

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I wish to correct one statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He says the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) made the remark that this road could not ship out grain during the season in which it was grown, and therefore he opposed it. Now, that was not the expression of the member for Selkirk. What the member for Selkirk said was, as I understood him, that even by our present route *via* Lake Superior the bulk of our grain could not be shipped out in the year in which it was grown, and that *via* the Hudson Bay route, if we could not do any better, we could at least do that much. The hon. member for Selkirk and myself both think that we can ship out more grain in the season in which wheat is grown by the Hudson Bay route than we can at present *via* Lake Superior and Lake Huron.

Mr. DALY. I suppose a word of explanation from me is necessary. I do not suppose this matter would have obtained any prominence were it not for the remarks of the hon. and clever gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson), and if he had not the mind of a child he would have understood exactly what I said. I read from a pamphlet, quotation after quotation, showing the months within which the Straits were navigable, that is, from June to December. What I said with reference to wheat going out—and I want the statesman from North Wellington to bear this in mind, although I may not have explained myself as fully as I might have done—was that the bulk of the grain from Manitoba and the North-West would be stored, just as the bulk of the grain from the North-Western States is stored to-day at Duluth. We know that at Duluth there are fourteen or fifteen million bushels of wheat stored during the winter season. What I undertook to say, and what I say now, is that the bulk of the threshing in Manitoba is done in and after October; though there is threshing done in September, and there is a large amount of grain shipped in September by the lakes to Eastern Ontario and Quebec to be ground into flour for the people of the eastern provinces; but the bulk of the wheat of Manitoba is bought after the period at which navigation closes. It is true that in certain portions of Manitoba where grain ripens more rapidly than in others, people endeavour to get their grain to market earlier, in order to get the advantage of low freight rates by water, but the bulk of our wheat at present has got to lie in elevators until navigation is opened in the spring. There is a quantity of wheat shipped during the winter *via* Boston on the all-rail route, but only a small quantity. The evidence I have adduced to the House shows conclusively that if this Hudson Bay route is navigable between June and December we can, if there is grain threshed, as I admit there is, in September, earlier get the benefit of the Liverpool market. But it is a matter of perfect indifference to the farmer. It is not the farmer who will have grain stored in the elevators at Fort Churchill or other points on Hudson Bay, as at the present time thousands of bushels of grain are held every year by buyers at the elevators at Port Arthur after the cash is paid over. If this is the only argument against the Bill I do not think it will affect the question before the House.

Mr. WATSON. As explanations are in order, I desire to offer one, especially as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN.

man who has just taken his seat has been allowed a second speech. The hon. member for Selkirk said that if I had the mind of a child I might understand what he said. I admit that if I had the mind of a child I might understand what he said, but as I have a mature mind it is very hard to understand what he meant to say, when he said exactly the contrary.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not altogether surprised at the opposition which has suddenly arisen against the resolution, because it is quite in harmony with the pessimistic policy usually displayed by hon. members opposite respecting the development of this country. Their ideas rarely extend beyond their own limited localities, and if they succeed in convincing their constituents that every dollar should come there they have accomplished a great deal, for beyond that they have no higher aim. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has reminded the members from Western Ontario that they will be called to account for this vote, and he said he proposed to divide the House on it, and he declared that not one dollar should be spent in that country for railway schemes until Ontario was recouped her outlay for railways in the past. The people of Ontario occupy a very different position from these people in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman's constituents have railways all round them to-day, and are in a very different position from the western people, who have to struggle with the difficulties of life and have not the comforts to be found in the older settlements. The hon. gentleman spoke as if we would be rolling up some large debt to the Dominion by carrying out this, which he designated as a wild-cat scheme. I wonder what he understands by this term? I presume he means an impracticable scheme, the scheme of a railway going into an inhospitable country where settlement was never likely to take place, and for the reason that they would be unable to raise crops from their labour there would be no use for railways. Regarding the practicability of navigating Hudson Bay, I need say but little. But I hold different views from those who declare this region is an inhospitable one and will grow nothing. In 1883 I brought down to Ontario potatoes raised at Fort York and Fort Churchill, and on the shores of Hudson Bay, weighing two pounds and two and a-quarter each. I was assured by a person who grew them that not only would potatoes grow there, but small fruits and other vegetables would grow to maturity as well as in any part of Ontario. If this is the case, and this is a fact beyond dispute, it is a guarantee that this is not an inhospitable region, and that it is only a matter of time when it must be settled by people who will come from Ontario and other parts of the country. But the question is this: Does this involve any divergence from the policy of years past? What has been the policy of this Government? It has been to throw as rapidly as possible colonization railways into different unsettled parts of the country. In many sections of the North-West people from Ontario and foreigners have been struggling hard with the difficulties of life, and railway communication is an important factor in enabling them to cope with those difficulties. In the prairie country the railways are even more needed than in the wooded district. This is no divergence from the principle we have adopted and followed for