

proposition to stay proceedings in that section of the country, I confess that I am amazed, considering the position of my hon. friends opposite are in with reference to the obligations they solemnly entered into with British Columbia and with the British Government, through Lord Carnarvon. It is now a grave and serious question in dealing with this expenditure; and, I must say, I was surprised, when the vote was taken a few nights since, to find, on the other side of the House, gentlemen voting for a proposition that would, if it had been adopted, deprive the Dominion of Canada of the means, available from the sale of lands, for the construction of that Railway, and thus subject the older Provinces to increased taxation for the whole of that expenditure; and those gentlemen will, no doubt, vote for the proposition of the hon. member who is to move a resolution that these works are not to be constructed, knowing, at the same time, that our Treaty engagements must be carried out. When the right hon. Premier referred, yesterday, to a statement that had been put into his hands with reference to the revenue that was likely to be received from the lands of the North-West, there was some little laughter on the other side of the House; and, no doubt, in justification of their vote on the land question this morning, they will say there was no money in it, and, therefore, they did not sacrifice anything in voting against the sale of the lands. But I hold that that estimate was not an exaggerated one. But suppose it was large, taking but one-half the population that is estimated to go into the North-West, making this year 12,000 instead of 24,000, and adding 2,500 a year instead of 5,000, and then provide for the sale of but one-half of the lands estimated by the Premier, and what is the result? It produces in ten years, in money, according to that statement, \$19,500,000 instead of \$39,000,000, and it would leave a balance of payment due on the lands of \$16,000,000 towards the payment of the debt. The hon. member for Gloucester called attention to the fact, that my hon. friend the leader of the Government did not refer to the interest that is to be paid in that time. Well, our calculation is this: that, in order to complete the Railway from the head of Lake Superior to Winnipeg and

the 200 miles beyond it, we will have to spend \$10,000,000 a year for two years. After that the Government policy is not to expend on public works over \$5,000,000 a year; and you will find, by making the calculation, that the expenditure for the two years, when we have completed it from the head of Lake Superior to 200 miles beyond Winnipeg, together with that in British Columbia, will not exceed \$5,000,000 a year. In the ten years, according to Mr. Fleming's estimate under this expenditure, it will be completed, involving an outlay of \$60,000,000. Now, then, if we calculate the interest on the \$10,000,000 for this year, \$10,000,000 for next year, \$5,000,000 a year afterwards, it amounts to \$18,500,000 in ten years; \$1,000,000 less than half the estimate of my hon. friend for the payment of the interest, and leaving \$16,000,000 as a balance due, besides over 80,000,000 acres of unsold land to complete the road. Is it unreasonable to suppose that in ten years 250,000 people will be placed in that country? Mr. Fleming's statement is, that the road from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains will cost at the outside \$15,000 a mile; \$13,000 is his estimate, making the whole expenditure something like \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000 for that section. I have heard the hon. member for Gloucester say that the experience in the other Provinces is that railways have not developed the country. Why, suppose we had put a railway through any part of New Brunswick that was difficult of access, and through such lands as we have on the banks of the River St. John—and this is the kind of soil we have in the North-West—I would like to know if that Railway would not be an effectual means of developing and settling the country? Well, Sir, if that be the case, I think there is every reason to hope, and be hopeful, with reference to the great future of this country. Our financial difficulties, as I stated in my Budget Speech, will be for the next year or two; after that our course will be clear, and the Government will have the control in their hands. If they find there is a difficulty with reference to the expenditure, they can limit it; but I believe they will find that \$5,000,000 a year on that road, and upon the 900 miles beyond Winnipeg, will not be an