

man who calls this a monopoly that will shut out people from the North-West. How could they shut them out if these lands are to be sold to settlers and bought by them? You cannot have both things. It cannot be a monopoly that will close up that country and yet recoup themselves by the sale of their lands to settlers. The hon. gentleman said they would become the landlords of the North-West. Well, that cannot be the case, because, in the first place, they will be obliged to sell the lands in their own interest, and, according to the hon. gentleman, they would recoup themselves very soon by the sale of those lands. Of course, the Company may, if he uses the word monopoly in another sense, be a monopoly in this way: that it is a railway company which will have the traffic of this country over their railway; but in any case, such power must be given to a company, and it is better to give it to a powerful than to a weak company. But the hon. gentleman, following his argument, said, as I stated a moment ago, that the Syndicate would be landlords of the North-West. Well, as I have stated, they cannot be the landlords of the North-West, for the very good reason that, out of 250,000,000 acres of land there, they will have only 25,000,000, or one-tenth of the whole. But the hon. gentleman, in his fear, has forgotten that, in his position as leader of the Opposition, in that high position which his talents and the confidence of the Liberal party give him, a threat should not be thrown here to Parliament. He told us that the men who will settle there would be less than men if they allowed such a law to stand. "You talk, said he, of sending Irishmen to the North-West!" The hon. gentleman would wish those men to do—what? To prevent this Company having the power that they possess under this measure. He says the settlers would be less than men if they allowed such a law to stand.

Several Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGEVIN. That law would stand as long as Parliament wished it to stand; and if Parliament wished to abolish the law, I suppose the Company would be treated as any other company, or as any individual, and be indemnified for the loss of their rights.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGEVIN. If you go and take from that Company a portion of their lands, of course, you must give them compensation for that. Perhaps the principles of the hon. gentleman who says "hear, hear," are different from these.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I would be very sorry that in this country we would ever say: property is robbery. Property is not robbery. Property is one of the great foundations of society, and, therefore, I am astonished that the hon. gentleman, who holds a prominent position in his party, who has been a Minister of the Crown, should propound such a doctrine here. I have no doubt that Parliament will never assent to such a doctrine in any case, whether it is this Company, or whether it is an individual, or whether it is a man who is an agent of a company that is disliked. Parliament will always do justice. Parliament always does justice. It is one of the great features of our legislation that, whenever an acquired right or a right of property has been put in danger, Parliament has always indemnified the parties that have suffered.

Mr. MILLS. Not always.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Of course, the hon. gentleman will persist in his views; I cannot change them. His views are very advanced, but I doubt very much whether, in this Parliament, he would find many supporters in a course of that kind. Let him try it.

Mr. MILLS. Question.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Let him come with a motion, and see whether Parliament will assent to such a doctrine.

Mr. MILLS. You have such a Bill before the House.

Mr. LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to return to the subject which is under consideration, then, when he brings in the bill he speaks of, I will be ready to meet him. The last portion of the remarks of the new leader of the Opposition on this point goes further than we might believe. He says, in effect, speaking of the sending of Irishmen to the North-West, that no Irishmen are required, "No Irish need apply." They are not to go to the North-West; that is reserved to the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, and no Irishmen are to be allowed there. We generally find Englishmen, Scotchmen, Frenchmen and Irishmen working together on the railways, trying to do their part there; and we know perfectly well that the Irish are not less industrious, less useful laborers than the others. But what does the hon. gentleman want? I have no doubt you remember his speech in 1874. He would prefer Chinese labor. He would prefer the Chinese to the Irish. I do not object to the Chinese, when they are here in the country, so long as they respect the laws and are good citizens; but what I say is this, let our own fellow countrymen, the Irish, who leave their beautiful island, come here by all means. There is plenty of labor and land in this country for them, and they will be received as friends, and not as foes. I now come to a very important point—a very important remark made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. He says he is in favor of an eastern connection, but not at an enormous expenditure. He does not want the Lake Superior section at all events for the present, and prefers the Sault Ste. Marie line. He says that the line would be 87 miles longer than the proposed line by the north of Lake Superior, but that we would have it seven years sooner. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not exactly in accordance with the views of the hon. gentleman last year. Now, he says, here is the eastern connection to the north of Lake Superior, it is too costly; don't let us have that; let us have the Sault Ste. Marie line that will bring you through the United States to Manitoba. The hon. gentleman will remember that the policy of this Parliament has not been to have a railway going through a foreign country, nor to expend millions upon an Intercolonial railway to the east and a Pacific Railway to the west for the purpose of having a road through the United States of America. We want a road on British soil; we want a road of our own, for the maintenance of British institutions upon this continent. We want a road that will be a benefit to Canada and the Canadians; but we do not want a road that will lead our emigrants through the United States, and have them then carried away to the western prairies of the United States, and lost to Manitoba and the North-West. If the hon. leader of the Opposition wants a road of that kind, why did he not, when he was on these benches, come with his Sault Ste. Marie scheme, if he had that intention? But, no; he was not sure. He knew that he could not have that eastern connection by the north of Lake Superior; he could not get a company, he had not the means at his disposal, and he never spoke of the alternative. But now let us see what the hon. gentleman stated last year. It is very interesting, because it shows what the policy of the Opposition was towards the east of Canada, and when I speak thus I mean the region from Lake Nipissing to the east, including Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. Let us see what was the policy of the hon. gentlemen on the other side as to the east, and what we might expect from them if they were on these benches. I do not wish to be too long on a matter of this kind, but I think that the House will bear with me while I read some extracts from the speech of the hon. gentleman. I do not ask the permission of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, because it is a