

appear that they have made any very careful analysis of the route, or that they know exactly where it is going to go. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) states that one of these projected lines will serve a population—he did not say how much, perhaps the Minister can tell me; but the other, he says, will serve no population at all. Now, a colonization road which may go through the country entirely uninhabited is not a matter of urgency for us to consider.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of the Interior has already mentioned that the Government will see that the money is not granted to the company unless the road is located where they may desire, and yet he begins by saying that either of the two lines may be taken that are projected. Now, I do not think there is any rule better established than this one: that the one thing over which the House of Commons ought to exercise control is the appropriation of public money. We do not delegate to the Government our right to judge of the propriety or fitness of an appropriation, and it is not for the Government to give the House an intellectual holiday and to assume the responsibility on its behalf of locating this road after the appropriation is made. It is the business of the House to see that the road is located on a line where they think it will justify the appropriation asked for, if any location can justify such an appropriation. But what the Minister is asking the House to do, is to vote this money without knowing anything about the location of the road, whether it is to be located where there are settlers or where there are none, where it is possible that settlers may not be able to go, in a very narrow district hemmed in by water on both sides. Now, I say this is a matter that the House must judge for itself and cannot shift the responsibility from its own shoulders to the shoulders of the Administration.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think that point is well taken. I think it is a safe rule that we should not hand over to the Government the control of money that belongs to the people until we know how that money is to be expended. I do not see myself where the urgency is in this matter, as the money is not to be paid over until the road is built, and the road is not likely to be built before the end of the session. Then, over and beyond the question of building this road, there are many matters to be considered before we grant the money for the construction of this road. If the Government say that all the land in the North-West that is open for settlement has been sold, that all the land that lies along the railway has been sold and is now occupied, that, in my opinion, would be a cause of urgency. If the land is not all settled even where they have railway facilities already provided at an enormous cost by the people of this country, then I consider there is no urgency. One of the great difficulties in the settlement of the North-West that has been complained of by people who go there, is the distance that settlers live apart. It is desirable in the interest of settlement that we should get the settlers to live close together, as a matter of protection, as a matter of improvement and progress in the different communities. Now, if we open up a new settlement, open up other lands, we will tend still further to increase the evil that has been complained of all along in the settlement of Manitoba. We know that in many counties in Ontario

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

where they have built their own railways with their own money without being aided in a single dollar by this Government, the people of those counties will have reason to complain of the conduct of this Government in aiding railways in localities where settlement is not demanded, when the Government have any amount of land now unoccupied, and yet possessing railway facilities. I think those counties that have built their own roads will have great cause to complain of the grant to this railway for so many years. I do not know how the Government can justify to this House or to the people of this country the granting of this \$80,000 for twenty years for this railway, to open up a new settlement, which must be a sparse settlement, in the North-West, when they neglect to refund any portion of the money that has been given by many counties in the Province of Ontario, the population of which, in some cases, are justly entitled to a refund of some portion of the money they have paid. I am one of those who believed, and I still believe, and I know it was the belief of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that it would retard the settlement of the North-West if the Canadian Pacific Railway was built too rapidly. If that railway had been built more slowly, the people employed in its construction would have acquired lands and settled in the country; but the rapidity with which the work was prosecuted caused the contractors to employ men from the United States, Norway, Sweden, China, and elsewhere, and they never became permanent settlers on the land. Now we have the fact that the general settlement of Manitoba and the North-West has not progressed as rapidly as we would have desired, especially in view of the large amount of money expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we are glad is now built and is completed as a substantial road. We believe that if much more land is opened for settlement and more railways are aided, settlement will be diverted, and we will not be doing as much good as we think we are doing. The Government should consider well before they grant this aid, and they should especially consider the claims of the people in other portions of the country for the refund of money already expended on railway construction.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I desire to offer a few words in reply to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman mentioned that he could not see the urgency of this Bill being proceeded with now, and he had not been able to see the arguments for it. I stated some time ago that English capitalists were here and expected to sail by a certain steamer which would leave in a few days, and I was anxious on that account, as some of the promoters of the undertaking wished to accompany them, that the measure should be pushed forward. There was also the additional reason that the financial season was about closing in England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has closed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is one of the explanations I desire to offer. There is another in regard to the debate that has taken place on the Hudson's Bay scheme. If the hon. gentleman had heard what I said when I brought the Bill before the House, he would know it was not my wish and my consent that the debate took the turn it did. I read what the terms were on which we proposed