

of the good will and great services, and great concessions that the Province of Quebec had ever received at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. He should have told the members from that Province, how they had been treated when, two or three years ago, their Province came to this House and asked for redress. He should have told them how the petition of that Province was treated by those hon. gentlemen when it was presented to the House. What redress did they give to Quebec? In 1878, where was the hon. member for West Durham when that question was put to a vote? Did he show his friendship towards Quebec and her representatives? Did his name appear in the division that then took place? You will set that amongst the names of 70 members out of 112, the name of the hon. member for West Durham is not to be found in the vote on the Letellier question. The hon. gentleman had been in the House, but when the vote came on he was not to be found. He would not give his vote for the Province of Quebec. After that, it is rather doubtful whether the members for Quebec will put themselves in the hands of the hon. member for West Durham. And now, it is well that we should study a little, the course of the hon. gentleman on the Pacific Railway question. He was opposed to the branch from Esquimault to Nanaimo, and the hon. member for Lambton had not the courage to resist him, and he threw out the Bill. The hon. gentleman further says, that we are not bound by the Carnarvon terms. I suppose the hon. member for Lambton had again to bow to his hon. friend, and say the Carnarvon terms must go also. The next point is, the hon. member for West Durham said, or wished the country to believe, that there was some pledge on the part of the Government of Canada, to build a railway there. Therefore, he assented to the proposal of the hon. member for Lambton, to offer that Province \$150,000 as compensation. That was refused. For what was it offered? As compensation for the delays that occurred in the building of the road in British Columbia.

MR. BLAKE: And would occur.

MR. LANGEVIN: Then came the tenders called for by the hon. the First Minister, for the four sections in British

Columbia. The hon. member for West Durham assented to them.

MR. BLAKE: How did I assent to them.

MR. LANGEVIN: The hon. gentleman assented to them by continuing to give his support to the hon. member for Lambton, and by supporting him at the elections.

MR. BLAKE: I was in England before these tenders were called for, and I did not return until last December.

MR. LANGEVIN: Then why did not the hon. gentleman state on the hustings that he did not agree with his hon. friend?

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Because he was not here at the time the elections came off.

MR. BLAKE: I said I had left this country for the Old Country before these tenders were called for, and I did not return until last December. A matter of fact, I was not aware that any such tenders had been called for until a few months within the present speaking.

MR. LANGEVIN: I accept what the hon. gentleman says, but it is strange he never took an opportunity of declaring that he had not assented to the calling for these tenders, and that he knew nothing about them. It is one of the strangest things possible that the hon. gentleman, while from the country, never saw a Canadian paper, and was ignorant of what was going on in this country. The hon. gentleman now says that if his hon. friend, the hon. member for Lambton, had wished to build these four sections he would have opposed him. It is late in the day to make this statement. We can see how the mind of the hon. gentleman is drifting. There is, first, the giving up of the Esquimault and Nanaimo Branch; then the offer of \$75,000 compensation, and, subsequently, his attitude in relation to these four contracts. Now, what has he done during the past year? The hon. gentleman being convinced that this Government was to build the Railway by Bute Inlet, denounced the policy of the Government, and it was asserted on the other side of the House that we were expending \$20,000,000 more than would be required to build the same road on the Fraser River. Had we adopted that route they would have asked, "Why did you not take