

us some slight view of the question, but we do not know its value or its dimensions, or what it is. We know this, that it occasioned a convulsion in the Cabinet. That it occasioned that delay by which no member of the Cabinet was able to announce definitely what the policy of the government was to be, but evidently the plunge has been taken. Something has been resolved upon, but I will say this, that if my hon. friend the leader of the government cannot come before the Senate, and the other members of the government cannot come before the other branch of parliament without some definite stipulation, or some guarantee that if we part with the material resources of this country in giving a money grant and cast aside for ever the hope of building our own navy or constructing our own ships, of defending our own shores—if we have not these substantial guarantees and stipulation that the augmented force shall be used, if necessary, for the defence of our own country we ought to say, and back up the hon. gentleman in saying—and if he will not say it, say it ourselves—in the language of the immortal Pinckney, 'Millions for defence, but not one cent for tribute.'

I may be pardoned again for making a brief allusion to the subject of the representation of the new provinces in the Senate. We ought not to be restricted by the letter of the Act. Fair play, good government, the wants of the people ought to be respected and that which is above statutes, that which is above the legislation of any Act is that the people should be represented. That is a principle beyond and above all Acts of any parliament, and if you give those provinces a partial representation in this House and withhold from them the substantial representation in the House where money is voted and which governs the country, you deprive them of their rights as British subjects and you strike a blow at representative government which may redound throughout all the other provinces and inflict a lasting wound in the minds of those people who are grudgingly accorded their rights at the last moment when those rights were withheld from them so long as the power existed of withholding them.

Hon. Mr. ROCHE.

My hon. friend from DeLorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) yesterday gave us a very glowing account of the possibilities and capabilities of the Hudson Bay route. I hope that all those sanguine expectations will be realized and that Montreal, Quebec and other cities of Canada will benefit by the construction of the Hudson Bay railway and the navigation of the bay. Both parties are committed to the project. It will cost a large amount of money. It would be deplorable if the results did not correspond to the expenditure, but I would remind the House that the bay is navigable for only two months of the year. It is only navigable during those months by specially constructed ships, and not the ordinary ships, and that will make the transportation of goods by that route more costly. During those two months of the year the St. Lawrence and all other routes are open, and I fear—I hope my fears will not be realized—that the Hudson Bay railway will involve a large expenditure of money with a correspondingly small amount of benefit in return.

I do not think I should pass away from the speech without alluding to one or two topics referred to in the very interesting address of my hon. friend who seconded the motion, because he has brought to us new experiences and some experiences which apply to territory of which he now is a denizen, but which are not entirely new in some aspects. I think the same complaint that he made is contained in the Assyrian rolls discovered in Babylon, and certainly in some of the manuscripts dug up in Egypt, and that is the scarcity of money in a new country and the inability of agriculturists and others to get from the hard fisted bankers such money as would make them comfortable. My hon. friend will pardon me if I suggest to him that banks are institutions of a peculiar character. They must not have the element of entering into the speculations of the people. What they invest money upon must be good and valid security and that security must be fortified to a large extent so that no risk will be incurred by the bank. My hon. friend looks on a bank as an institution. Possibly if he gives it any personality he looks upon the manager as the bank, or