

that the men from the North-west could not be expected to support a land monopoly. I wonder that any man on that side of the House should have the assurance to talk of land monopoly. If the hon. gentlemen would like to look at a map, I will show them one that represents the fertile belt from the Rocky Mountains to the Red River and Lake Winnipeg. I will show them on that map the land monopoly of the North-west as it exists to-day. There it is. (Exhibiting map.) I live in the North-west—but let me explain the map first. Here, on this map, are the Red River and Lake Winnipeg, and there are the Rocky Mountains. This portion shows all the fertile belt, and of this fertile belt the hon. gentlemen opposite contracted to give away so much that they did not have enough there but had to go outside it. On all that enormous territory, every odd-numbered section—67,000,000 acres—has been reserved from settlement, and reserved for the benefit of the railway companies. Sixty-seven million acres—the whole fertile belt and much that is not is now a land monopoly reserved for the benefit of railway companies. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think it is the white portions of this map that show the land reserved? No, it is the black part. We mourn over that in the North-west, and therefore I had it marked in black on the map. I want the House to understand that that is the result of the land administration of our friends opposite, who claim to have the instinct of government. We have 67,000,000 acres of land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories reserved from settlement. On that 67,000,000 of acres, I, as the Minister of the Interior to-day, cannot give a man a homestead entry. Nor can I sell a single acre of it, although there are millions of acres of that land that never have been and never will be or can be earned by any railway company whatever. But, Sir, they are reserved by Order in Council, the good faith of the Dominion is pledged to that for ever, and no Government can interfere with that reserve until the bond is literally fulfilled to the very last letter. That is the position these hon. gentlemen have put us in. I wonder that any member on that side can have the colossal assurance to talk to any member from Manitoba or the North-west about land monopolies.

Do not let us run away with terms. What is a land monopoly? We have it in the North-west. We have there millions of acres owned by corporations—owned in part by a corporation which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) represents. And let me say, I do not blame him for that, but I thought, when he stood up the other day and said he was going to oppose this contract at every stage and every chance he got, he was not quite so bitter when the Calgary and Edmonton Bill was before the House. I did not then hear, away in the far North-west, that any tenders were called

for when that road was contemplated. We all knew in the North-west that the cash subsidy to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway was enough to build the road and provide a very snug sum to go into the pockets of the promoters, as it ultimately did; but I did not hear that the hon. gentlemen who then composed the Government called for any tenders or permitted anybody else to have any share in that enterprise except our hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). What we have in the shape of a land monopoly is this. We have millions of acres in that country owned by railway companies, and these companies are not required to do any work or spend any money. They sit down; they toil not neither do they spin. But the farmers toil and the farmers spin.

The farmers do their work: they cultivate their land and make their roads and bridges and pay their taxes and improve their land. And land goes up in value for the benefit of the railway companies. That is what takes place under the land-monopoly policy of our friends on the other side of the House. That is what is taking place now. And I tell the hon. gentlemen that there is no man sitting in this House to-day who realizes now, or who will live to realize the baneful effects of that policy upon the finest agricultural territory that the world has ever seen.

We propose, for the purpose of getting a great and valuable public work constructed under the most extraordinarily difficult circumstances, to give a land grant. It is a land grant to which value will be given by the labour of other people or by the expenditure of other people's money? No, Sir, but a land grant which is not worth a dollar, except as it is made valuable by the expenditure and the work of the men who get it. Let the hon. gentlemen rest with that and explain to this House the coherence and logic of the position they take on this subject. I apprehend that if any man goes up and discovers a valuable claim, he will register it for himself and not for the railway company, and the company can find their own claims and register them for themselves, and they are in no respect better off for the labour the miner has performed.

I have detained the House longer than I anticipated. I look for great things from the construction of this railway; I look for great things because of the fact that I think it will largely promote Canadian trade. I think that if it is promptly and vigorously carried through, as I have no doubt it will be, it will have the effect of drawing to Canada within the next six months trade to the extent, perhaps, of twenty or twenty-five millions of dollars, that being a moderate estimate. I think it will conduce to the honour and dignity of Canada in making that country safe to us from a national standpoint. It will remove the danger of the country being not in the hands of our