

and fertility of this great North-West, that in a short year applications would be made by colonization companies for no less than 23,000,000 acres of land, what would he have said? He then thought it premature, or beyond the resources of the country, to enter upon this work, but he was not so considerate when asked to vote \$3,000,000 of additional taxes in 1874, by hon. gentlemen opposite, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1881, however, he was unwilling that 25,000,000 acres should be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for grappling with this great undertaking. If the hon. gentleman had been told that those 25,000,000 acres were wanted by colonization companies within one year, would he have said it was premature to undertake this great work? I have mentioned the \$1,000,000 in cash and settlers' effects brought into the country by those 28,000 immigrants. What does this mean as a source of revenue to the country, when we remember how valuable every inhabitant added to the country is as a source of revenue? I believe the returns of the Customs' revenue, at Winnipeg, between the 1st of July, 1880, and the 1st of March, 1881 inclusive, show a total of \$196,453.58.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is for 1880 and 1881.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and this was obtained under the policy of the present Government. In relation to Winnipeg, hon. gentlemen opposite know that when we came into power Winnipeg was dead—that the policy of the late Government struck a fatal blow at Winnipeg. It had decided to carry the Canadian Pacific Railway from Selkirk, away twenty miles from Winnipeg, across through the narrows of Lake Manitoba, and with what result? From that hour until we came into power and changed that policy, Winnipeg was dead. Hon. gentlemen know that there was no enterprise—that everything was in a state of despondency; any person could then have gone into that town and purchased for \$1,000 property which he could not get to-day for \$100,000. That was the condition of things. The hon. member for Westmoreland thinks that an extravagant statement; but I tell him that it has been proved over and over again that a property which would not have realized \$1,000 before that policy was adopted, has within a year after its adoption realized \$100,000, and instead of using terms which are extravagant, I am greatly within the mark when I make that statement. If the hon. gentleman had been told that this policy would have had the effect of giving \$582,743 into the Customs Department alone, for the same period to 1st March, 1882, he would have hesitated a great while before using that word "premature," before he would ask this House to declare