shipped by water, either to the markets of Great Britain; or to the New England states. These are the only two markets that are available, and I happen to know that this very property to which I refer was always operated in that way in the hands of previous owners, and will be operated in the future by the present owners in exactly the same way. It is the only commercially profitable way in which to handle a timber limit like this. Then my hon. friend speaks of the immense quantity of hardwood lumber. Does my hon. friend know that the day has not arrived, so far as eastern Canada is concerned, when it is commercially profitable to manufacture and sell hardwood lumber?

People have tried it. Men well experienced in the lumber manufacturing business have tried it, and I say there is absolutely nothing in the hon. minister's contention that this is desirable from the standpoint of the lumber industry. The most important argument in favour of this vote is from the standpoint of the fisheries. That is the strong argument, and I advise my hon. friends on the opposite side who are anxious to see the vote go through to stick to that as the test. It has more merit than the argument in regard to the timber business. I do not know that the country is specially concerned with what transpired in 1911, or even in 1915 or 1916, to which reference has been made, but I would like this committee and the country to understand that the proposal before parliament to-day is an entirely different one from that before parliament in 1911, or even 1916, as I understand the present resolution and the resolution of 1916. The former resolution had merits from the standpoint of the betterment of the line of railway, and it is a