

of the Interior, my former colleague, has been attacked repeatedly for his extravagance in connection with the scheme for promoting colonization roads. I think, however, if I remember rightly, that the hon. Minister of Railways agreed with him that the scheme was a wise one. In the first place, it must be remembered that that scheme was brought down solely for the purpose of discussion, without any intention of passing it that Session. I do not think that either the Government as a whole were committed to it in any formal way whatever. We would be committed to it, as a matter of course, if we brought it before the House as a matter to be carried; but like some other measures which hon. gentlemen opposite have laid before the House, for instance the Bill on Elections and the Supreme Court Bill, and several other measures brought down avowedly for the purpose of discussion, it was laid before the House without the slightest intention of having it carried through this House. When the hon. gentleman insinuates, as he did yesterday, he only shows how entirely unacquainted he is with the policy of the Liberal party in Ontario. He does not appear to know that twenty-five years ago great efforts were made by the Liberal party in the west—in fact, it was a plank in their political platform to obtain possession of that country. We became aware, through the efforts of Mr. Isbester and others who were thoroughly acquainted with the Red River settlement, of the vast extent of domain which could be peopled in that country, and our efforts were unremitting to obtain possession of it out of the hands of the monopolists who held it as a barren waste. When the railway question first came up our only consideration was not whether it was wise to build the railway, but whether we were not premature in going to such an enormous expense for the purpose of obtaining it in a given time. As the hon. member for West Durham remarked, last night, no one ever opposed the building of those sections that led into the prairie country, and we lost no time in obtaining access through the United States in advance, by six or seven years, of any possible access through our own country. Instead of depreciating the value of the road, no one more highly appreciated it than we; but, on the other hand, we had to consider the interests of other sections of the country—whether it was wise to incur an expenditure of \$120,000,000 for the purpose of constructing the road within a certain given, very short, and wholly inadequate time. It was our discussions in relation to the limitation which could alone justify the hon. gentleman in imagining that we had the slightest hostile feeling towards the Canadian Pacific Railway as a scheme. I did not believe then, and do not now, that it was wise to incur such a heavy expense to get beyond the prairie country. Of what earthly benefit will it be to a large portion of British Columbia, except the small strip that it passes through, no one can say. As for the scheme the hon. gentleman has for Asiatic travel, he reads Mr. Sandford Fleming's notes of last year as to distance, and it is gratifying to know it is the shortest road across, and it is gratifying to know, also, that by steaming up the coast and taking a slight circle, we are nearer Yokohama and the other places than San Francisco. But the question still remains to be decided whether the traffic from these countries can be profitably carried over the road or not. I hope it may be, and it should be tried. But, on the one hand, our scheme, if carried out, would have enabled us to have the road opened quite as soon to the prairie country as the hon. gentleman has succeeded in doing it; while, on the other hand, our colonization scheme, or something like the one submitted to the House in 1878, would ensure settlement and the building of the railway through the prairie country not visited by our own great national line. The hon. gentleman referred last night to the terms of the Act of 1874. He said that we had no reason to complain of if they took 25,000,000 acres when we proposed to take 54,000,000 acres. Now, Sir,

we did not propose to take 54,000,000 acre, we proposed to take 20,000 acres per mile. The mileage was uncertain, but was generally supposed to be about 2,500 miles, and to reach the same figure that hon. gentlemen opposite had in their Bill of 1871 too. Their proposal was to take 50,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000. Our proposal was to take \$10,000 per mile and 20,000 acres of land, but our land was to be taken in a very different process from that in which the hon. gentleman has taken his land. The hon. gentlemen in their scheme have provided that the Syndicate shall get the very best land to be found in the North-West. That is practically, in a few words, the scheme of the hon. gentlemen, and it is doubtful if they do not own the lands there also. Our policy was this:

"That a quantity of land not exceeding 20,000 acres for each mile of the section or sub-section contracted for, shall be appropriated in alternate sections of twenty miles each along the line of the said railway or at a convenient distance therefrom, each section having a frontage of not less than three miles nor more than six miles on the line of the said railway, and that two thirds of the quantity of land so appropriated shall be sold by the Government at such prices as may be from time to time agreed upon between the Governor in Council and the contractors, and the proceeds thereof accounted for and paid half yearly to the contractors free from any charge of action or management,—the remaining third to be conveyed to the contractors. The said lands to be of fair average quality, and not to include any land already granted or occupied under any patent, licence of occupation or pre-emption right, 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 such quantity, shall be appropriated at such other places as may be determined by the Governor in Council."

This, Sir, made it incumbent upon the contractors, whoever they should be, to have the line which we owned in British Columbia, made it incumbent upon them, if we succeeded in obtaining the land from the Government of Ontario, east of the boundary line near Rat Portage, to take the land there also. We applied, in fact, as a Government, to the Government of Ontario to give us the land required to fulfill this section in their territory. Our request was not granted, and we thought that as the road was to be built through that portion of Ontario, the land might possibly be given us by the Government of Ontario in return for whatever advantages it might derive from the building of the road. They, however, took another view of it, and we did not receive the land. Now, the hon. gentleman is aware that at the time the contract, was made with the Syndicate, there was under contract or built from Selkirk to Fort William, 1,410 miles—I am not sure now as to the mileage, but it is about that. From Selkirk to Pembina, eighty-three miles; from Kamloops to Emory's Bar, 127 miles, and ninety miles from Emory's Bar to Port Moody, or a mileage altogether of 710 miles, assuming the entire mileage to be 2,650, leaving 1,823 miles, 20,000 acres per mile for which would amount to 38,460,000 acres. Well, that is for all classes of lands a fair average of the quality of the country it passes through. Now, in the prairie region, extending a distance say of 1,000 miles in rough numbers, the quantity would be, of course, just about one-half, or 19,000,000 acres in the prairie country, and the same quantity will be obtained in the rough or wooded country. This will show a very different result indeed, as to expenditure, from what has been presented in the scheme the Government ultimately adopted. Now, Sir, with regard to that scheme I have a very few words to say. I do not desire to enter upon the general discussion, but I have to say this: the hon. gentleman knows very well that they had no right to enter upon that contract at the time he did. They had not asked for tenders in any way, except indeed, as the hon. gentleman told us, that they got their leader in a stump speech to say they had been conferring with some parties. Even he did not in that speech invite tenders from any parties, nor did he intimate that any new policy had been decided upon or any new departure had taken place. The law strictly prohibited giving out any contract without publicly asking