

will there not be the same trouble and complaint?

Hon. Mr. POWER—The Duke of York did not operate the mines.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—He sold them to a British company and they had a monopoly of them for years. There was a great agitation about it.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I say there was a monopoly in that case, and there is no monopoly in this case, except as to one-twentieth of the mineral lands. Then Mackenzie & Mann do not carry those lands out of the country. They have to pay a royalty on them, of one per cent. It has been contended that it is most unfair that they should pay less royalty than other people. Well the royalty is imposed on all that Mackenzie & Mann get out. They could take up the lands without any such contract as this; and it has been contended by hon. gentlemen who are members of the opposition that the royalty of ten per cent is altogether too high, and if hon. gentlemen opposite had their way I suppose the royalty would be reduced to possibly two per cent or something like that. Now, Mackenzie & Mann have to pay royalty and have to pay wages; and it has been shown, I think by the hon. leader of the opposition not in this House but in the other House, that all that remains as a rule to a mining company is about this—that out of \$22,500 they have to spend \$20,000. They are sending in a very expensive engineer, and will spend a great amount of money in developing the country, or developing the mines rather, because there is nothing in the country except the gold and rock. So that I really cannot understand the attitude of hon. gentlemen who oppose this measure in such a strenuous way. I can understand that a gentleman, after weighing both sides, being influenced by his political feeling, may think that on the whole it is not a good agreement, but that any one can honestly believe that it is such an indefensible and outrageous agreement as it has been described to be, I cannot understand. We are told at one time that the government have taken a leap in the dark, I think the hon. gentleman from Calgary, told us that—that they have undertaken to build a railway without sufficient information, that they have attempted a

huge undertaking. That was the expression he used. At another time we are told, and I think by the same hon. gentleman, that they have not moved fast enough, and have not moved soon enough. They cannot very well be open to both charges. As a matter of fact, the government waited till they had the reports of Mr. Jennings and others, and they then decided upon their line of action in time to have the work begun and to have a road open for sleighs in the middle of March and a narrow gauge railroad opened by the 1st September. I do not think they can be found fault with for their action in the matter. It is perfectly clear that by the time they got all their information there was not time to ask for tenders in the usual way, and they had asked some people to tender, and they gave the agent, or gentleman who was represented as being the agent, of some Rothschild syndicate an opportunity to tender which he would not do. It seems still more surprising, hon. gentlemen, that we should be so very exacting and hard to please in the matter of this contract when we remember the case of the Canadian Pacific and of most railways through the North-west country.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—There is no similarity in the two cases.

Hon. Mr. POWER—No, there is no similarity between them. In the first place there was no urgency, no risk of people dying of starvation if the roads were not built; there was no impossibility of going into the country for the purpose of administering government there as in the present case, but in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway the land was given in alternate blocks. There had been surveys, but the company were not obliged to follow any particular line, they were allowed to select their own line. They departed from the line which had been surveyed by Sir Sanford Fleming and his engineers, and there is no doubt the company made a mistake in the location of the line through the Rockies; and in the case of those roads to which we are voting large quantities of valuable lands in the North-west and in some cases money grants, we have less information than with respect to this road; and I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen should become so excited over this particular case.