

with regard to the question of route. No matter what representations are made, the government is responsible to the people for the route they should take, and I would suggest that they shoulder that responsibility and establish the route. I am satisfied that if they did so the people in northern Ontario would get behind them and accept whatever route they selected.

While speaking of routes, there is no doubt in my mind that before many years there will be demands for more highways than one in northern Ontario. I am satisfied that if the route should go north the people in the other section of the country will feel that there should be another route; similarly, if the highway is built in the south there will be required before long a northern route. We have two or three routes from the city of Toronto to Hamilton. All through old Ontario you can choose various routes wherever you want to go, and these highways have been built in large part out of the revenues provided by new Ontario. The revenues from mining, fishing, game, forests and water-powers have all contributed to the building of these highways through old Ontario, and I was very much surprised during the last provincial by-election to read that Mr. McCrea, a gentleman who I am sure knows what he is talking about, made the statement that, at this very moment, for every dollar the Ontario government places in northern Ontario it get back ten dollars. If that is true—I do not happen to have his speech here, but I can get it—that is all the more reason why more consideration should be given to the north than it is receiving at the present time. And even if it is not true, the province of Ontario and this government, now that it is under obligation to carry out its promise in this regard, should give greater assistance to that sparsely settled country in accordance with their pledges.

Mr. D. J. COWAN (Port Arthur-Thunder Bay): I wish to intervene in this debate for a few moments inasmuch as the route of the trans-Canada highway would of necessity pass through the district I have the honour to represent. The members of the government, particularly those from northern Ontario, in the past have been in favour of the construction of a trans-Canada highway and at all times have endeavoured to promote the possibility of having that route constructed as early as possible. I do not think there is any argument as to the advisability of the construction and the early commencement of it. Confederation became possible because of the construction of a

trans-Canada railway, and in the world of transportation the motor has become a very important item. It would seem to me that the unity of Canada would be promoted if a motor road were constructed across this country, and particularly is that true of northern Ontario.

I do not propose to discuss this issue at great length, except to say that in the communities of northern Ontario we have not a municipal organization. There are no township or county organizations which would contribute towards the cost of this highway, it must be borne either by the provincial or by the federal governments, or by both. It is a matter which can be discussed properly in this parliament; it is a national matter, and for that reason I say that the government now in power should give it its earnest consideration.

Knowing the attitude which this government and the members of the cabinet have taken in the past, I have no hesitation in saying that this is one policy which should be carried out very shortly.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Gordon Aaron.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of Rita Margaret Mary Longmore.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 75, for the relief of Barbara Wallace Barlow.—Mr. Factor.

Bill No. 76 for the relief of Ray Finkelstein.—Mr. Factor.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg) (for Mr. Woodsworth) moved the second reading of Bill No. 44, to amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the hon. member explain? The sponsor of the bill is not present.

Mr. HEAPS: In the absence of the sponsor of the bill, I might say a word or two in explanation. The purpose of the bill is to prevent the government from deporting people who have resided in this country for more than ten years. As regards the purpose of the measure, I think it will have the general support and sympathy of members in all parts of the house. Although I