

voted \$1,500,000. How was it voted? Only to be paid when the road is constructed, and not one cent before. The resolution before the Committee proposes that \$80,000 a year for twenty years shall be paid for certain services to be performed when the road is constructed. I submit that if the enterprise is not a proper one, and is not likely to pay, this grant will deceive people in the money markets of the world. It will go far to enable those floating the scheme to put the bonds on the market, and the unfortunate men who put money into the enterprise will suffer serious loss. The question for the Committee and the House to determine is, whether it is a feasible scheme, and one likely to succeed as a commercial undertaking and pay a fair return to bondholders. Let hon. gentlemen bear in mind that this is a part of the great Hudson Bay Railway scheme. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) has quoted from the report of the expedition sent by the authority of Parliament to report on the feasibility of the scheme. We have also other reports, which declare, in a most unmistakable manner, that as a commercial route for the carriage of produce between Manitoba and Great Britain, this route is utterly impracticable. And yet, Sir, we are asked again, by the resolution now before us, to give the sanction of this House to a scheme to lead the moneyed men of the old country into a trap to invest their money in a wild-cat scheme. This railroad is one of two things: it is either part of the Hudson Bay Railway, pure and simple, intended for the purpose of through traffic, or else it is a colonization road. If it is simply a part of the Hudson Bay Railway, I think I have said enough, and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) has said enough, to show that the road is impracticable, and that it would be worse than money thrown away to invest anything in it. Worse still, the honour of the country would be involved by encouraging the financiers of the old country to invest their funds in a wild-cat scheme. I know that in the map laid on the Table of this House we have what is called an alternative route. I submit to this Committee, and I want it to be particularly noticed, that according to all the information we have, the line of the Hudson Bay Railway, as originally surveyed and as shown on that map, is not a colonization road; that it runs through a country which has no necessity for a railway and which is not fit for farming, and that there will be no traffic upon it unless it is traffic through to the Hudson Bay. Therefore, as originally surveyed, the railway is not in any sense of the word a colonization road, nor is it in any way calculated to settle up the waste lands of Manitoba and the North-West. It is of no practical use whatever except as a through line to the Hudson Bay. As I have said, they show an alternative line on the map. The original line runs between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, but the alternative line crosses over the narrows in the middle of Lake Winnipeg and runs on the east side of Lake Dauphin. It is patent to every one in this chamber that the great object of the nations of the world who are making any efforts in this direction is to shorten the lines of communication. The route from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay is a very circuitous route, and if the railway runs to Port Nelson it very much resembles a half moon, and the more circuitous the line the less chance there is of paying, and that the alternative line greatly in-

creases the length of the road by still further deflecting from a straight line. I have only to point to the Intercolonial Railway, as an example, to show that the long circuitous route by which it was built has precluded for all time the possibility of it becoming a paying investment, and has made it a burden of half a million dollars per year or more on the people of this country for all future generations. Let me draw the attention of the House to the fact that the survey as originally made is very circuitous, if you run to Port Nelson, which my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) points out as the objective point on the Hudson Bay, which is the nearest port they can get to. When those explorers were sent out they reported that there was 27 miles of a shifting sand roadway which is constantly fluctuating from the mouth of the river until you get to the clear water out of Port Nelson, and that the only practical harbour on the Hudson Bay is one at the mouth of the Churchill River, which greatly increases the length of the road. Another word about this route as a colonization road. I submit that it is not in the proper place for a colonization road at all; there was such a railway charter asked for here last session and it was refused because it was going to interfere with the Hudson Bay Railway line. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) last year asked a charter for a line starting from Portage la Prairie and running by Lake Dauphin; and I may tell the Committee, from reliable information which I have, that there is a splendid farming country in Lake Dauphin district. This road when it crosses the Narrows gets into good land and runs east of Lake Dauphin, but I submit that it is about 100 miles too long. Somebody may say that it was none of our business how long it was, but I contend that it is our business, because we have given 6,400 acres of land per mile, and every mile extra is just so much out of the property of the country. If you are going to build a colonization road, the proper place is where the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) asked a charter to build it last year; or better still, and I tell the House there is a still better route, if you run a line from Gladstone, Nupawa or Minnedosa right up into the very country which is going to be served by this long railway, you will save 6,400 acres of land per mile for every mile you cut off, and instead of a road 200 or 300 miles long one within 100 miles long will serve the whole purpose. The attention of the House has been called to the fact that the period of navigation is so short in the Hudson Bay that it utterly precludes it from being a safe route for carrying grain to Great Britain, and that fact being established beyond the possibility of dispute, as shown by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), you can never by that route take the year's crop out in the year it is raised. This, as the hon. gentleman showed so forcibly, is a very important consideration in this matter, for if you can bring the crop down by the present route or take it by any other way to the market, you have a chance to sell at any time of the year, but if you take the crop by the Hudson Bay route you cannot get it to the British market before August or September of the next year. All these things considered, I appeal to the Committee to pause before launching themselves upon a scheme of this kind. I believe it will pay those who constructed and pro-