

culties, extinguishing Indian titles, making surveys, increasing, as we fondly supposed, their market value, why is it that the hon. Minister says now that they are worth but \$1 an acre?

Mr. PLUMB. You said so yourself last year.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am not now speaking of my own opinion, but I am asking now why it is that hon. gentlemen on the other side repudiate the statement made by their leader in this House a few short months ago? Why is it that they ask us now to conclude that that statement was utterly and grossly inaccurate? If the prairie lands lying close to the railway are worth but a dollar an acre, then lands lying twenty, thirty or forty miles away, of what market value are they? Sir, the object of this depreciation is very palpable. If the hon. the Minister of Railways, in making his statement before the House, were to admit that the statement made by his leader a few months ago was a correct statement, then he must say to this House and the country that this is a monstrous bargain. Taking the average value of these lands, even at the corrected estimate—the hon. member for West Durham did correct, in a material point, the calculation of the Premier last year and so reduced the general average of the price of the land—taking even that reduced average these lands must be worth at least \$3.15 an acre; but at \$3 an acre you would have \$75,000,000 paid to those gentlemen, or \$126,000,000 in all to build a railroad that is at the outside to cost but \$80,000,000. That is the reason why the estimates of last year are so coolly repudiated. Why do those gentlemen taunt us with inconsistency? We can proudly point to our past record; we can defy them to take up every line of our speeches and to point out the slightest inconsistency. They may find that we may have had reason, after acquiring further information, to correct our views on some minor points, but where principle is concerned they will find that our views and opinions are thoroughly consistent upon the whole question. Some gentlemen say that perhaps two dollars an acre would be a fair average price for those lands. If the land is worth anything, if the country is worth settling at all, two dollars must be a low average indeed; but at that price the bargain would give \$50,000,000 in addition to the \$53,000,000, or \$103,000,000 for the building of a railroad that is to cost but \$80,000,000. But there is no certainty whatever that it will cost that sum. The standard adopted leaves it entirely in the choice of the Syndicate whether the portions of the road they build shall cost \$80,000,000. The extent to which the railroad can be cheapened is something hardly conceivable. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) informed us a few evenings ago that a very difficult piece of railroad running out of Kingston was constructed for \$15,000 a mile. A gentleman connected with that road has since assured me that though it ran to a rocky country, it was actually built for \$15,000 a mile, and was, when constructed, a first-class road. It is well known that a road can be built very cheaply if we are only contented to have heavy grades and sharp curves, and poor road-beds and wooden bridges. A very important feature of this bargain is that for a portion of the road which can be constructed most cheaply the Syndicate are to get the largest quantity of land per mile. One would suppose that when you come to what is admittedly the most difficult section of the road, the Lake Superior section, the allowance of land and money would be much larger than in the eastern and central sections. Nobody has explained why more land per mile is to be given on that central section than on the eastern section. If the Syndicate chooses to convert the \$25,000,000 of cash subsidy, as they are authorised to do, into bonds on which the Government will be obliged to pay 5 per cent. per annum for twenty years, it is calculated that they can in that way convert \$25,000,000 into \$40,000,000.

Mr. ANGLIN.

The Government provides that of the money so raised the Syndicate shall be paid *pro rata*, withholding only \$2,000 a mile for 800 miles, to be applied for the construction of the more difficult portion in the far west. Even taking off that \$2,000 a mile you find there remains a sum of \$14,500 a mile. Last year Mr. Fleming's estimate of the cost of the whole railroad through the prairie section was but \$13,000 a mile, and we know that the hon. Minister of Railways, last year, boasted that he had let one or two sections at a rate so low that the total cost would be much less than \$13,000 per mile if this contract had been carried out, so that the road might be constructed for \$10,000 a mile. Now, I venture to say that no one who knows any thing of the mysteries of railway construction can deny that a railroad of some kind or other, equal, at all events, to the Union Pacific, as first constructed, can be built across the Prairie section for \$8,000 a mile. But let us suppose it will cost \$13,000, yet we undertake to pay \$14,500 a mile, or \$1,500 a mile more than the road is to cost, and to give besides 12,500 acres per mile of the choice lands. Now, you will find, if you take 12,500 acres of lands for a thousand miles—for the Syndicate may possibly find it to their interest to build a hundred miles beyond Jasper House—at this rate you have 12,500,000 acres of land, and that is as much good land as can be found in either of the twenty-four mile belts along the railroad. So that you positively give them \$1,500 a mile more than the outside estimate of the cost of the railroad in cash, and besides 12,500 acres of land throughout the whole length of the road, and you convey that to them absolutely, you cease to have any control or right over it, and they may convey it away any day they please. What security have we to have, if they find it is not to their interest to build the more difficult sections of the road?

Mr. PLUMB. What has the country to do with that?

Mr. ANGLIN. Why! The country is to give all these millions in money and millions in acres of land, and if the country gets nothing back again, are we to be asked what has the country to do with that? Mr. Chairman, such a question put to me from the other side of the House at this stage of the debate, shows what little attention the hon. gentleman has paid to this question, and shows what their feelings are in regard to interest. The country is everything to us. But I fear much that the majority of the hon. gentlemen on the other side will put the matter in such a position that they can, with much propriety, bye-and-by ask, what the country has to do with it! They will take everything away from the country, and leave us nothing in return—no security. A million dollars is to be lodged in the hands of the Government. What is one million compared with the profits they will make in this transaction? They would forfeit a million even if the security was real, instead of being sham and bogus, and take this \$1,500 a mile cash profit, and all the fertile land in the twenty-four mile belt along the 1,000 miles in that fine country. It has been said there is another security—that the Syndicate are bound by their contract to commence the work on the eastern section within a month after commencing on the western, not proceeding exactly *pari passu*, but at a rate that will satisfy the Government. They intend to complete it within the ten years. We are told they will build the central section within three years. No doubt they will. There is no great difficulty about constructing it. Whether they intend to remain in the country, and use the extraordinary powers as a monopoly which this Bill will confer on them, or be content with the profits realized and abandon the whole scheme, still they will build that section within the three years. Well, how much of the other sections will they have built in the three years? Three-tenths, if they carry out the contract faithfully. Then, if they build a road not better than the Union Pacific they will receive money enough to cover their whole