

whether grain goes up or down the grower suffers, for the wheat buyer carries the risk, and, consequently, gives a lower price. Now, grain is being carried from Chicago to New York at this season at 4½ cents per bushel, and from Port Arthur to Duluth and New York at 4½ cents. Two cargoes were shipped in May from Port Arthur to Kingston at 2½ cents, and other cargoes have been shipped at 2¾. It cost to carry grain from Kingston to Montreal from 2 cents to 2½ cents per bushel, and it is being carried this year for 2 cents. Corn is sometimes carried for ¼ of a cent less than wheat. One cargo has been shipped in May from Chicago to Montreal at 4½ cents. Now the grain is shipped from Montreal to Liverpool at 3 cents per bushel, and often less, being carried as ballast in cattle and other ships carrying light freight on deck. The rate of 4½ cents from Chicago to New York is by the Erie Canal *via* Buffalo. Grain has been shipped from Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo at 1½ cents, and these ships get a return cargo of coal. These ships carry grain from Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo and get return cargoes of coal, and the competition is so great on the lakes and will always be so great, that if this scheme which is proposed be ever carried out and grain be carried by it for the producers of the North-West, it will have to be carried for almost nothing and the bondholders must pay part of the running expenses or hand the road over to the Government. If the Hudson Bay Railway be built, it will have to carry grain at such low rates that the investors in the bonds will never see the interest much less their capital. I can assure the House, and I believe every sensible man will agree with me, that no man who invests his money in these bonds, when they are floated on the English market, will ever see his interest much less his principal, and I believe the Government should not allow a scheme like this to be floated in order to take in the English capitalists. We all know that some money will be made out of it. No doubt the builders of the road will make money; no doubt the contractor will make his pile; but God help the poor foolish bondholders. Now, the ships which carry goods from Montreal, New York and Boston must have return cargoes. Grain has been carried for 1 cent a bushel. Hudson Bay ships must be expressly built, will cost more, carry less, and cannot bring any return cargoes to compare with vessels coming to Montreal and Boston, and as they can only make one voyage to Churchill and back, and possibly two under the most favourable circumstances, therefore if they are to pay, which they never will, it will be at the cost of the producers of the grain. At the present time ships of over two thousand tons are passing through the Welland Canal, and when the Sault Canal is completed and the St. Lawrence Canal is enlarged, as should be done, we will have navigation from Montreal direct, and vessels will make through trips from Fort William to Montreal at lower rates. Why do the Government talk of building the Trent Valley Canal, if they intend to build this railway to Hudson Bay? I submit that the Government should be honest with us, and either stop this grant, or go on and build a railway to Hudson Bay, because we know that the promoters of this scheme, when they go to England, will not ask the moneyed men of England to subscribe their capital for the road to Saskatchewan, but to subscribe their capital to build a rail-

road to Hudson Bay; and they will show, backed up by their flowery arguments, that they are bonussed by the Manitoba Government and the Dominion Government. I ask, is it fair to the moneyed men of England to allow this scheme to go in this shape and ask them to advance money? The Trent Valley Canal is a public work, it has occupied a prominent position in this country, and the promised completion has done a good many great services in the past. We generally hear of it sometime before an election, after which it dies out. Now, as far as I am concerned, I believe the Trent Valley Canal is feasible. It can be built for a very small expenditure, and I believe, if it were built, grain vessels, taking grain from Fort William, can be unloaded at the terminus, which fortunately will be in my riding, and the elevation, as all shippers know, will benefit the grain. Then grain can be carried through the Trent Valley Canal as cheaply as through the Erie, and we know that at present grain is carried more cheaply between Chicago and New York than between any other places of like distances and similar situation. I, consequently, submit it is much better for the Government to invest the money in completing the Trent Valley Canal, enlarging the Welland Canal and St. Lawrence Canals, and allow the provinces which have built the Canadian Pacific Railway and have been taxed a large amount of money therefor, to be recouped by building up the cities along the line of the Trent Valley Canal, and along the River St. Lawrence and our lakes, instead of throwing away all this money in the wild scheme of building a railway to Hudson's Bay, which will only allow of one trip a year to England. For the benefit of Manitoba members, I wish to submit that should the Hudson Bay Railroad ever be built it will be of little use to the farmers of that country. Grain in Manitoba—and if I am wrong I ask the hon. members for Marquette or Selkirk to set me right—is cut from the 15th to the 25th of August, and is not shipped until the 15th or 25th of September. Now, everyone knows that by the time this grain reaches the elevator at Churchill, it will be too late for shipment to England that year, and it will, consequently, have to be locked up in the elevators at Churchill, and the grain buyer must pay interest and storage, all of which must come out of the pockets of the Manitoba farmers. So that, notwithstanding the fact that it may at the present time look like a small boom to have this road started, I can assure the representatives of Manitoba that were this railway in operation to-morrow, it would be of no practical use to the farmers of that province. The storage of grain at Port Arthur costs 4 cents a bushel for five months. I will leave it to the promoters of this scheme to say what it will cost for eight or nine months at Fort Churchill, when interest on the grain and insurance also must be paid, and all that comes out of the farmer. Now supposing that you store grain at Fort Churchill and the price of grain rises during the winter, there is no outlet. We know that the price of grain often fluctuates, that it often goes up in the fall and goes down in the spring; and all the grain which would be shipped to Churchill would be deprived of that rise. How different it is at Fort William. If grain can be sent from Manitoba to Fort William and stored in the elevators there, and a rise takes place, that grain could be shipped by railway. I am informed