

rected calculations, the Government would be receiving in the fourth year \$1,231,000, running up to nearly \$5,000,000 in the last year, so that these corrected calculations are, in this respect, almost as preposterous as the original. Depend on it your returns will be long deferred. Then the hon. gentleman takes up the question of the expenses of management and surveys, which he estimates at \$2,400,000. Now, judging by the results in the United States, that also is quite too low. You will remember that there is an enormous acreage to be surveyed. If all the lands were fairly good lands, and the surveys could be kept only abreast of the settlement, you would require to survey 49,000,000 acres to effect the settlement the hon. gentleman expects, not that so much land is to be taken up by that number of persons; but to give room for the expected homesteaders to take up their free grants, so many townships as will comprise nearly 50,000,000 acres must be surveyed. But that is on the assumption that all the land to be surveyed is good land, and that all the land surveyed will be taken up. I say that is an assumption we cannot reasonably act upon, since there is bad and broken land, and since you must keep surveys ahead of settlement; and it is more correct, perhaps, to conjecture, as we are now in the region of conjecture, that 80,000,000 will be the amount of acres required to be surveyed, in order to effect the disposal of the smaller quantity, than to conjecture that 50,000,000 will be the number. Then, there is the cost of collecting all these millions of money from all these thousands of men. I think the charge too low. I do not know what the immigration policy of the Government is to be, whether they intend largely to increase the expense for that purpose or not, or to devote the available amount to the North-West; but it is obvious that, if these lands are to be rendered productive by immigration, the cost of inducing immigration should be considered a first charge upon the lands; and that this, in addition to the cost of surveys and management, should reasonably be deducted from the proceeds of the lands, before you can apply anything to railway purposes. Indeed, I may go further and say, that the cost of payments for Indians of over

\$550,000 a year, and for the Mounted Police Force about \$300,000 a year, in all \$850,000 a year, and other local charges, are prior charges on the proceeds of the lands. I maintain that the whole thing is visionary. Indeed, I may remind the House that when the hon. gentleman opened his remarks, he demanded a certain postulate to be granted to him; that he declared later that he would prove his figures to a demonstration; and then at the end he offered us to abate one-half. "If you will not," says he, "take the whole of my estimate, take one-half." A calculation commencing so pretentiously, and terminating in so humiliating a manner, was hardly, perhaps, worthy the serious attention I have been compelled to ask the House to give it. Now, with reference to the application of all this money. In the announcement of the First Minister, he took \$38,600,000 to be received in the eleven years, and deducted at the close of the period \$2,400,000 for management, the net cash coming in being thus, \$36,200,000. Set this against the \$60,000,000 he estimated to be spent on the Pacific Railway, and there is a small balance of \$24,000,000! Yet the hon. gentleman tells us the cost of the road is to be met out of the land sales, without encroaching on our taxes. But that is not the true state of the account. The hon. member for Gloucester at once pointed out that the hon. Minister had not allowed for the interest on the cost of construction, and that this would absorb a large part of the receipts. To that, no reply was then made; but the next day the hon. the Finance Minister acknowledged the justice of the criticism, and, in that free and off-hand manner in which he is accustomed to deal with millions of money, agreed that \$18,000,000 for interest on the \$60,000,000 should be deducted from the receipt. First, he would reduce the hon. First Minister's estimate by half, then take off \$18,000,000 from the remainder, and still, said he, enough remains to build the road. Even the \$18,000,000 the hon. the Finance Minister was willing to deduct, does not represent the true state of the case. As I said the other evening, we shall have spent, up to the 30th of June, \$15,000,000, in round numbers, on the Pacific Railway, the interest paid on which, at only 4 per cent., would amount