

which I might classify—according to the description given of the Hudson Bay road by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly)—as a colonization road. The hon. member claims that the proposed grant should be made to the Hudson Bay Railway, on the ground of its being a colonization road, which will open up new lands to settlement, as well as valuable timber limits and mill sites. If that is a valid argument for a grant of \$80,000 a year for twenty years to this railway, with how much greater reason can we, in Queen's and Shelburne, ask for a subsidy for the 45 or 47 miles of our railway which are yet unsubsidized, on the basis that our railway is a colonization road? Because the construction of our line will have the effect of opening up large timber limits and great powerful mill sites, and bringing people engaged in the lumber business nearer to the centres of trade. If that is a good argument why we should support the proposed subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railway, I say on the same ground that \$20,000 a year for twenty years, or even \$10,000 a year for twenty years, would give us a sufficient sum of money, if capitalised, to build our railway. If it can be fairly urged that Parliament is pledged to this scheme on the ground that a resolution in favour of it has already been accepted by the House, I say that we are equally entitled to a grant on the ground that Parliament has already agreed to the principle of the railway in the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne. From the peculiar nature of this proposition I feel myself bound to oppose it, though not on the ground taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who oppose a general distribution of public moneys for railways on the ground that the public debt of Canada is too large. I look at the matter in a different light altogether. I hold that the public debt of Canada, if incurred for public works, is properly incurred by the Government of the day; but it behoves the Government as trustees of that fund to consider wisely whether they are going to support a measure like this, which is so fraught with danger to the investors of capital, which is loaded with visions of profit having no practical foundation, that it is likely to reflect on the credit of the country and embarrass the promoters of future schemes of utility in this country. I can understand the hon. members for Selkirk, Lisgar and Marquette supporting this measure, because the railway is designed, as we might say in vulgar phrase, to go right past their barn doors, and interests their constituencies. In so far as it assists in developing and expanding north-western Canada, I am in favour of the scheme. In so far as it does assist in developing the North-West, I am in favour of a grant; but, I say, as it stands to-day, it is in an incomplete and insufficient condition and not entitled to our support. If the promoters would come in with the resolution asking a grant for a portion of the line, 100 or 200 or possibly 250 miles, on account of colonization, they might expect the support of hon. members on this side; but when they ask our support, on the ground that it is to be extended to a point on Hudson Bay, with the object of carrying the trade of the great North-West through that channel, and when it is shown, conclusively, that such a scheme will not warrant the arguments put forward on its behalf, and that it goes beyond the wants of the country, it is our bounden duty to oppose any

grant. And, therefore, I feel bound to oppose this resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. I need hardly say that I listened with pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, although I cannot agree with his arguments. It is impossible to keep from one's mind the building of the Hudson Bay Railway, and I do not think it would be desirable to do so. The resolution reads as follows:—

"That it is expedient, in order to enable the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company to construct a railway from the city of Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan river," and so on.

So that the resolution itself suggests, and very properly suggests, the time when, instead of having a colonization railway before us from Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan, we shall have the Hudson Bay Railway running right from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay. And not only that, but the map which is on the table and those which have been circulated by the promoters of this scheme contemplate a Hudson Bay Railway, not merely from Winnipeg to some point, either Nelson or Fort Churchill, on the Hudson Bay, but a railway running south-west from the Hudson Bay right into the heart of the territory, and from the North-West Territories right down to the Pacific coast in the United States. Now, if it were only a colonization road I consider that it should still get the support of this House. It goes through a country and into a country that will invite settlement. That portion of the Saskatchewan country which it will open up is known to every one familiar with the North-West as a portion of the North-West that may invite the largest possible amount of settlement. But, Sir, I think that regarded as the herald of a complete Hudson Bay Railway, as the herald, not merely of the Hudson Bay Railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay, but also of a railway that will inevitably be built from Hudson Bay south-west right into the heart of the territory, and running down to the Pacific coast of the United States, it is a still more desirable scheme to support. If the Committee will bear with me for a moment I will point out that if you take a map properly scaled and use a measuring line you will find that the distance from Fort Nelson to San Francisco is precisely the same as from San Francisco to Chicago. There is as much evidence as that picked by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), to show that the Hudson Bay is navigable for four and a-half months in the year. In fact, the Bay is navigable for the whole year; but with regard to those Straits on which the hon. gentleman dwelt at such length, the Straits near Nottingham, there is evidence in the very same documents from which he quoted—the evidence of experts who have made four and five voyages through these Straits—to prove that they are navigable for four and a-half months during the year. The leader of the Opposition, who is an experienced lawyer, knows that if you were to take the report of a case in court, and cull the testimony of a few witnesses, you might prove also almost anything; and if the hon. member for East Simcoe had been as impartial as he was earnest and had given us the evidence of such experts as Professor Bell and some seven or eight others, who had made a voyage through these Straits between the middle of June and the middle of November, he would have found that the evidence