

personal favour to his own constituency in the shape of a repayment of the moneys voted by those municipalities, or simply because he wants to develop some of the remote ports in the older provinces of Canada, then I say to the hon. gentlemen sitting on your left. Good-bye for ever to support from the North-West. I only returned to-day from Prince Albert, and when I was up there some of my fiercest opponents during the last campaign said to me: Well, the Conservative party has certainly done one good thing for the Dominion." I asked them what that was. They said: "Why, they have passed the resolution granting aid to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company." I said: "Well, but wait a little, the Grits are going to oppose that:" and they answered me: "Oh, send them up here and we will strangle them." It is a pity they were not strangled on the 5th of March, for then there would be no difficulty, and the Hudson's Bay Railway would become an accomplished fact. It is all very well for hon. members to laugh at this statement, but I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that although hon. gentlemen on your left may take pleasure in deriding the honest aspirations of the hard-working toilers of the western country, the people of the North-West are able to estimate at their true value every word that is uttered by those hon. gentlemen in this House. I shall have the greatest pleasure, for one, in sending hundreds of copies of the hon. gentleman's speech throughout that western territory in order that the people may understand what one of the most influential members of the Grit party thinks about the development of that country.

Mr. WATSON. At the present stage of the debate I did not intend to say anything further on this subject, having expressed my opinion upon it when the resolution was before the House a few days ago. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has taken the wisest course to obtain the favour of the House in support of the Bill now before us. He says that the people of the North-West can never look to the Liberal party in the House of Commons for any favour on behalf of that country. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who was the party that in days gone by have stood up for the rights and interests of the North-West?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The Conservatives.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has demanded that the petitions of the people of the North-West should receive consideration at the hands of this House? I would like to ask him who has advocated the principle that the Government of the day should grant the concessions asked for by the North-West Council, which body, I suppose, he will admit represents the people of the North-West? I should like to ask the hon. gentleman who has advocated the demands of the Province of Manitoba? None but the Liberal party. I asked who, when the Government voted large subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway, demanded that the principal portion of that money should be spent on constructing lines of railway in Manitoba and the North-West Territories? The Liberal party did so against the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. While the people of the North-West were being kept down by the monopoly granted by hon. members opposite to the Canadian Pacific Railway, who advocated the doing away of that monopoly?

None but the Liberals on this side of the House, and it was not until the Government were forced --I say, advisedly forced--to yield to the demands of the people of Manitoba and the North-West, that the Government gave a guarantee of \$15,000,000 in consideration of the abolition of that monopoly. In regard to the grant given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for doing away with that monopoly, the members of this side of the House felt that Manitoba had been unjustly placed at a disadvantage in regard to railway construction within the province by the disallowance of her railway Acts. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) voted on that occasion in favour of that grant, and by that vote he did more for the people of the North-West than the hon. gentleman opposite has done by his speech to-day. The people of the North-West, I consider, have not fully appreciated the policy which has been advocated by hon. members on this side of the House. We may be told that public questions have been submitted to the people, and that only one member of the Opposition has been returned, and he by a narrow majority. Let me say that if the ballot was extended to the North-West there would be a different result; and if that occurred, the hon. representative from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) would not be here to speak as he has spoken to-day. I hope the present Bill will pass, and it has my support. No doubt there are differences of opinion on this side of the House as to this scheme. I hold, however, it is as much entitled, if not more entitled, to this aid than are many other roads in the Dominion. As I have stated on a previous occasion, the Government have seen fit to grant a bonus to the Calgary and Edmonton equal to this amount, and to the Long Lake road \$80,000 a year for 20 years on the same conditions and terms, and as we hope this road will be continued to Hudson's Bay, there is strong reason for giving it greater assistance than has been granted to the small roads running from Calgary to Edmonton and from Regina to Prince Albert. For this reason, I am in favour of the measure before the House. So far as the navigation of Hudson's Straits is concerned, it is a matter of no interest to this House. I consider that this railway is as much and more entitled to the assistance asked than were other roads which have been bonussed, and which may more appropriately be called wild-cat schemes. As a member of the Liberal party, I consider that our party has done more in advocating the interests of Manitoba and the North-West than gentlemen on the other side can claim credit for doing. They have done much by their votes in this Parliament, and by their criticisms the people of the North-West have attained greater liberties and privileges than they would have received if hon. gentlemen opposite had had all to do with the matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not yield on questions affecting the North-West until they were forced to do so by the advocacy of the Opposition and by petitions sent from the North-West and Manitoba, setting out what legislation was required by that country. As a supporter of the scheme under consideration, I hope no hon. member from the North-West will make such foolish remarks as were made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan on this matter.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I rise to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman does not come from this