

I would not take from the hon. Minister of Railways one iota of the glory that is his, while I would not detract from the credit he deserves for the amount of work he has to do—for I believe the labor he is engaged in is telling on his own health, and he brings a great deal of energy to his own department.—I cannot withhold the praise due to the hon. gentleman who preceded him, and who today gave evidence that in the honest fulfilment of his duties in that office, he had so impaired his health that he could not address the House to the length that he desired or that the House desired. Therefore, I think the hon. Minister was unfair when he sought to take to himself all the glory of the prosperity we see in the North-West and the progress of the Pacific Railway. Grant that thousands have gone in and that hundreds of thousands are going into that country, grant the increased value of property there, how do the immigrants who have raised the value of lands go in? Upon one mile of railway built by the present Minister of Railways? No, Sir; every man who has gone into that territory passed over not one foot of railway built by the present Minister of Railways, but every man found his way over the road built by his hon. predecessor; and if there is any development in that country, it is due to the gentleman who promoted the railway and successfully built it, and that is the hon. member for Lambton, who sits there to-day, a man honored by the people above the man who seeks to share his honors.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH. It is not my intention to occupy very long the time of this House, nor would I have spoken at all but for the course taken by the hon. Minister of Railways. It was fair and reasonable that he should have made an exposition of the progress of that work, and when he did so during the first hour of his speech I was very much interested; but in the last portion, when he showed an intention to revive the whole discussion, and assailed the resolution which I moved, and the resolutions moved by other members on this side, and thereby challenged the discussion of this subject at this stage of the Session, after we have been in session for seventy days, it seemed to me that he had not thought of the economy of time, and that he did not wish to shorten the Session, as we on this side are desirous of doing. Now, I think it was imprudent and unwise for that hon. gentleman to revive that question. I do not think any hon. member would have spoken on this side, except perhaps the leader of the Opposition, but for his action; and if two or three weeks are not consumed in this discussion, it is only due to the forbearance of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman referred to the Act of 1874. He said that Act offered greater advantages to a company to construct this railroad than has been granted to this Company by the contract which has been made. Now, let me say that in 1874, that country was a comparatively unknown country; and when my hon. friend acceded to power he found that this country rested under an obligation to British Columbia to construct that railway within a time in which it was absolutely impossible to accomplish it, and he passed the Act of 1874, by which he offered certain facilities for the construction of that road. The country had up to that time been very slightly surveyed, and it was very little known. We find in that Act one clause which particularly guards and protects the people of this country, and which is absent from the contract of which the hon. Minister of Railways boasts. The subsidies to be given were large, but the Government reserved to itself the right to resume possession of the road, and pay the contractors the amount they had expended, with 10 per cent. profit for themselves. This provision is so important that I will read it:

"In every contract for the construction of the said railway, or of any section or sub-section thereof, the Government of Canada shall reserve the right to purchase, under the authority of Parliament, the said railway or such section or sub-section thereof, on payment of a sum equal

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

to the actual cost of the said railway, section or sub-section, and 10 per cent. in addition thereto. The subsidies in land and money granted or paid by the Government for the construction of the said railway being just returned or deducted from the amount to be paid, the lands sold being valued at the full amount the contractors may have received from the sale of such lands as may have been sold."

Suppose, under that Act, the Government had given contracts, 20,000 acres of land and also a subsidy, and reserved the right to retake that road by remunerating those contractors, by guaranteeing 10 per cent. profits. Have we any such provision in this contract? Let us weigh this provision in the Act under consideration. Let us say the Government had the right, having had the same regard to the public interest, when they prepared this measure, they would have retained powers to acquire the road. What would have been the position of the matter? What is this Company called on to expend under this Act? My hon. friend behind me stated it clearly; the present contractors are to expend \$48,500,000 to complete their contract. What, under the provisions of this section, would the position of the Government have been? They would have had the right to assume this work on paying that amount, with 10 per cent. added, or less than \$53,000,000. But what is the condition of things under the present contract? The hon. Minister of Railways said last year that everything was let by public tender and competition, and that the contract was issued under the provisions of the Act of 1874, when it was shown and clearly proved that not a single provision of that Act had been regarded in the making of the contract. What did he say then? That it was made under the Act of 1872. Then we produced evidence to show that the Statute of 1872 had been repealed, so his assertion was baseless. The present Syndicate are obliged to expend \$48,500,000 and no more. What is the Government giving them for that expenditure? A subsidy of \$25,000,000, 25,000,000 acres of land, \$28,000,000 expended in the construction of the road, and \$3,000,000 spent in surveys, besides exemption from taxation of their property forever, and a monopoly of this country. And what is this worth? I was astonished when the hon. Minister of Railways portrayed the great glory achieved by his Government in this matter, and particularly by himself—and that the letting of this contract had achieved the present marvellous prosperity. It has been made manifest that this Government has really done nothing in this direction. They had undertaken to build 100 miles of the railway west of Winnipeg, which it seems had been located wrong, and from which the rails had to be taken. They simply carried on the work initiated by my hon. friend the member for Lambton, until this contract was made for which the hon. Minister of Railways takes so much credit to himself in the most egotistical fashion. When the hon. gentleman talked about the boom in the North-West, and the great enhancement of the value of its lands, he did not tell us how the Syndicate had participated in that advantage. The contract last year was based on the assumption that the lands were worth \$1 an acre. He says nothing now about their value. How has the great rush of immigration affected the value of those lands? Will the hon. gentleman deny they are to-day worth more than \$3 an acre? If so, what becomes of the position he took last year that the lands were worth only \$1 an acre? Being worth \$3 an acre, how much does that give the Syndicate? Fully \$132,000,000 in money, railway and public property for an expenditure, by it, of \$48,500,000. This is no fiction; this proposition can not be controverted by hon. gentlemen on the other side. He did not tell us how much the Syndicate made by the sale of their lands at Brandon and other stations along the line, where I understand they made hundreds of thousands of dollars. Does not the light of experience show the unwisdom, folly and unpatriotism of having made this contract, and giving this Syndicate so many millions of public property which, had we had the same provision favored by hon. gentlemen on this side, might have been got for