mining purposes, which will leave only 36,000,000 acres, or a little over the amount of land which the hon. Premier hopes to settle in ten years in the North-West. We have been settling this Dominion nearly a century, and we have only succeeded in all these Provinces in settling 36,000,000 acres of land. Yet the hon. the First Minister proposes, in ten years, to settle 32,000,000 acres in the North-I think these two statements are sufficient to illustrate the impossibility of the hon, the First Minister's anticipations being realised. As to the quality of the land, it can scarcely be contended that this new territory will be any better than the land in Ontario. The hon, member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) stated, that the motion of the hon, member for West Durham was a kind of repudiation. The hon, the Minister of Railways. did not take that ground. He took the ground that if we found at any time the state of our finances did not admit of continuing the work we could then stop. He may find that the finances of the Dominion will not admit of our going on with the road even next year. If we went on with the present contracts, even for one year, large liabilities would be incurred, and contractors would want to be reimbursed for their outlay and for damages, and the difficulty in the way of stopping the work would be very great. Another objection to the Resolution is that it will break up the Union. We have heard much of this from the hon. members from British Columbia, and we can sympathise with them. I believe the Union between British Columbia and the other Provinces was premature. I believe that worse things may happen to this Dominion, and worse things may happen for British Columbia than that the Union should be dissolved. The Union, by Act of Parliament, cannot long subsist when there are no commercial ties to strengthen political Union. I think it can be demonstrated that it will be impossible to have commercial Union with that country for many years to come. hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) has, on several occasions, asked for a separate Tariff suitable to British Columbia, and differing from that of the rest of the Dominion. I felt that there were many good reasons why British Columbia should have a separate Tariff.

Supply—Canadian

The circumstances of that country are very difficult from those of the rest of the Dominion. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that there could be no commercial interco rse between these two countries, I hold it was premature for British Columbia to le annexed to this Dominion, and that the Union was detrimental, not only to Canada but to British Columbia herself. If it is dangerous for the British Columbia end of the road to be delayed until our finances will permit of the work being proceeded with, it is more dangerous to go on and build this road in the present state of our finances. There is more danger of breaking up the Union by proceeding present than by halting state present. Ι that advisedly. assure you, Mr. Speaker, that, in the Province from which I come-and I think the same remark will apply to other Provinces—there is great dissatisfaction at the amount of debt we are rolling up and the amount of taxation already imposed, $_{
m the}$ ${f recklessness}$ \mathbf{with} the Government is being conducted. That dissatisfaction is assuming proportions which cannot ere long be controlled, and will culminate, I fear, in a storm which the hon, gentlemen opposite will not be able to allay, and in worse disaster than the secession of British Columbia. If we go on and build that road at present, it will certainly add one hundred million dollars to the heavy debt with which this country is already burdened, and will absorb the entire Customs Revenue to pay the interest alone. I ask is it fair to absorb the whole of our Customs dues and deprive the Provinces of necessary public works in order to build the British Columbia end of this road, which can be of no service, commercially, at present, but which must entail a large additional burden to operate it? For the reasons I have given to-night, and in view of the state of our finances, I must enter my protest against proceeding with the construction of this portion of the road.

Mr. SCHULTZ: As this discussion has been so long and so exhaustive, I desire only to ask the indulgence of the House long enough to enter my protest against the manner in which the western Provinces have been treated by many of the supporters of the amendment. One