

As to the people wanting to go to Moosejaw by way of North Portal, of course, if they wish to that is the way they will go. They are going to Northern Alberta.

Mr. McCREARY. And how are you going to get there?

Mr. OLIVER. They go to Moosejaw now because they cannot get in the other way. Every hon. gentleman understands that, I am sure, except the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) himself.

Mr. McCREARY. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that I do understand that people can go in by two ways, either via Winnipeg or via North Portal and the hon. gentleman is foolish to try to impose upon the House. Either he is deliberately trying to impose on hon. members or it is a case of absolute ignorance on his part—one or other. If I want to go to a point on the main line, I can go better via Moosejaw than via Winnipeg. As to any question between the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway, it makes no difference to me. But I say the only way to get in east of the Calgary and Edmonton road will be by the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and thence by the branch line, and not by a main line that is not likely to be built for three years and thence by a branch line going south. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) that, even though I do not live in Edmonton I know the situation there so far as immigration is concerned, probably as well as he does. I had a great deal more to do with the settling of that country than he had. I have visited the immigrants there over and over again, and have had the question of immigration before me every day for three years and a half. That is why I asked the government two or three years ago—and my letters are on file in the Department of the Interior—to urge the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct this line for immigrants. I did it as a civil servant then in what I believed to be the best interest of the public, and I do the same as a member of parliament to-day. I say this is the only practical way to build the line.

Mr. OLIVER. I would leave it to the judgment of the committee whether the hon. gentleman or I know more about the subject in hand.

Mr. GILMOUR. As to any question between the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway, I have no preference. But any one looking at the map will see that it is a desirable thing not to give the charter. If it should hang fire, it might prevent the other road building from Medicine Hat. Not only should there be the road coming up from Medicine Hat, but there should be a cross road. That should have been built long ago and, had the Canadian Pacific Railway owned the Calgary and Edmonton road, I believe it would have been built before this.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. SPROULE. The argument of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) falls to the ground in view of the fact that there is a charter to build to Medicine Hat now.

Mr. McCREARY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that that was stated clearly in the committee.

Mr. McCREARY. It is advertised and applied for and will come up in two or three days.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, can we not put it through this House? Certainly we can. And then let whichever company will build the road. We have pursued that policy in different parts of the country before now. It seems to me there is no reason why we should refuse the one that is before us for the purpose of giving it to another. Let us give it to both.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would not object to the passage of this Bill simply because the company is asking for these branch lines. I am willing to give it this charter and to support the other charter as well. It will simply be a case of the survival of the fittest. But if there be anything in the contention of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that this will increase the liability of the province of Manitoba—although I do not place that interpretation upon this Bill—I would join with my hon. friend from Selkirk in asking a postponement for further consideration, especially as no member of the government seems to be present to give us a legal opinion. I believe that the liability entailed upon the province of Manitoba was for the special lines mentioned in the Act we passed last session, and has nothing to do with any of the lines asked for in this Bill; but to avoid all doubt, we should have a legal opinion from the Minister of Justice on that point. With regard to the discrimination referred to by the hon. member for Selkirk, I had some correspondence with the immigration agent in the province of Manitoba in the United States, and he drew my attention to the fact that discriminatory rates are charged in favour of the 'Soo' line. However, that has nothing particular to do with this discussion, and I would favour the postponement of this Bill for further consideration unless some member of the government is prepared to give us an opinion that the province of Manitoba will not have any more liability entailed upon it by the passage of this Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not wish to speak, as a member of the government or as a lawyer, but as having some experience in the Railway Committee, and, speaking for myself, I cannot see that there is anything in this Bill which can increase the liability of the province of Manitoba. It does not require a lawyer to know that