

have taken as much time of the House as the House is willing to grant at one time, reserving my right to speak on the third reading or again in this committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been rather surprised at the speech of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I do not know whether, in his address to the House this afternoon, he was speaking for West Elgin or for George E. Casey. It appears to me that if I were an elector of West Elgin and my hon. friend appealed to me for a renewal of confidence, I would hesitate to give it to him. When we come to discuss questions of this kind, we should discuss them on their merits, and not allow personal interests to induce us to lead the course which should be followed in a matter of this kind. In the first place, I wish to refer to some remarks that have been made with regard to the shareholders. I have read over the list of shareholders; I am happy to say, with regard to many of them, that they may be very decent, respectable men. I contend, however, in the first place, that before we grant this money, if we should decide to grant it, we should have a detailed statement of the financial status of the company. That company has been in existence some years, and I contend we should know the entire amount of their receipts and expenditures and their present condition. They are asking now, by a clause in this Act, for the privilege of issuing paid-up stock. I would like to know to what extent promises of paid-up stock have been made and the amount they intend to issue, and I think it is wrong that we should give power to enable the company to carry out a pernicious issue of paid-up stock to those to whom they wish to grant it. My hon. friend has made some remarks with regard to Hudson's Bay. I am sorry he was not in his place in this House when we had an extended discussion, the other day, on this point. I think it was proved most conclusively to this House by gentlemen who have studied the question, that the navigation of the Hudson's Bay is not to be depended upon for a longer period than three months in the year. I fancy it is not disputed that navigation is open for that length of time; but those three months are not very clearly defined. Sometimes, we are told, it is not closed until October, sometimes till November, and sometimes earlier than October. In my humble opinion, we are not in a position financially as a country to grant this money, without crippling ourselves or drawing upon the resources of the people to too great an extent. At any rate, until there is a much larger development of the North-West, and until an additional outlet for the produce of that country becomes an absolute necessity, not a dollar of this money ought to be granted. We have already spent in the development of the North-West not a dollar short of a hundred millions. When you take every item of expenditure upon that country—for Indians, for the Mounted Police, for the Government of the North-West, for land expenses and other expenses—and put all these items together, including the grant made to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I contend that this Dominion has contributed fully a hundred millions of money towards the development of that country. In the face of that, and in the face of the enormous amount of land which is

Mr. CASEY.

now surveyed and open for settlement—land which has been declared to be of good quality and the most desirable within the limits of this Dominion—amounting to hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of acres, and no settler asking on what terms it can be occupied, I say it is folly and worse than folly to ask this House to pledge itself to a grant of \$1,600,000 towards the construction of a railway to Hudson's Bay. When we entered into the work of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, what was the argument by which the claims of that undertaking were presented to this House and the country? It was that this would be the great iron band that would bind together the several provinces of this Dominion, that it would promote increased trade between these provinces, that the wheat of the North-West would come down to the harbours of Montreal and Quebec, and Toronto, and bring about such a development of trade as would tend to enrich the towns and cities of the older provinces. Even supposing the Hudson's Bay should be open for a longer period than three months, and we could send by that route a large quantity of the produce of the North-West to the markets of Liverpool, I ask, would we not be doing an injustice to the older provinces if we took away from their cities, and ports, and shipping companies, which are now anxious to get trade, much of the advantage which they expected to derive from their expenditure of money on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-West generally, and provided means for sending the surplus produce in the other direction, where we will never see it, and where we will never reap a dollar of advantage from it? In that view of the case it is imprudent to grant this money, even if the scheme were a feasible one. But I contend that we are bound as sensible men to accept the arguments which have been presented to this House, and which have not been confuted, showing that the Hudson's Bay is not a desirable route by which to export the produce of the North-West. In the present era of rapid transit, it is folly to think that any man will be found in any part of the world ready to invest money in produce that will have to lie at one port frozen up for seven or eight or nine months in the year, from which not a bushel could be got even to keep off starvation. I do not think either that men will be disposed to ship produce by that route. But when we come to consider the present financial condition of this country, the amount of our annual outlay, the enormous expenses we have incurred, and the demands of other sections of the country which have been rapping at the doors of Parliament for relief on the ground that since the inauguration of the system of subsidizing railways they have a right to be reimbursed for the money which they have granted to their own railways without receiving a dollar of aid from the Parliament of Canada,—I say that to ask that those people should be subject to a further drain in order to grant \$80,000 a year for twenty years to a railway to Hudson's Bay, is a monstrous proposition; and I am satisfied that the representatives of the people in this House who will sanction this measure will not receive the thanks of their constituents when they go back to them and try to explain to them the grounds upon which they give it their support. Now, I hold that it is time we should draw the rein. We have not had all the information we should have with regard to the