then that wholly viai-House not to ments upon monting later he Canadian Government of land would and they peruntry to agree pecific pledge. ed that that declared that couped out of which it was on to expend. ment of the nich you can or those of more correct. which hon. l the House

made this

ree to their

n for years.

promise made d make the land vinion the \$25,the Syndicate, already spent, adian Pacific in the world, ain, why the s should put id settle that uild railways try, which is those railways mprovements, oy to say, is so or, that what the beginning at it will be t while pre-it would be contributed nection with with interest

t of the hom

that we were to be recouped in cash out of the lands that Parliament, and afterwards the people, accepted the bargain and endorsed the policy—on that promise and on that promise only.

Who is bold enough to declare now that that promise has not been broken?

That policy which the people they confess endorsed on the understanding that eventually the country would pay the whole of the expense? Again:

On April 27th, 1882, the First Minister said:

"It is safe, it is certain beyond the possibility of doubt to say that every farthing and every cent and every dollar that has been or will be expended in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, not one shilling of this burden will fall on our shoulders, or the generation that will succeed us. We will be free from the whole amount of that debt."

Again:

"\$750,000 was paid in in one day from the recent sales -this is a very substantial commencement of the fund which is to pay off the \$25,000,000. It will be put to the credit of the fund and invested at interest for the purpose of paying off the whole of this \$25,000,000."

Again:

"By this year then there will be 10,000,000 acres granted to colonization companies under plan No. 1, which means the eventual payment of \$10,000,000 into the Treasury."

And again:

"That will be \$10,000,000, and with the sales that will take place of railway lands in other portions, we will have, either in money, or in what is as good as money, solid mortgages on every one of these colonization tracts an amount equal to \$12,500,000; so that in one year we may fairly say we have got half of the whole, \$25,000,000."

Where is it now? Then on 12th April, 1882, Sir Charles Tupper said:

The lands have increased in value as to warrant us in the statement, and to warrant the conviction in the mind of every intelligent man, that at an early date we will not only have the \$25,000,000 recouped to the Treasury, but we will go on; and if we

have not wiped out our other responsibilities we will soon be in a condition to wipe out the engagements thrown upon us by the late Government, as well as those incurred by our own in reference to the work."

I think I have shown the House what the situation was in 1882. Let me now come to 1883. In that year Sir Charles Tupper declared that our secured receipts from transactions already effected in the three previous years, 1880, '81 and '82, would be by 1885 a trifle over \$10,000,000, apart from all new transactions such as railway grants and further sales; they were actual receipts to come in by the year 1885 from the transactions already accomplished in 1880-91-82. hon, gentleman declared to the House and the people that those enormous sums would be realized, and would go to a reduction of the principal, and that the interest would be paid also. Which has TURNED OUT CORRECT? What are the actual receipts from all sources, not for the transactions of 1880-S1-82, but all 1880 receipts from to 1885? The receipts were \$4,052,000, and the expenditure for surveys and land officers and that class of expenditure, was \$3,820,000, leaving a balance of \$732,000.

From this you have, in my view, still to deduct certain charges. For example, I estimate that at least one-half of the cost of the Department of the Interior under the old system, before the hon. gentleman enlarged it, is fairly to be chargeable to the land branch of that Of course the Indian Department. branch is a separate branch, and I am speaking of the Interior by itself. Now. half the cost of the Interior under the old scale for the last six years would give you \$133,000, and then I take the whole excessive cost of the Interior, beyond the cost in the old time, the cost of the hon. gentleman's policy, as attributable to the lands, and that is \$225,000 more in the six years, making an aggregate of \$338,000, leaving, as a net result, \$374,000, without saying a word about the Indians, about immigration about mounted police, about local government, or any of those charges. So you may practically say that