

leader of the Opposition, the first day of the Session, gave us some figures to show that, during the last years of the Administration of my right hon. friend there was a yearly increasing number of Canadian emigrants to the Republic; that during the five years of the late Government, the number annually decreased, and that since the accession of the present Government, the number has again been increasing. I take those figures as giving the best possible proof, that a large portion of this so-called emigration represented the movements of business men going to the United States on business. During the good times, before the change of Government, in 1873, when people had occasion to go to the United States to purchase goods, and had money to travel with, there was a very large amount of this so-called emigration to the States; and now, again, that better times are come, and the people have money for travel and business in the States, you find a very large reported emigration, which consists of business men going to and coming from that country. But during the five lean years of the late Government, the number constantly decreased, because our people had no business to do in the United States; but even if they had had business, they had no means of travelling to and from the Republic. I believe that those figures prove that this supposed large exodus consisted of business men travelling, and of emigrants passing through Canada to the States, and through the States to our own North-West.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. IVES. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was addressing myself to the question of immigration, and, if you will pardon me, I will add a few words to what I have already said on the subject. I look upon the matter in this light: That we have the only large block of good land, prairie land, now remaining unsettled in America; that our lands are becoming well known to the immigrating world, both in Europe and in America; that good lands in the United States, although not entirely exhausted, are rapidly becoming exhausted, particularly in large blocks; and that the Government, in its efforts to promote immigration, working in accord with the Syndicate, will naturally bring about, in the course of the next ten years, a very much larger immigration to our North-West, and also to the older Provinces of the Dominion. This is a matter of the very greatest importance to us. I look upon it as the salvation of the country, and as a means of raising from the shoulders of the present population the burden of taxation which now rests upon us. I now propose to address myself for a few moments to the objections which have been raised by hon. members to the minor details of the contract. The first of these objections is that the lands are to be selected by the Syndicate themselves. Now, as this point seems to be objected to with great seriousness, it may not be out of place to compare the provisions of the contract with those of the Act of 1874, introduced by the late Government. In the contract it is provided that, should any of the sections consist, in a material degree, of land not fairly fit for settlement, the deficiency may be made up by lands to be selected by the Company in similar blocks along any branch line, or line to be located by the Company, or any common front line, or lines agreed upon between the Government and the Company; and the Company may, with the consent of the Government, select in the North-West Territories, any tract or tracts of land not taken up as a means of supplying, or partially supplying, such deficiency. The provisions in the Act of 1874, section 4, are these:

"The said lands to be of a fair average quality, and when a sufficient quantity cannot be found in the immediate vicinity of the railway, then the same quantity or as much as may be required to complete it, shall be

appropriated in such other portions as may be determined on by the Governor in Council."

By the present contract, 25,000,000 acres of land, fairly fit for settlement, are appropriated; by the Act of 1874, 52,000,000 acres of land, of fair average quality, are appropriated. Now, I appeal to the House whether there is any serious difference between the terms of the contract and the terms of the Act of 1874, with respect to the quality of land which the Syndicate, in the one case, and the contractors in the other case, were to receive from the Government, except that, in the one case, the quantity to be appropriated was very much in excess of the quantity to be appropriated in the other. Then, the one proposition makes the selection of the land necessary to supply the deficiency along the main line, a matter of agreement between the Government and the Company; whereas, in the other case, the Governor in Council may designate the land which the contractor was to take, but was bound to designate land of fair average quality. I ask whether there is any serious difference between the terms of the Act and the contract in this particular. But there is this very great difference: that whereas the terms of the contract are no more onerous, but, on the contrary, are quite as favorable as those of the Act, yet they make the scheme, as a financial scheme, much more satisfactory than by the terms of the Act. Under the contract it would be impossible for capitalists to say to the Syndicate that they would be obliged to take inferior land. The next objection is that the Syndicate may choose their own route. Here, too, we might compare the language of the contract with the language of the Act of 1874. The termini of the eastern section are fixed, the one at Callander station and the other to connect with the line from Lake Superior to Selkirk, and the termini of the central section are fixed, the one at Selkirk and the other at Kamloops; and, inasmuch as 100 miles of the road from Selkirk west has been nearly constructed, inasmuch as the line has been surveyed and located by the Government, I do not think there is any likelihood there will be any great deflection made by the Syndicate from the line actually selected. In the Act of 1874 the following are the provisions, and I may say they are much less definite than the provisions of the present contract. Section first of that Act provides:

"That a railway to be called the Canada Pacific Railway shall be made from some point near to and south of Lake Nipissing to some point in British Columbia on the Pacific Ocean, both the said points to be determined and the course of the line of railway to be approved by the Governor General in Council."

In both cases the location is subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council; but to the people of the older Provinces what great difference does it make whether the line goes ten miles north or south of a given point. We know that the interests of the Syndicate will be to locate that line where it will be likely to receive the largest traffic, where it may be the most direct and the most cheaply constructed. Provided these terminal points are connected, we have no reason to find fault with the way in which the work is done, and there is more definiteness in the terms of the present contract than there was in the terms of the Act of 1874, which hon. gentlemen opposite found to be perfectly satisfactory. Objection is taken that the Government give the Company right of way and ground for stations, sidings, workshops, &c. Now, I am surprised to hear objections taken to a provision of that kind, I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen, who represent constituencies of the older Provinces, taking exception to that provision. Does not every hon. member from the Province of Quebec know that nothing is more common than for Governments to aid the construction of railways in that Province? Does not every hon. member from Quebec know that our Local Government not only gives the right of way to a road for its stations, workshops, &c., but actually gives