

We need to rise to that viewpoint at this present time and realize that we are not hurting any other part of Canada, but only giving its just due to that part which possesses this great outlet. I think it is a significant fact of history that the man, Sir Henry Hudson, who gave his name to the great bay on which the port of Nelson lies also gave his name to the river in the republic to the south of us, which has the second greatest city in the world and one of the greatest ports of the world, and I, Sir, am one of those like the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) who preceded me in this debate, who having read our great explorer Stefansson have become enthused with some of his sentiments, and I endorse his statement that the trend of Empire is northward, and if already a great city and a great port is on the river bearing the name of Hudson, there also will be, and I hope in my time and your time, Mr. Speaker, a great city and a great port on the bay which also bears his name.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): I really do not know that I can add anything to this debate, no matter on which side of it I talk. One of the difficulties with which we are confronted is that our numbers are so few and our needs so many. We are heavily taxed—at least, we say we are, though I submit that we have a good deal to learn about taxation compared with many other countries.

Let me approach this question not from the east or from the west, but by keeping in the middle of the road. As a matter of fact, we will never get anywhere as a nation if we cannot get close enough together to talk about Canada as a whole, and not of one particular part of it. Sometimes it is difficult to adhere to that plan of argument, but we ought to let it go through the world that we are united for the welfare of the whole country, and that whatever is best for all Canada is what we are after. I will go further than that and say that generally speaking, although there may be exceptions, what is good for any part is good for the whole.

This resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Knox) calls for two things:

That in the opinion of this House, the government of Canada give further consideration to the report of the Senate committee on the Hudson bay railway with a view to safeguarding the investment of public moneys made in the construction of that portion of the work completed to date—

And secondly:

—that the government recognize the priority of this undertaking with reference to other transportation projects started subsequent to the Hudson bay railway.

I do not know to what projects my hon. friend would refer, but this I do know, that hon. gentlemen who insist that this situation has not anything to do with branch line construction have my sympathy, because we are discussing the Hudson bay route without any reference to branch line policy. The only connection there can be between the two is this, that it takes money to build either or both. In securing grants from our Finance Minister we can go to a certain limit and no further, and we all agree that we are going a long way towards getting at our own pockets in our taxation.

It is a difficult situation with which we are confronted, and particularly do I find it a difficult one. I am asked for the time being at least, to sponsor in this House the Canadian National Railways. The majority of parliament at least are in favour of giving the Canadian National Railways a chance. Now, with no special reference to the Hudson bay project, some things are suggested to me that will not help give the Canadian National Railways a fair chance. Our whole question of transportation is a bit difficult so far as expansion is concerned, and just at this point let me give expression to an opinion of my own. It is this, that in inaugurating transportation projects, two things might be kept in view, and in some cases only one. The government of a country owes it to the people of that country to supply them so far as possible with the means of making their calling a success. It cannot do it altogether, because there are some people you cannot make successful. Providence did not start them out right, or if so, they spoiled themselves. But so far as a government can, it ought to use its best endeavours to make a success of their occupations. That might mean, and I want to call the attention of the House as representing all Canada to this, that the government would be called on to construct railways that would not and could not pay their way for years, but it might at the same time be in the interest of all Canada that certain parts of the country should be developed and certain people given an opportunity to make a livelihood. In that connection the opinion I want to express is this, that parliament ought not to ask the Canadian National Railways to accept the responsibility for deficits that must ensue for years, but if we know that certain projects are necessary and wise and in the interests of all Canada, then the parliament of all Canada ought to accept the responsibility for the construction of those projects and the meeting of their deficits, and not