

Pickering Harbor. That harbor belongs chiefly to a Mr. McClellan, who gave evidence before your Kaministiquia Committee. He was brought in my opinion very improperly and unfairly to injure the character of Mr. Murdoch, an engineer. I did feel that that was a base proceeding, one unworthy of a Minister of the Crown to have played a part in. We now find in the Supply Bill an item of \$5,000 for Mr. McClellan's Harbor. There is another fact in connect on with this which I may state. It is a small matter, but it shows wastefulness of the public money or worse. This Mr. McClellan came here doubtless to induce the Government to put an item into the Estimates for his harbor, and, while here he was called upon by the Government to give unimportant evidence before the Committee, and for this he was paid out of the public funds his travelling expenses from Pickering to Ottawa and back, and allowed besides \$4 a day for a certain number of days while here, although his real business in Ottawa unquestionably was to get an appropriation for his harbor. It is quite evident that the gentleman is one of the special favorites of the Government, who is held in higher regard than the people. When speaking of that terminus on the Kaministiquia, I may state that the railway was actually deflected into the town plot, instead of being taken, as it might have been, almost in a straight line to the McKellar farm.

Hon. Mr. HOPE—What can the McKellar farm be got for per acre?

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—We have it in evidence that Mr. McKellar would have been willing to have sold a part of the farm for \$75 an acre.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—I read it that he said distinctly the reverse.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—He is not very distinct upon it, but he said he would be willing to have taken \$75 per acre for it.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Yes; if the railway had gone to Nipegon.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—He said if the
Hon. Mr. Macpherson.

railway had come to his place he would have been willing to give 15 acres towards the terminus.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—I asked him if he would have refused \$50 an acre for the whole farm, and his answer showed clearly he would have considered that a good price before the railway terminus was located on the town plot. The hon. Secretary of State has frequently asserted that the Government cannot acquire land as advantageously as a railway company can. I do not see why that should be the case. If a railway company had been surveying the Canadian Pacific line, and hesitating as to whether the terminus should be at Fort William, Prince Arthur's Landing or Nipegon, they would have taken good care to have got a sufficient quantity of land for a terminus under offer at all those points. Had the Government done this a large sum of money would have been saved to the country, and in addition to the terminus grounds they might have secured enough for a town plot, the sale of which would have helped to pay for the railway.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—The hon. Secretary of State thinks that could not have been done. I will tell him of a case which came within my own knowledge where a large sum was saved through the prudence and forethought of a Minister. The late Government, in 1869 or 1870, determined to build a new post-office at Toronto. They fixed provisionally upon what they believed to be the best site. The land was owned by several parties, and the Government got all the lots required under offer before they committed themselves to any of the owners. I will tell the hon. Secretary of State how I know this. The hon. Senator from Kingston was then Postmaster-General, and in March, 1870, during the Session of Parliament, he told me what the Government had determined upon, and said that the time within which the lots were under offer to the Government would expire before the money could be voted. He added that the land would cost the Government a considerable additional sum if those offers were allowed to lapse. And he asked