

including the other items I have mentioned, altogether over \$42,500,000, leaving out entirely both ends. What are the ends to cost? \$45,000,000 is, as I have stated, the cost from Edmonton to Burrard Inlet on the West; and from Fort William to Nipissing on the East, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at a length of about 650 miles, and a cost of \$32,500,000. Thus, the ends make up together \$77,000,000; the centre and the past expenditure, \$42,500,000, making a total of \$120,000,000."

The hon. gentleman gave us these figures to show what the road would cost. It was, of course, the object at that time to show that it would cost an enormous sum of money, to let every elector in the country know that it would cost \$120,000,000; that we were unable to go on with the road, and that it would ruin the country to attempt to do so. That was the cry then. This year we come and say: we are able to build the whole road for \$78,000,000, although only last year it was to cost, according to the hon. gentleman, \$120,000,000. The fact is, hon. gentlemen opposite do not want the Pacific Railway at all. If we apply the hon. gentleman's calculation to the eastern and the western sections, we will find that every mile of railway in the mountainous section would cost \$100,000, and every mile in the eastern section \$50,000 a mile. Well, under our calculations, the western section would cost \$30,000 a mile instead of \$100,000, and the eastern section \$25,000 a mile. The proportion here given is more favorable to the eastern section as a guarantee to the Government than that according to the figures given by the hon. gentleman last year. But what is the use of giving them \$100,000 and \$50,000 a mile if that money is not required? The hon. gentlemen opposite must see that the estimate of the Minister of Railways, if that was his estimate, could be changed this year, as in the case of the reduction in the contracts which brought down the estimate from \$38,000,000 to \$28,000,000. Therefore, the Government have ample security in this amount of money for the building of the eastern as well as the western section. By the contract these three sections must proceed simultaneously and vigorously. On 1st July next the work must begin on the eastern as well as on the central section; this is a condition of the contract, the bargain with the Syndicate, and, at the end of ten years, the whole railway, the eastern as well as the central and western sections, must be completed. The prairie section may be built faster than the others. If so, so much the better. It will open up the country sooner; emigrants will flow in, and our lands, as well as the Company's lands, will be the sooner taken up. It is a specific condition of the contract that the two sections be finished within ten years. For this eastern section we have reserved 16,250,000 acres to build the 650 miles, and \$25,000 a mile. As I stated before recess, it is now known that the country north of Lake Superior is not the barren region many people imagine. It appears a large portion of it is a good country that will furnish traffic to the railway. Fortunately for Ontario it is within its boundaries, and the railway will open up the country; but that does not prevent our being sure that this fact was not quite sufficient to secure the building of that section. The next objection of the leader of the Opposition is, that the Company may build railways where they please; that other Canadians have not the same privilege, but must come to Parliament for power. Well, the Company may construct branch lines in the North-West; what harm is there in that? Do we ever refuse gentlemen who wish to form a company permission to build a railway where there is no other railway, and where one is wanted? Never; we always give them a charter, and they are very often subsidized by the Federal or local authorities. In this case the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does not ask a dollar subsidy either in land or money to build those branch lines. They say, we want that power. We give them 25,000,000 acres, a great deal of which will not be near the road; much of the land may be 50, 100 or 200 miles distant. How are they to reach those lands? They have a great interest in those lands. Why? Not only because they must be sold to give them capital

Mr. LANGEVIN.

to recompense them, but those lands settled will give traffic to the main line. So, it is their interest to construct side and branch lines; and why should it not be so? This road is not to be a sham, but a railroad or highway from one end of the country to the other; and why not offer all facilities for the opening up and settlement of the country? But the Company's blocks of land 100 or 200 miles in the interior will have on each side blocks belonging to the Government, and the Company's branch railways will benefit the Government by opening up its lands and enhancing their value. People will not settle 200 miles in the interior where there is no railroad. I am surprised at the complaints of hon. gentlemen opposite on this head. I am sure that the settlers in that country, 10, 20 or 30 years hence, will not thank them for trying to prevent the Company from constructing branch railroads to open up the country. The leader of the Opposition says that Canadians do not stand on the same footing as the Syndicate. No doubt, and it is because other people will not belong to the Company, or assume the same obligations. Not only the Company, but the country is interested in having branch lines. It is for the good of that region that such powers should be given to the Company. Any other company that will come to Parliament, will not, I am sure, be refused an act of incorporation. Suppose some of the gentlemen living in Winnipeg wish to have a railroad to the Peace River; does any one believe there will be any difficulty in giving them a charter? This Syndicate could not stand in their way. They could not prevent other citizens building that road if they chose. Do we not remember the famous Bill of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)? It favored the construction of all railways in the North-West, not only by a Bill as we propose, but by giving projectors aid in money or land. Therefore, if it was then good under the Government of the hon. member for Lambton—and the present leader of the Opposition must have favored its policy—to aid railways to that extent, it cannot be bad in us to aid them when we are giving neither money nor land. The next objection the hon. leader of the Opposition has made is this: that the Company will invest only \$5,000,000, and will recoup themselves soon by the sale of their lands. Well, Mr. Chairman, what objection is there to this? These lands will be their lands, and they will sell them, and the money will come into their coffers to recoup them for the money expended or subscribed by them for the road. That is the case with every other company that has lands to sell and a railway to work. The receipts from the sale of lands and traffic go into railway companies' coffers, and are devoted to paying expenses and dividends, and I suppose this Company will be allowed to do the same. But if these lands are sold, the Syndicate will not carry them out of the country. These lands must remain in the North-West, and, if sold, to whom must they be sold? They must be sold to settlers, and if they be sold to settlers, we will have obtained exactly the object we had in view; that is, to bring settlers to settle in that country, to open it up, to make it a great country, to have new provinces in that region. We will have new British subjects there, men who will have the same objects in view that we have, who will elect their representatives, whose representatives will sit in this hall, if this hall is large enough to hold them, who will, at all events, sit in Parliament with us. They will come here and legislate with us, and they will have the same rights that we possess. But, the hon. gentleman complains that this Company will have the advantage of selling these lands and settling these settlers there. The object we have in view is to build the road. We do not wish to spend \$55,000,000 in cash, but \$25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land; and why should we not do so? If the hon. gentleman is correct, if the Company will recoup themselves by the sale of these lands, then what becomes of the affirmation of the hon. gentle-