

jected it, but as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) says, where will the poor bondholders be. I submit that this House should be very careful before they do anything which would lead the moneyed men of the old country into investing in any such wild-cat scheme as this, a scheme which will never pay anybody except the projectors and those who build the road. After careful consideration of the question, these are my views upon it, and I feel it my duty as a member of this House, and as a citizen of this our common country, having the welfare of Canada at heart, to oppose this scheme to the bitter end at every stage which it reaches in this House.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss as to whether the bondholders or the people who purchase the bonds of the Hudson Bay Railway will derive interest or not from their investment. I take it for granted that men who have money to invest will make it their own business to know whether it is properly invested or not. I have been a little surprised and amazed by some of the arguments used against this scheme by hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon. We are told by the first gentleman who opposed this scheme that the railway is no good, that it is impracticable, and that the Hudson Bay Straits cannot be navigated, and then at the close of his remarks he attempts to point out to this House that if this aid is granted that road will be built and that it will consequently destroy the trade that would otherwise come through the Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. SPOHN. I did not say that the Straits could not be navigated, but I said that, as a commercial enterprise, the railway would be a failure. Of course, we know they could make one trip a year there; that is considered navigating it, I suppose.

Mr. WATSON. Well, if I were under the impression that ships could only make one trip a year, I do not think I would rise on the floor of this House and advocate the scheme, nor do I think the promoters of the Trent Valley Canal would lose much trade. But I have greater hopes of the navigation of Hudson Straits than the hon. member for Simcoe. If I did not believe that our grain would be carried out in the same year that it is grown, I would not support the scheme. But I am under the impression that at least a portion of our grain can be taken out the same year that it is grown. The scheme would be practically wiped out, so far as outside capitalists are concerned, if it were understood that that could not be done. If the grain had to be stored up at Churchill or Nelson for eight or nine months, that would be fatal to the scheme. At the present time, instead of the farmers of Manitoba not threshing their grain until November or December, the greater portion of it is shipped and goes eastward by the lakes in the same season that it is grown. Now, while I am glad that there are some schemes on which the hon. member for Selkirk and I can agree, I regret that he could not sit down to-day without having a fling at the Greenway Government, by stating that they were forced to do certain things. I may say that the Greenway Government have always supported the Hudson Bay Railway, and the change made by them in the form of the assistance they were granting to the scheme from a guarantee to a direct grant of a million and a-half,

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

was made to suit the promoters of the scheme, and that change, I believe, had the almost unanimous approval of the people of Manitoba. The Local Government felt that they could not speculate too much in a work that was calculated to benefit not only Manitoba, but the Territories westward even to a greater extent than Manitoba, and they made the change because circumstances had changed. The railway monopoly was done away with, there was another railway in the country, and the same importance was not attached to the Hudson Bay Railway as at the time the guarantee was given. However, last session, the Manitoba Government considered it so important that they agreed to give it a bonus of \$1,500,000 if the road were completed within five years. This should convince the members of this House that the people of Manitoba feel an interest in the construction of this work. As the hon. gentleman who last spoke has stated, it is not a colonization railway. Although it might be run through a country where it would be more profitable for colonization purposes, there are some 37 miles of it built now in the direction indicated on the map; and it is proposed to continue it by the Narrows of Lake Manitoba and westward of Lake Winnipegosis, and Cedar Lake to the Saskatchewan River. By this route it will tap the Lake Dauphin district, which is already fairly well settled; and it will give communication with steamers on the Saskatchewan River a month earlier than it would if it ran to the eastward of Cedar Lake and on to Grand Rapids. Another reason for carrying the road to the west of Lake Manitoba is that by that route it will be more valuable to points west of the city of Winnipeg. While Winnipeg is an important city, there are many other points of importance in Manitoba and the North-West, and it is also of advantage to these points that the road should be constructed westward of Cedar Lake. This route passes through a tract of country which is probably fit for grain-growing, but it is certainly good for grazing, and it would open up a large territory which at present remains undeveloped. From the Narrows of Lake Manitoba there is good navigation to the north end of Waterhen Lake. There are also valuable fisheries and timber areas in the same district, which this road would be the means of developing. Now, we have heard read here to-day some reports made by Commander Gordon, who was instructed to make the survey he did for the purpose, I believe, simply of pleasing the people of Manitoba and the North-West; but the Government did not go into the matter as if they wished to obtain the most favourable report regarding the project. I believe they desired to have such a report made as would discredit the scheme rather than one favourable to it. They sent out to Hudson Bay an exploring vessel which was nothing more nor less than a sailing vessel, the *Alert*.

Mr. SPOHN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The *Alert* is a steamer.

Mr. WATSON. The *Alert* is a sailing vessel with a 50-horse power engine in it. It was stated by the hon. Minister of Finance, who I do not think knew what he was talking about, that it could be worked up to 150-horse power, but if that were done it would burst the boiler. I would ask any gentleman familiar with the matter if he thinks that a vessel with a horse power equal to what is