

may have been well spent, but I cannot forget that the Minister of Finance himself had to admit that the immigration into that country, notwithstanding the Canadian Pacific Railway, had not come up to our expectations. Now, would it not be wise for us to wait and see whether the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to fulfil all the grand predictions we heard about it, before we vote these millions to build any other railway? We are told it is going to help settlers to come down from the Hudson Bay and settle in the North-West, as if we needed another way for settlers to get into the North-West. If settlers are not going into the North-West by the present road, I submit there is not much chance of getting them to come in by any other. I can well understand how hon. members from the North-West want this road for the benefit of the settlers now there. I happen to come from a county where, from one end of it to Halifax, a distance of nearly 200 miles, there is not a foot of railway. I come from a county that has, according to the last census, a population equal to between one-fifth and one-sixth of the whole population of the North-West, and still there is not a mile of railway in that county. Twelve short miles would bring the county town in connection with the Eastern Extension Railway, but we cannot get it built. Now, I submit that there should be some little consideration shown for the older counties as well as the new counties. Remember that I am not saying a word against the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but that being built, and not having fulfilled the predictions made concerning it, I am afraid, notwithstanding the eloquent manner in which members have spoken in behalf of this scheme, that the prospects do not warrant us in passing this resolution, although we are told that there is going to be a railway from the Pacific coast up to that point, that we shall have vessels from Halifax going to Hudson Bay, and coming back to Halifax on the way to England, and perhaps the grain would have to be put into elevators at Halifax and rest awhile before going over to England. I cannot see my way, therefore, to support this resolution, coming as I do from a province where, although we have received money for railways, we still feel that the wants of our people are not fully met. In view of the fact that the North-West is not being filled up as was anticipated, in view of the fact that we have a falling revenue, in view of that facts that we brushed off the book last night the sum of \$2,000,000 a year, I submit that at present I cannot see my way to support this scheme. I do not think we have sufficient evidence to prove that we can have shipping from that point, and as wise legislators we ought to have such data as will convince reasonable men that it is practicable to get some advantage from this scheme before we consent to engage in it. It appears to me that the scheme is undertaken as a speculation. We are told this new country is going to be filled up by people who will pay taxes, if only the settlers were able to get into that country. That is one side of the question; the other side is the hard fact that we will have to pay \$80,000 for twenty years on that speculation, without having any data to convince us that it is going to pay. I am not opposing this on sectional grounds at all. While I would like to receive as much money as possible for roads in Nova Scotia, I am bound to say that there is no

Mr. FRASER.

feeling of sectionalism in my province. If it was going to be for the advantage of the whole Dominion that this road should be built no one would object to it, for I agree that if that country were filled up with settlers the whole nation would benefit by it. But believing that we have not sufficient data before us, that there is no prospect that the scheme would bring us any return, and that older sections require the money, I am bound to oppose the resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think hon. members are entitled to further information on this subject before the resolution is taken out of Committee. It is worthy of the consideration of the House that a number of hon. gentlemen who have this afternoon and this evening so ardently supported this resolution were gentlemen who opposed the construction of the railway 12 months ago through this same section of country, or a very considerable section of it. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) submitted a measure to the House last year for the purpose of connecting the settlement west of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba with the Canadian Pacific Railway by a line of railway lying west of Lake Manitoba. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), all of whom have ardently supported this resolution, all of whom have pressed on the attention of the Committee the importance of constructing a railway in that section of the country, were equally ardent and earnest in opposing the Bill of the hon. member for Marquette, and they have not informed the House what new light they have received during the last 12 months to induce them to ask for railway accommodation for small settlements to which they denied railway communication 12 months ago. It would have been interesting if those hon. gentlemen had told the House how it was that they opposed the Bill of the hon. member for Marquette last year and how it is they are supporting this resolution for the purpose of constructing a railway at very considerable expense to the public treasury for the accommodation of the inhabitants of a portion of the same district. Why, this railway, located where it is, as shown on the map, will leave out a settlement nearly 100 miles in length, for which no railway accommodation will be provided. The House will be interested in learning how it is that those hon. members from Manitoba have come to change their minds. Is it because they are not so much interested in furnishing railway accommodation to the inhabitants as in promoting the interests of certain parties who are interested in this charter? How is it they support this scheme, and they opposed the one proposed by the hon. member for Marquette? I do not think there is any difficulty on the part of the Committee in drawing its own conclusions. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is always an ardent supporter of any measures proposed by the Government. I can well understand why the hon. gentleman should support this resolution proposed by a Minister of the Crown, and should have opposed the Bill proposed by a member of the Opposition. It is not the merits of the question that determine the merits of the proposition; it is not the public interests. It depends altogether in whose hands the Bill may be for the time, and who it is that in