

Then why introduce it? I have not heard any other member speak along this line, but I thought from the very first minute I saw that passage in the Speech from the Throne that it was rather anomalous to include it there.

Now, I have an open mind with regard to the completion of the Hudson Bay railway. I do not believe it will ever be any use for the transportation of grain; but I am prepared to accept any reasonable arguments that may be submitted in support of the completion of the railway for the development of the country tributary to it. That is a different proposition altogether. And I do not mean to say that the amount of money that is proposed to be expended on the completion of the line is exorbitant or extravagant in relation to the resources of that northern country, for I would not venture, from my own knowledge of these outlying places in the Dominion, to guess either the extent or nature of the local natural resources that would amply repay completion of the road. All I desire in this regard is to remind members from the province of Ontario of what happened when the provincial government started to build the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario line into northern Ontario. I understand that the primary purpose was to develop agricultural land in that territory. But the contractors stumbled on a rich mine—that is just about it—and the silver and gold-mining industry that developed later amply repaid the province for all the expenditure on that railway. I would not venture the suggestion that there were not equally as good possibilities in the Hudson Bay territory, because I have seen a whole lot of those great open spaces of the west, and you can never tell what they are worth until you examine them. But is the Hudson Bay railway the only railway question that is vexing the people of this Dominion, even admitting that it is proper to mention it in the Speech from the Throne? I do not think so. I have heard a lot since I have been in this House about the railway troubles of the Maritime provinces, and I must say it seems to me they have a legitimate ground for complaint down in that part of the country; they have a railway situation there of some magnitude. Then why not mention the railway grievances of the Maritime provinces in the Speech from the Throne, as well as the Hudson Bay railway? I have brought up this subject particularly for the purpose of pointing out that British Columbia has also a very important railway question on its hands, and British Columbia needs assistance from the Dominion government in order to solve its problem.

British Columbia's railway problem concerns very materially the province of Alberta also. The Peace River and Alberta railway situation comes down to this: the Peace river people are looking for a western outlet. Look at any map you like, and you will find that the only way in which the products of the Peace river country can be got to their natural market is through British Columbia. There is no use talking about taking those products down to Edmonton or through Alberta or anywhere else. British Columbia is the only way. I should like to refer to a statement in this connection made in the House by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy). At page 541 of Hansard he says:

Including Pouce Coupe and the Canadian National lines there was \$427,800 worth of creamery butter produced north of Edmonton last year.

I have every respect for the intelligence of the hon. member for Peace River, and I do not think he ever intended to make a statement of that kind at all, for as a matter of fact there is not a single mile of Canadian National railway operated north of Edmonton. The hon. member must have meant the Canadian Pacific railway. We have the Canadian Pacific railway operating in that northern territory the Edmonton and Dunvegan railway. That road was originally planned to provide a proper outlet for the products of the Peace river country by way of our road in British Columbia, the Pacific Great Eastern, but unfortunately, owing to the financial condition during and following the war, the connecting up of these two lines has been delayed. But the point I want to make is this: If it is proper to mention

4 p.m. the Hudson Bay railway in the

Speech from the Throne, the railway problem of the Maritime provinces should also be mentioned, as well as the railway problem we have in Alberta and British Columbia of connecting up the Peace river country with the coast.

During the last election campaign the Prime Minister said that he was going to direct the spearhead of immigration to the Peace River country. Now if the spearhead of immigration was going to be directed to the Peace river country during the election campaign, why is there no mention made in the Speech from the Throne of the necessity for an outlet for the Peace river country?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is the comparison the hon. member is making fair? The money for the Hudson Bay railway has already been provided by the sale of western lands.