

being taxed. The next point the hon. gentleman has found fault with is the amount that we are giving the Company. He says that, last year, the hon. the First Minister stated in the House, that the regulations of the Department of the Interior were to this effect: the policy of the Government was, that along the railway the lands would be divided into so many belts, there would be Belts A, B, C, D and E, and the first belt alongside the railway would be sold at \$5 an acre, the next \$4 an acre, the following \$3, the next \$2, and the last \$1 an acre. The hon. gentleman, last year, I may observe, ridiculed the idea of having these lands sold for \$4 and \$5 per acre, and thought that after such an exhibition the hon. the First Minister should disappear and make place for him. Well, the country thought otherwise. We passed our scheme, and this year here we are with this new scheme. Well, last year the price was \$5 an acre, and the hon. gentleman says: "now you are going to give this Company blocks one mile in frontage and twenty-four in depth. He adds: "Apply to them the rate of \$5 or \$4 per acre, as the case may be, and you have an immense sum for the 25,000,000 acres of land. But if the hon. gentleman applies those prices of \$4 and \$5 an acre to our scheme, he should apply them likewise to the proposed scheme of his hon. friend next to him (Mr. Mackenzie). If it is too high a rate for us, it must be far too high a rate for his hon. friend. He knows that 55,000,000 acres of land—he was in the Government then—

Mr. BLAKE. I was not in the Government.

Mr. LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman was not in the Government, he was not opposed to the scheme. He was in favor of it. He supported it. He never separated himself from his friends on account of it. At the rate of \$5 an acre for 55,000,000 acres, you will have \$275,000,000. It looks a big sum. The hon. gentleman smiles at it, no doubt it is laughable, but he must remember that he made the same laughable calculation about our old scheme, and if he laughs on one side of the mouth he must also laugh on the other side. My hon. friend at my right has passed me a calculation to show that a strip of land 100 feet through a township would make 72 acres altogether as the whole exemption in the township for all time to come. Well, let the hon. gentleman take the roads in all our townships, and he will find many times 72 acres in each that are not taxed, and why should this highway, this railway, be taxed? I was observing that this rate of \$5, or \$4 should have been applied by the hon. gentleman to the three different schemes. He should have shown that the \$4 or \$5 or \$3 per acre applied to the scheme of 1873, made such an amount; that applied to the scheme of his hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), it made so much; and that applied to the present scheme; it made another amount; and that comparing the three with each other, the amount obtained by the scheme of 1873 was less than that given by the scheme of 1875, and that the present scheme was less costly than either. My hon. friend at my right (Sir C. Tupper), did not apply the rate of \$1 an acre to our own scheme and \$5 an acre to the scheme of the hon. gentleman. He acted fairly by applying the dollar rate to both schemes, and he found that the amount was exactly what I stated in the beginning of my remarks, that is: In this case, \$78,000,000, while it was a much larger sum in 1873, and a still larger sum according to the scheme of the hon. gentleman. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman declared, and he tried to make the House and the country believe, that our scheme was a bad one. I have no doubt that when the country becomes acquainted with the speeches made on both sides, the people will judge us as they did in 1873; they will see that we have brought forward a scheme for the good of the

Mr. LANGEVIN.

country, and the best that could be made under the circumstances. Hon. gentlemen ask us: "Is there not something in that scheme you would prefer not to see in it—you would prefer to see changed?" I will answer the hon. gentleman in the same way as we did in 1866, when we came down with the scheme of Confederation. We said to the House that was the best scheme we could present under the circumstances. We said to the country, we have not to deal with an uninhabited country, which will be settled in the future, and to which we will have to give laws and institutions. We have not to deal with a country settled by only one race, and that race having but one religion; we have to deal with a country settled by different races, by Englishmen, Frenchmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen and Germans. We have to deal with a country where the Protestant religions and the Roman Catholic religion, are each professed by a large number; we have different institutions, and special institutions in one of the Provinces, and those special institutions are for the French race, who are attached to them, and wish to keep them—a loyal people, as loyal as any other in the Dominion—and, under these circumstances, we have to consider the interests of all; here is a scheme of confederation, and we ask you to pass it as a whole. It is a question of compromise; it is a treaty between the different Provinces; and though there may be in that scheme—and there were certain things that, for my own part, I would have preferred omitted—nevertheless I accepted it as a scheme of compromise, as one that would secure the future greatness of this country. Why did the Government do that? Because we were not alone to settle this question. We were four Provinces, and we had to take into account the prejudices and the difference of races of each. But there was something else. We knew there were outlying provinces, west and east, as well as territories, which would sooner or later ask for admission into the Confederation. Did we treat them as foreign countries? No; we said they should have the same institutions and the same laws as ourselves. Well, Mr. Chairman, in this case, in this contract, we are not only one party; we have to deal with the Syndicate. These gentlemen are one party and we are the other. We have to make a contract with these gentlemen for the building of this road. Shall we say to them: "You must take that or nothing?" That is not the way contracts are made. You have to give and take; you have to take into consideration the exigencies of the case; you have to see whether your terms are acceptable to the other party, and, after reasoning the matter with him you find that he is right and that your proposal is not sufficient, and you have to give more land, or more money, or other conditions; the result is that you have to agree to give and take on both sides, to prepare the contract and sign it. That is what we have done. Here is a contract, and we say that is the best we can do. I believe it is to the advantage of the country. We shall save money to the country by adopting it, and I hope the answer will be "yes;" from all our friends. The next point the hon. gentleman has alluded to is the sale of land by the Company and by the Government. The hon. gentleman has gone into a very learned and very elaborate calculation to show that, while the Company is going to make a great deal of money with their land, the neighboring blocks belonging to the Government will scarcely sell at all. The Company, he says, will sell their lands for \$5 an acre, while our lands, lying alongside, will not sell for more than a dollar an acre. That must be the inference from the calculations of the leader of the Opposition, because he applies his five dollar calculation to the Company's and not to the Government's land. But if the Company are able to sell their lands at this price, we are justified in expecting that the Government's land will sell just as well. I hope the Company will sell their lands at five dollars an acre, and that settlers will be glad to pay