

(b) From a point on Nipigon bay of Lake Superior to a point on the west of Lake Helen on the line of the Nipigon Railway, not exceeding $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

(c) From a point on the line of the Nipigon Railway at or near the crossing of the Fraser river, to a point on Lake Jesse, by way of Cameron's Falls, not exceeding $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

(d) From a point on the north shore of Lake Nipigon northerly, not exceeding 45 miles.

The said subsidies to the said line being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 34 of 1904, section 2, item 3, not exceeding in the whole 80 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation as to this?

Mr. EMMERSON. These lines were first subsidized in 1903 and renewed in 1904. A deputation waited on me recently to urge the building of some particular portions of these lines, utilizing the Lake Nipigon navigation. They design to reach the National Transcontinental.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it the fish company?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know the name of any company in connection with it; it was a delegation from the people.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Are these Clergue lines?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. They are desirous of making a start so as to reach the transcontinental speedily and they represent that it would lessen the cost of constructing that railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The object was to give the people living at the terminals and along the line speedy connection with the National Transcontinental. That was the object when the subsidy was first given but the transcontinental will likely be built before these lines are commenced.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a celebrated fish company up there and I thought the object of this line was to enable them to get out their fish from Lake Nipigon. Another ostensible reason is that this line might reach the transcontinental, but the sum and substance of it is the whole company is the celebrated James Connée, and he was no doubt the deputation that visited the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can assure my hon. friend that it was the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Connée) who introduced the delegation.

Mr. SPROULE. I would naturally expect that. If it is in the interest of the people of his riding I certainly would not oppose this railway, but if it is only in the interest of the corporation in which he has virtually the whole interests himself then it is quite a different thing. When I was up in that country I was told that this company practically controlled the fishing industry there, and a great deal of the mining

Mr. EMMERSON

interests, and a good many of the water-powers and about everything else in sight, and now they want the government to give them a subsidy to build a line of railway into their own property. What evidence has the Minister of Railways that this line will be built?

Mr. CALVERT. If it is not built we will not pay the money.

Mr. SPROULE. Don't you think it is a proper thing to ask if there is any reasonable hope that this line will be built, and if there is not such hope don't you think it wise to save the money for the people and also to economize the time of this House.

Mr. PATERSON. You can do that.

Mr. EMMERSON. The only assurance the government can get in these matters is that of the men who are actively promoting the work. I assume if the conditions there necessitate a railway they would justify construction of a railway, and I assume that the financing of railways is not an easy matter just now. We know that if we allow the subsidy to lapse hope is gone to them, the people in that section cannot expect that anything will be accomplished, but so far as any assistance can be given them by way of subsidy it should surely be given.

Mr. SPROULE. The difficulty with the minister is that he commences from a wrong premise with regard to the bonusing entirely. Originally when the subsidy system was commenced by the Canadian parliament it was the aim of the government, where a company or individual could satisfy the government that they had financial arrangements made whereby, with the aid of the subsidy from the government, they could go on and construct the road, or in other words that there was a financial nucleus already and they only required sufficient aid to enable them to complete their road. But the Minister of Railways seems to argue from the standpoint that the subsidy is required as a financial nucleus around which to build a financial scheme sufficient to complete the undertaking.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid the doctrine of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is altogether too broad. There are cases where a section of the country has been unprovided with railways. The people have agitated for a railway. Although there is no company in sight, no financial basis as my hon. friend says, the fact remains that a section of the country is without railway accommodation. The people want accommodation such as is enjoyed by other sections of the country, and it may be that the first step in obtaining that railway accommodation would be the granting of this subsidy even although there is no company in sight at the moment. I think the con-