

Our people would not desire to go two or three hundred miles away from all settlement and to make their homes on the line of a through transcontinental railway, where many of the trains would not stop and where they might not get the accommodation they would desire because it might be expensive and difficult to give such accommodation on a through line of that character. If you build colonization roads from the centre portions of Quebec and Ontario into that northern country you will keep settlement as it advances, closely in touch with the people in the central part of the provinces and in that way will be more likely to accomplish the colonization of that country. By this method you will attract settlers and it is the only businesslike method that can be suggested.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General entered into a long discussion upon my suggestion of an additional transcontinental line in the future. I did not propose the immediate construction of a transcontinental line, but I wish to tell the hon. the Postmaster General and the people of this country that I did not and I do not shrink from the possibility of a further transcontinental line built by the government and operated by the government when it is called for by the requirements of the Canadian North-west. Let the hon. Postmaster General, who shrinks from that possibility, think for a moment of the language of the expert of the government, who said at page 8523 of 'Hansard,' that within the lifetime of persons within this House we might have three or four transcontinental lines. If he wants extravagant language let him look at the words of the expert of the government and not at my modest statement that I believe at some time in the future it might be necessary to have a transcontinental line built and operated at the cost of the people of this country. I do not shrink from that responsibility, although the Postmaster General appears to do so. When he takes that position he takes entirely different ground from the expert of the government, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and from that of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell,) who stated, at page 8953 of 'Hansard,' that the number of transcontinental lines which we might have to build in the future was absolutely unlimited. Let my hon. friend also look at the language of the hon. Minister of Finance, who also, at page 8562, looked to the possibility of several more transcontinental roads. Let him also consider the words of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who at pages 9516 and 9518 of 'Hansard,' dwelt on the immense possibility of that country in the raising of stock and grain in the future. Let him also read the language of the hon. Minister of the Interior. Let my hon. friend the Postmaster General not thus shrink from the possibility that at some time in the future the people of this country may

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

be called upon to build another transcontinental line and may answer the call.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General grew merry over my proposal to equip the Georgian bay, the St. Lawrence, and maritime ports. At page 9777 of 'Hansard' he actually derides this proposal, and in effect declares—and I think the attention of the country should be called to it—that it is no part of the policy of the government of this country to spend one single dollar upon the Georgian bay ports, or upon the St. Lawrence, or Atlantic ports. I say that after having examined the language of the Postmaster General, and I will show to the House and to the country how I gather that distinct enunciation of policy from the language of the hon. gentleman. The hon. Postmaster General is making a fair comparison—he has stated that over and over again—between my proposal and the proposal of the government. He calls attention, at page 9778 of 'Hansard' to the fact that the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec amounts to \$5,803,538, and he calls attention to the fact that the debt of the harbour of the city of Montreal amounts to \$8,054,156. He does not go into the cost of the equipment of other ports, he does not give the figures in regard to them, because he has not the figures before him, but he takes the figures which he has, and he deliberately adds them to the cost of my proposal, and adds not one single dollar to the cost of the government proposal. He is either making an unfair comparison, and I cannot charge him with that, or else it is not the policy of the government to spend one dollar on the equipment and development of the Georgian bay ports, the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ports. If there is any answer to that, I would like to know what it is. We have a member of the government, put up by the government to criticise the financial part of my proposal, deliberately adding \$5,803,538, the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec, and \$8,054,156, the debt of the harbour of the city of Montreal, to the cost of my proposal, and not one dollar for any of these works does he add to the proposal of the government. Is it not an accurate and necessary deduction from that to say that not one dollar does the government propose to expend on the development of the Georgian bay ports, the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ports? Either that is the policy of the government or else the hon. Postmaster General has made a deliberately unfair comparison. I leave the hon. gentleman and the right hon. leader of the House to say which of these alternatives he desires to accept.

My hon. friend also became somewhat merry over my proposal in regard to the consideration by this government of the project of erecting elevators or warehouses, and he said that it was absolutely absurd, because the government could not undertake to com-