

acre. These lands to-day are worth from \$40 to \$50 an acre.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not true that before the Saskatchewan Land Valley Company got this land and began to bring in settlers there was a territory over 60 miles in length along that railway on which there was no settlement, although the railway had been built for a number of years, because the general impression was that it was not good land, or land which was fit for settlement?

Mr. BRADBURY: The answer to that is very simple. It may not have been thrown open to homesteading at the time and consequently no homesteaders could get on it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is entirely mistaken; the land was all opened to homesteading.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not want to deny the hon. gentleman the opportunity of asking questions. What I have said was stated many times before.

Mr. CARVELL: And denied many times.

Mr. BRADBURY: We have the proof of the pudding to-day; we know what has taken place, and we know that a more glaring and outrageous scandal never was perpetrated on the people of Canada than the sale of these lands to this company; and the proof of it is that much of the stock of this company was divided up amongst a bunch of political friends. But I pass from that.

What has their policy been in connection with grazing leases? The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) criticised the Government the other evening for having given away or sold cheaply some grazing lands for the purpose of raising horses. The hon. gentleman is young in this House and young in public life, or he would not have referred to this matter; for what does the record show? It shows that one outfit or one combination of political friends secured nearly four hundred thousand acres of grazing lands on irrevocable leases for twenty-one years at the nominal rent of one cent an acre, I think, and they were given the right of purchasing ten per cent of that land at one dollar an acre. That is how hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to assist the poor people of this country, the farmers' sons who are looking for homesteads, and many of whom are to-day being crowded out of their own districts and forced to go farther west or farther north to lands many of them utterly unsuited for cultivation.

Then, we have the irrigation land deal. A few of the friends cleaned up a million and

a quarter of money on that. Then there was the Blairmore townsite, a notorious case at the time. Many hon. gentlemen in this House will remember the man who got this townsite for something like \$480—a townsite that was worth to the people of Canada at least two or three hundred thousand dollars. Hon. gentlemen opposite gave this townsite to a political friend. The man has since died, so I will not go any further into that. Then there was the exploitation of timber lands. I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) wax eloquent the other evening over the high price of lumber on account of this extra tariff. If the party that he has followed so long and so ably and faithfully had conserved the timber resources of the Northwest Territory and of Manitoba, we might to-day have been in a position to give to our people cheaper lumber than we can now give them. These timber lands are held by a few men, Liberals, who got them for a song.

Then, there was the exploitation of the fisheries. You all remember what they did with our fisheries. They gave all the fisheries north of lake Winnipeg—a kingdom in itself—to their political friends for the nominal sum of \$10 a year, with the right to fish in Hudson bay—a most glaring outrage. I think, in view of the fact that our fisheries are one of the most valuable assets we have in Canada to-day. After this matter was exposed in the House the leases were cancelled, as they ought to have been. The pity is that the policy of restoration did not go farther and force some of these men who had received our timber lands and our coal lands in the manner they did to restore at least a portion of them to the Crown.

Then, we have the St. Boniface land deal, engineered by one of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway. The evidence shows that \$161,000 was cleaned up on that deal. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had the temerity to throw a challenge across this House regarding the manner in which pledges are kept, and I am giving these few examples to show the people of Canada how hon. gentlemen opposite implemented, when in office, the pledges they gave to the people of this country. They have not shown, nor can they show one pledge given by the leader of this side of the House that has not been kept.

I want to refer for a moment to another pledge given to the people of this country—the pledge in regard to prohibition. Perhaps no question is receiving such earnest