

hon. friend. He sneered at his arguments, and at the scheme which he treated, in the first instance, as a matter of badinage, but the Minister of Railways came best out of the argument. How did the hon. member for West Durham end his speech? He called the great scheme a sacrifice of our country's honor.

Mr. BLAKE. What I said was, that the last time you were in power you sacrificed our honor. This time you are sacrificing our interest.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He said this was the second time we were sacrificing the honor of our country.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. LANGEVIN. It may have been a *lapsus lingue*, but I heard the hon. gentleman and took down his words. Of course, if he does not wish to stand by his words, as in another part of his speech, he said he was not bound, by any expressions of opinion of his, as to the value of the lands—well, if he does not wish to stand by those words—

Mr. BLAKE. I stand by the words I spoke.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I will not insist on the hon. gentleman being bound by words he may have uttered in the heat of discussion. It was, I think, at the end of his speech, when he may have forgotten that he was applying those words to this scheme. At all events, Mr. Chairman, we are, by this great undertaking, working for the extension of our country and for the consolidation of our institutions. We wish to have those British institutions that we have been enjoying from year to year consolidated. We want them to be the inheritance of our children and our children's children. But the hon. gentleman wishes to know—I will not say so—he has taken back those words.

Mr. BLAKE. Which words? If the hon. gentleman will look at the official report, he will see he is quite wrong.

Mr. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman may say the official report is different, but I repeat I took down his words because they seemed to be so strange.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand it to be the invariable custom of Parliament to accept as true an hon. gentleman's statement. I told the hon. gentleman what I did say. The official report, which was unrevised by me, bears out my statement, and it is extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should set up his own recollection of what I said against my statement and against the official report.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I did not set my own recollection against the hon. gentleman's statement. I say I took down these words as the hon. gentleman uttered them.

Mr. BLAKE. You misheard.

Mr. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says he did not utter those words, and I must accept his statement; but I say I took down these words on hearing them, so that I must have misheard the hon. gentleman, and, therefore, I stand corrected. But, Mr. Chairman, how could we be surprised to see hon. gentlemen opposite opposing this measure which is sure to give us the railway from one end to the other, from the shores of the Pacific to our system of Canadian railways, when, at all other periods, they have always opposed all the great schemes that were brought forward by this party to Parliament, and assented to by a large majority of its members? The Grand Trunk Railway was opposed by these hon. gentlemen; the Intercolonial Railway was opposed by them. The House will remember that they thought the Intercolonial Railway was one of those measures that would ruin the country. "Twenty million dollars, said they!" And, besides that "why do you not put this railway on the frontier, between Canada and the United States?" That was the scheme of these hon. gentlemen with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. Well, we thought

Mr. LANGEVIN,

otherwise, the country thought otherwise, Parliament thought otherwise, and the result was—what? Did they not say that railway would not give revenue sufficient to pay the grease for the car-wheels? Well, the other day, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways declared that, by all appearances, this year this railway and the Island railway would be self-sustaining. The National Policy is another measure that hon. gentlemen have opposed. They would not consent to that. For years, during their term of office, we were insisting that they should give protection to our industries and manufactures. But they were deaf to our representations. They said: "No; you are a small minority"—we could hardly obtain a hearing at certain times in that Parliament—"you do not represent the people; we know better; we want Free Trade in this country." Well, the elections of September, 1878, settled that point; and when we came into office, we came with a National Policy. And how were we met by hon. gentlemen opposite? Did they not oppose that also? And, if the Pacific Railway were left to their tender mercies, I have no doubt we would not see it completed for thirty years to come. This Pacific Railway will be built in a comparatively small number of years, for it is a necessity for the country, not only because we made a treaty with British Columbia, but because the necessities of our position here in the north, north of the United States, require that we should have complete communication with all parts of the Dominion. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to answer some of the specific objections that were taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and to the scheme. The first objection, the first remark he made about my hon. friend was, that there was a great variety in the estimates presented by him to Parliament; that, last year, my hon. friend had brought down an estimate for the building and completing of the road for eighty-eight millions of dollars, while, this year, he came down with a corrected estimate of \$78,000,000. Why he should complain of that, I cannot imagine.

Mr. BLAKE. I said that it was pleasing.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman is pleased, for I could not understand how he should take any objection to the altered estimate of my hon. friend (Sir C. Tupper). I should rather think he would accept that estimate, and believe that it would be pleasing to the country, seeing that, instead of an expenditure of eighty-eight millions of dollars the cost will be only seventy-eight millions. If instead of this the Minister of Railways had said, last year, that the cost would be seventy-eight millions, and that, this year, he had said that it would be eighty-eight millions, ten millions more, then I could have understood it; and I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would have been a little shocked to find that the estimate was ten millions more than last year. But it is not so. My friend on my right, the Minister of Railways, has been able to reduce the expenditure, and the reason for that is this: my hon. friend, after studying the subject more closely, and after having the whole data before him, has been better able to judge of the cost. The hon. member has admitted himself that we have every day better information about the fertility and wealth of the country; we are thus better able to judge. But the leader of the Opposition, instead of doing as he did last year—poo-hooing the calculations we made last year, when he thought these lands were not worth a dollar an acre—says now that they are worth four or five dollars an acre. He goes on to say that, with the acquisition of population, we must change our position, as it gives us the idea that these lands will sell for more. If that is so, why should not my hon. friend the Minister of Railways have the same advantage? Why, after thinking over the matter for eight or ten months,