

should be put on the land? Not the price of the hon. member for Lambton, or the hon. member for West Durham, or myself, because, as opponents of the Government, we might be charged with dealing unfairly by them, but the price which the men who signed the contract on behalf of the people of Canada placed on it, \$3 an acre, and that is greatly under the average as stated by the hon. leader of the Government, and I have *Hansard* under my hand in which I can turn up the page. When did the hon. gentleman put that price on the land? Only a few months before the hon. Minister of Railways attached his signature to that contract. You have the 25,000,000 acres which the man who made the bargain said was worth \$3 per acre, giving \$75,000,000 in land, which with \$25,000,000 in cash, made \$100,000,000 as the amount given to those men to build work estimated at \$48,500,000. Do the hon. gentlemen say these figures are nonsensical? They dare not say it, as they would be declaring that the Minister of Railways, standing in his place in Parliament, and stating on his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, talked nonsense, for they are his figures. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say the price is ridiculous? They dare not say that, because the hon. First Minister stood in his place and told the representatives of the people that this price was greatly under its value. There is \$48,500,000 worth of work to do for which the Government give \$100,000,000 in cash and land according to figures furnished by themselves. What more? Why, when they had done that they gave the Syndicate the road besides. Surely, when they gave the Company \$51,500,000 more than the work would cost we might have owned the road, but the Government gave the Company the road. What more? They exempted the Company forever from all taxation. What more? The 406 miles of railway from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, passing through the Lake Superior region, is to be constructed and paid for with the money of the Canadian people at a cost of from \$16,000,000 to \$18,000,000, and when constructed it is to be handed over a free gift to the Syndicate, which has already \$51,500,000 more than the whole work will cost them. Is that all? No. That portion of the road building in the canyons of the Rocky Mountains, from Yale to Kamloops, at an estimated cost of \$10,000,000, is to be built and paid for out of the pockets of the Canadian people, and when completed it is to be handed over a free gift to the Syndicate. The ninety miles from Yale to Port Moody, for which tenders have just been received, and which will involve an outlay of \$2,500,000 out of the pockets of the people, is, when constructed, to be handed over to that Company, to be theirs forever. The Pembina Branch already completed and in running order and paying great dividends, is also to be handed over to the Company as a free gift, although the Company receives \$51,500,000 over and above the cost. This is the equivalent we gave them in money and land according to the price placed on it by the Government. Our position is stronger by the lapse of a year, because if hon. gentlemen were disposed to raise objections to the statement of the hon. First Minister, as regards the value of the land, we have now the fixed and determined value by the Syndicate. What is the price the Syndicate asks for these lands? The hon. Minister of Railways will agree that the first offer before there are many settlers in the country and the tide of immigration has set in will be the lowest price. The lowest price placed on it by the Syndicate is \$2.50 per acre. The hon. the Minister of Railways has told the House that it is \$1 and \$1.25 per acre; but the price was \$2.50, with a rebate of \$1.25 per acre. Does that affect the price put on the land? No, because the hon. Minister of Railways forgot himself, and in one part of his speech he furnished a very important argument to the Opposition. He said the Syndicate understood their business too well to hold their lands at too high a price. Every acre of land put under

MR. PATERSON (Brant).

cultivation was worth twice as much to them as if they had got \$10 an acre for it at the end of ten years. By placing the lands under cultivation, the Company would make \$20 per acre. The hon. Minister furnishes us with an argument of very great value. References have been made to certain amendments moved by hon. members on this side of the House, and the hon. the Minister of Railways declared we are afraid to allude to them. I allude to one amendment proposed. It was to the effect that in letting this contract there should be a clause inserted giving the Government the liberty at any time to buy back the work by paying the contractors 10 per cent. over and above the cost. Allusion has been made to the Act passed by the hon. member for Lambton, and it will be remembered that Act contained an express stipulation that any portion of the road would be bought back from the contractors, by paying 10 per cent. over and above what it cost them, they returning bonuses they received in land and money. We pressed that amendment, but the majority voted it down in silence without debate. What would have been the effect of the resolution, if passed, with respect to the central section? I have the figures at hand, and it is a calculation that every business man can make. It requires very little skill to determine it, because we have the figures supplied to us by the hon. Minister of Railways. It is 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper. What is the estimated cost? *Hansard* is under my hand, in which the hon. gentleman is reported as having stated that the line could have been built and equipped for \$13,000 per mile. In reply to a question of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) the hon. gentleman said, "Yes, that was it." He would be justified in saying \$10,000, but as he wanted to give the outside figure he placed it at \$13,000—1,000 miles at that rate would cost \$13,000,000. What did we give the Company? \$10,000,000 in cash and 12,500,000 acres of land, which, at \$3 per acre, being the price given by the Finance Minister, made a total of \$47,500,000. Then give them 10 per cent. on their \$13,000,000, that would be \$1,300,000. The Syndicate would give back to the people the money bonus we gave them, the land bonus we gave them, and we would give to them the cost of the road and 10 per cent. added. Had that clause been in the contract we could have got back from the Syndicate, if the figures of the leader of the Government and Minister of Railways were to be relied upon, the road constructed with our money, and \$33,200,000 cash besides. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) laughs. His laugh is at the expense of the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and of the Prime Minister. *Hansard* is here, and if any hon. gentleman denies it I will read the figures and statements to the House. Take now the actual price of the lands, the price at which they are being held by the Syndicate, \$2.50 per acre, besides owning the road we would have \$26,950,000. Yet the hon. gentleman says that when we meet the electors we will be afraid to mention to them that we had moved an amendment intended to secure that result. But the hon. Minister of Railways says: "How about the running of the road? We don't want to own the road. It would ruin us to own it." Let us see what the hon. Minister said about the running of the road. I have it here in *Hansard*. It is worth while to notice what he says. It is to be found on page 1422 of *Hansard*, 1880.

An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

MR. PATERSON. No, I will not dispense. It may be all very well for the hon. gentleman who, I have no doubt, is an opponent of the Minister of Railways to want me to dispense with the reading of the words of wisdom of the hon. gentleman, but I am too great an admirer of the hon. Minister