

formation to enable us to judge whether it is wise to make that expenditure or not. But that is not an issue at the present time. The government is not committing itself on that point, and I am not asking this House to commit itself to that further construction. But I say that we are entitled, in view of the promises made by representatives of both parties, to a definite declaration that the full amount required for the road be appropriated.

A great deal has been said about navigation. I submit that in view of the Senate report there is no need to go into that question exhaustively, particularly as the present vote is not concerned with that expenditure. Every man in the west believes that the Hudson Bay railway will be a grain route, but whether the grain business alone or the cattle business alone will justify the construction of this road, we believe that the grain business and the cattle business taken in conjunction with the other business that the road will develop will justify its existence, and it is only from the point of view of dealing with these characteristics that I am going to speak now, because I think we have gone far afield in dealing at the present time with navigation or with the cost of harbour improvements at the bay.

In the first place, may I draw the attention of the House to the report made by Professor Prince, at page 43 of the Senate report, with regard to the fisheries? It shows beyond all question that not only are the fisheries of the rivers wonderful, but the wealth of fisheries at the bay is overwhelming and would add greatly to the wealth of Canada. Almost every kind of fish is to be found in the bay. Mr. McLachlan has said that there might be fish there, but that there would be no fishing season. The only thing he had to go upon in making that statement was what some Indians in the district had told him. As everybody knows the Indian is not a deep sea sailor, and he fishes in a very crude way.

A pamphlet has been issued this year by the inspector of fisheries of the Dominion, showing the result of investigations made last year, and it confirms Mr. Prince's view that the fishery wealth of northern Manitoba and the bay is amazing. I am not going into the details, because any member who is curious can find them in the sources I have indicated.

With regard to minerals, the Senate report gives considerable information. We know that at The Pas minerals have been discovered that justify the expression of opinion that was made by Mr. Tyrrell before the Senate committee. There is not the slightest doubt that there is enormous mineral wealth in that district that will be available when the country

[Mr. Hannesson.]

is opened up by the railway. When you think of the wealth produced for Ontario in what was the backwoods of that province, which years ago people would not hear of as fit for habitation, you can realize the possibilities in the Hudson bay territory.

There is not only timber but pulpwood in that territory. Between The Pas and Split Lake it is estimated that there are 6,000,000 cords of pulpwood. There is now a mill at The Pas with a capacity of 125,000 feet per day, and the timber runs farther north than has been indicated. I have examined the photographs available to every member of this House, taken by the Air Service, and to be found in the Topographical Surveys branch, showing the whole country from The Pas to Port Nelson and Fort Churchill covered with forests of much the same character almost right up to the bay.

I do not need to dwell upon the fur wealth of that country, and how that will help. For centuries the Hudson's Bay Company has been capturing fur-bearing animals in that district. That will add to the business of the railway, and it is a big business, as witness the fur market in Winnipeg, which is going to equal the Montreal fur market. The furs come altogether from the territory that is to be served by the Hudson Bay railway.

I am going to dwell for a few minutes on the climate and soil, because more has been said detrimentally about that than perhaps about anything else except navigation. Hon. members laughed at the hon. member for Marquette when he spoke of bathing in the Hudson bay. I am not going as far as that, but I shall read a few extracts to show the nature of the weather at the bay, and which will at the same time give an idea of the capabilities of this region for cultivation. I am reading from "The Hudson Bay Road" by A. H. de Tremaudan, which will be found in the library. He has gathered information regarding the climate going back as far as 1752. He says:

In 1752, Robson, the architect of Fort Prince of Wales, had a similar opinion: "I have seen a small pea growing without any culture (at York Factory). Most kinds of garden stuff, particularly peas and beans, grow here to perfection.... I am of opinion that barley would flourish.... Gooseberries and red and black currants are found in the woods growing upon such bushes as in England.... I should expect by no more labour than would be proper for my health to procure a desirable livelihood; not at all doubting of my being able to raise peas and beans, barley and probably other kinds of grain (on Hayes river).... The natural produce of Hudson bay grows very fast, and comes to perfection much sooner than that of England. There is no spring or fall—a leap from winter to summer.... The soil is fertile, the climate temperate, fit for the produce of all kinds of grain