

that price; for, then, the Government will be able to sell their lands alongside at the same price, and so recoup themselves in a short time. The speech of the hon. gentleman leaves us no other conclusion. I think I may say that the fair inference from his speech, as published in the "Debates," is, that the Company will obtain \$10 per acre, while the Government will not obtain more than \$5. I do not know how he reached that conclusion. I tried hard to follow him through his calculations, but they were so minute and so abundant that, with all my effort and with all my desire to do the hon. gentleman justice, I could not follow him all through. But I was able to gather enough to understand that his calculations were not as fair as I would have expected from the hon. gentleman. In connection with this land question he also spoke of the surveys. Well, that is something that cuts both ways. These lands had to be surveyed into townships, correct alignments of the land had to be drawn, and for that purpose the Government required money. The Department of the Interior, I have no doubt, will be able to tell us the cost of the surveys. The hon. gentleman finds fault because the Government will have to survey a portion of these lands. But how will they be surveyed? If we are to give blocks of land to the Company, we must give the outside line of the blocks. But in any case the surveys would have to be made. They would have to be made by the Government if we kept the lands. And when we grant these 25,000,000 of acres to the Company, they will, of course, have afterwards to make their own surveys to divide the lots; so that portions of the expenditure, which otherwise the Government would have had to incur, will be paid by the Company, that is, if they are to make the railway profitable, and I, for one, hope they may do so. It is to the interest of the country that they may be able to work the road advantageously and profitably, and if they should not be able to do so, it would be better that the Government should work the road themselves. But we all know that a company can work a railway at a less cost and with a greater profit than a Government can, better even than so good a Government as the present Administration. The hon. gentleman has referred to the obligations and liabilities of Canada in connection with the railway. He says that they are undetermined—that they have no finality. I generally find the hon. gentleman very logical, but I fail to see his logic in this case. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways says to the House: the portions of the road which we have built and the portions which we are now building cost \$28,000,000, and then adds the \$25,000,000 which we are to give to the Company, and the value of the 25,000,000 acres of land. I think our liabilities in the matter are as well determined as they could possibly be. Taking the land at \$1 per acre, we have a total of \$78,000,000 as the sum we have to pay. Surely there is sufficient determinativeness and finality in that calculation to suit hon. gentlemen. But there would be no finality in the scheme of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I cannot conceive what the people of Ontario or Quebec have done to the hon. gentleman that he should say to them that they shall not have a railway. He says: do not build the railway; leave it to the future to determine the liabilities of the country. He adds: that the region north of Lake Superior is so wild and inaccessible, that it is such a wilderness that we cannot build a railway there, and that we must leave it for future consideration. One hon. gentleman—I think it was the member for Algoma, who knows whereof he speaks—informs us that that country is by no means so bad as it is represented; that we would be agreeably surprised at its condition if we went through it. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot complain of the lack of determinativeness in the matter, when he can arrive at the cost by so simple a calculation. The hon. gentleman, who evidently wanted to be facetious, says, that there will be a final relief for the country—and the relief will be that the

Minister of Railways will be in his place to present new and reduced estimates. I have no doubt it will be a relief to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to see my hon. friend in office, as Minister of Railways, for those twenty years; and I have no doubt that the country as well will be pleased with the prediction. At all events, I think it will be better to have my hon. friend here to prepare reduced estimates, which he may have exaggerated, than to have hon. gentlemen opposite in office promising increased revenues and all the blessings of a golden age, only to disappoint a waiting people. We must remember that when these hon. gentlemen occupied the Government benches they were found to be not quite equal to the promises they had made. They say our obligations and liabilities are undetermined; but I should like to ask if they were otherwise when these hon. gentlemen were in office. We had every year a speech on our finances; sometimes very able and very interesting to the country, and we were promised that there would be an end of deficits if the House would only submit to increased taxation. But after waiting year after year for five years, the result was not a surplus—not the liabilities determined, not both ends meeting, but a deficit of several millions of dollars. I think the country will agree with the leader of the Opposition, that it is a great relief to the country that the Minister of Railways and his friends are on this side of the House.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Before six o'clock I was coming to the eighth objection which the leader of the Opposition urged against this scheme. He stated that the division of money and lands into three sections was not a fair one, and did not offer a sufficient guarantee to the country. This matter was well weighed by the Government when we were discussing the conditions with the Syndicate. By referring to the contract, we find that there are three sections, or rather two sections, with one section divided into two sub-sections; of the central section, 900 miles, go to the Rocky Mountains—to Jasper House,—and 450 miles from Jasper House to Kamloops; the eastern section, of 650 miles, is that north of Lake Superior. By the contract, the first portion of the central section, 900 miles, is to receive \$10,000 per mile, in money, making \$9,000,000, and 11,250,000 acres, which, at a dollar an acre, are equal to \$11,250,000, making \$20,250,000 in money and land. The second portion, 450 miles, is to receive \$13,333 per mile, or \$6,000,000 in money, and 7,500,000 acres of land, which, at a dollar an acre, are equal to \$7,500,000, making \$13,500,000 in money and land. The Lake Superior section of 650 miles, is to receive in money, \$15,984 per mile, or \$10,000,000, and in land, 9,615 acres per mile, or 6,250,000, equal to \$6,250,000, making \$16,250,000 in land and money. If you take the land and money subsidies together, you have for the 900 miles to Jasper House, \$22,500 per mile; for the 450 miles, through the mountain region in British Columbia, \$30,000 per mile, and for the 650 miles of the eastern section, \$25,000 per mile. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman says that this division is not a proper one, and does not offer a sufficient guarantee to the country for the building of the road. Well, the hon. gentleman should remember that he, himself, last year, gave us a speech on this question, in which he brought forward figures to show what would be the amount of money required for these three sections. Of course, his object at that time was to show that the railway would cost a very large sum of money. The hon. gentleman was answering the Minister of Railways, and said:

"Of course, the through traffic depends on the road being first-class, and we must remember that, after we have spent all the hon. Minister proposes, we shall have, not a Pacific, but a colonization road. According to the old system of construction, that central section would cost,