

we shall require great quantities of steel. This is called the steel age, and in the construction of our buildings and bridges and other works of development, including railways, we shall require no doubt immense quantities of that product. Is it not very advisable, therefore, that ships should come direct from the steel plants in Sydney, laden with their products, and discharge in Fort Churchill, which is but a few hundred miles away from the centre of the Northwest Territories? Not only does this apply to steel but to all those other products which are placed upon the market by our fellow citizens in Nova Scotia, Cape Breton or even Prince Edward Island. Take, for instance, fish and other products raised in these provinces, they could be laid down at Fort Churchill very cheaply and in that way help not only the west but the east.

I now come to deal for a few minutes with the question of who should pay for the Hudson Bay Railway. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) seemed to lay it down as a foregone conclusion, that the money should not come out of the exchequer of Canada. I wish to be the last to raise the question of the east against the west or the west against the east. There is no profit in that kind of discussion, but I would be wanting in my duty to my constituents, if I did not say very frankly that, in my humble opinion, the people of the west are contributing very much to the exchequer of the Dominion and are not receiving one scintilla of profit in return except what they get back in the shape of expended revenue. It would not be unreasonable therefore to ask our friends in the east to seriously consider this question, whether it would not, in some way, tend to equalize the burdens of this nation we are trying together to build up if a return were made to the west by undertaking some great national enterprise such as this. It is very seldom that this matter is touched upon in this House, but this afternoon I am going to speak for a moment or two frankly along that line. When I spoke last session on the subject of the Hudson Bay Railway, I said that we of the west were willing to pay a certain amount of revenue and, incidentally—as there is no use denying—a certain amount of protection, that we might help our sister provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and the rest to develop their resources and build up their industries to the end that we might, together, eventually make a great nation in Canada. But I wish to recall what this House does not often hear, and that is that we are agriculturists, and while there are many agriculturists in Ontario and Quebec and the other older provinces, yet our people do not profit from the building up of manufacturing centres as do the agriculturists in the eastern provinces. The agriculturist in Ontario may find the burden of the tariff bear somewhat

Mr. KNOWLES.

heavily upon him as a consumer, but he always has the consoling thought that he is building up at his very doors, a great market—in Toronto it may be, London, or Hamilton, or Halifax, or Sydney, or Quebec or Montreal—building up a great market to which he may bring his produce. But there is no such consolation for us, there is no such compensation for us. We have to find our market on Liverpool prices, and anything that we contribute for the building up of Canada—I want to say here and I say it without fear of contradiction—we are paying for the purpose of building up the nation and there is no selfish advantage whatever. In view of that fact, would it be a very unreasonable principle to lay down, that, in the administration of the affairs of this country, the west should be more generously dealt with than she is, and that in the administration of the affairs of the country there should be a freer hand in dealing with the west because she has no such compensation as that of which I have spoken in the case of the people who live in the east? Of course this is not necessarily to be applied toward the building of the Hudson Bay Railway, but I contend that it is not an unreasonable principle to lay down.

My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) suggests—and I confess that I have nearly made up my mind that there is something in the idea—that the Hudson Bay Railway is not to be built out of the exchequer of Canada. The hon. gentleman suggests an arrangement which he outlined. He said: Let us keep one-tenth of the lands and wait until they are worth \$10 and \$12 an acre, and then sell them and reimburse the exchequer of Canada for the cost of building the road. To me it is a very unwelcome task to differ from such an eminent and hon. gentleman as the member from Brandon; still, in my humble way, I do differ from the position he laid down, and I will tell you why. For one thing, I am against tying up ten per cent of the land. We have had such a curse upon us from tying up lands for the Canadian Pacific Railway that not ten per cent, or even one per cent, would I favour tying up for the days to come. I can show you school districts, Mr. Speaker, that have to close the doors of their schools and could not educate their children because of the tying up the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway as these lands could not be taxed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) went further, and took advantage of the opportunity to say that, in his opinion, the odd-numbered sections which had been tied up as being in the railway belt, should be thrown open for settlement without the pre-emption. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in his expression of opinion on that point either. The government has already announced itself—the announcement having been made last session that it was in