

say, one dollar an acre. To these two sums, you have to add the cost of the sections completed or now under construction, as far as Burrard Inlet, amounting to \$28,000,000; so that the whole amount of money that will have been expended by this country for completing the Pacific Railway is \$53,000,000, to which you must add the value of the land at a dollar an acre, making altogether, \$78,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman means to say that the valuation of the land at one dollar an acre is too low. If so, we will have to consider the question of valuing it at a higher rate, and not do, as the hon. gentleman did the other night, apply that rate only to one contract, but to the contracts of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as to those of this Government. Thus, according to our plan, we shall have the whole Pacific Railway completed for \$78,000,000, and with the guarantee that the company now to be inaugurated, will work the road for all time to come. If we applied that valuation of one dollar an acre to the lands proposed to be given under our contract of 1873, and added the subsidy of \$30,000,000, we should have \$80,000,000, plus, I suppose, the surveys, costing \$4,000,000, making altogether \$84,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Why do you not count them in this contract?

Mr. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that, in this sum of \$28,000,000, for the constructed portions of the road, a portion of that is included.

Mr. BLAKE. Only a portion?

Mr. LANGEVIN. As my hon. friend on my right (Sir Charles Tupper) stated the other day, the whole of that sum could not fairly be added to the cost of the railway, because it was expended not only for the railway, but for the purpose of exploring the country, ascertaining its wealth, dividing it into townships, and so on, and, therefore, I add a portion of that to this amount.

Mr. BLAKE. But you added four millions when you counted up the cost under the Allan contract. You ought to add the same amount now.

Mr. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed to show how this valuation of a dollar an acre applies to the work as undertaken by the late Government in 1874. I will not weary the House with long columns of figures, but will show that, under the present contract, the railway completed and in working order, and with the condition that it will be worked for all time, will cost but \$78,000,000. Under the contract of 1873 it would have cost \$84,000,000, and, under the scheme of the hon. gentleman opposite, valuing the lands at \$1 an acre, \$104,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGEVIN. If my hon. friend opposite, by his cheer, intimates that he thinks \$1 an acre not sufficient, let us take \$1.50 an acre, and you will have this result: The contract of 1873 would have required \$112,000,000, the contract of 1874, \$132,000,000, while the present contract would demand only \$90,000,000; so that, even putting the price at \$1.50 an acre, you will save \$22,000,000 on the scheme of 1873, and \$42,000,000 on the scheme of hon. gentlemen opposite, by the present contract. But, perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) is not satisfied with \$1.50 an acre, and would prefer \$2. I hope the lands will sell for that price, or \$4 or \$5 an acre. But if we go into a calculation of this kind, hon. gentlemen must remember that \$2, \$3, \$4 or \$5 an acre must be applied, not only to the lands we give the contractors, but to those the hon. gentleman would have given the contractors, and to the 5,000,000 acres held as a guarantee for the working of the railway. The hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Blake) took good care not to speak of those 5,000,000 acres when applying his rate of \$4 or \$5 to the 25,000,000 acres we give the Syndicate. But, if he wishes to show to the country that we are giving a very large sum, by means of these lands, to the contractors, he should also show that we have a substantial guarantee by keeping 5,000,000 acres that he values at \$5 an acre.

An hon. MEMBER. They are our lands.

Mr. LANGEVIN. These are our own lands, no doubt; but the other lands will remain there also. Not only will you have the railway as a guarantee of the good faith of those gentlemen, but besides the substantial guarantee of one-fifth of their lands in your possession. Estimating them all at \$2 an acre, by the contract of 1873 the work would have cost \$139,000,000; by the scheme of the late Government, \$160,000,000, while, by ours, the amount should reach but \$103,000,000, or a difference in favor of the present scheme of \$36,000,000 compared with that of 1873, and of \$57,000,000 compared with the scheme of 1874-75. Hon. gentlemen opposite should not complain, but they should remember that referring to the bargain of 1871 they have declared, themselves, that it was a treaty of union with British Columbia. The present leader of the Opposition said, "this policy is not to be reversed by us." Therefore, hon. gentlemen opposite have accepted this policy with its consequences, and they have worked it themselves. They were in office five years, and tried their best to build the railway. They did not succeed. We had tried our hand, also, without success; but I trust by the present scheme with these wealthy, able and honorable men, and with all the guarantees we possess in the contract, we shall be able to construct the railway without burdening the country to too great an extent. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways showed, the other night, by facts and figures, in expounding this scheme, that the railway would, in land and money, cost but \$78,000,000. How was that met by the leader of the Opposition? He said it would take him only ten minutes to answer a two hours portion of the labored speech of my hon. friend. Well, it is very good for the leader of the Opposition to speak of doing so much in ten minutes only. We have yet to witness such a feat. When he speaks, he speaks forcibly and with great eloquence, and, though we do not agree with him, we are always glad to hear him; but his speech on this occasion was no exception to his other speeches, as regards the matter of length. He said, he would in ten minutes answer all the arguments of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BLAKE. I said I would take only ten minutes with the first two and a half hours of the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Well, the hon. gentleman adds a half hour to the two hours I was mentioning, so that the hon. gentleman said, that in ten minutes he would answer the arguments of my hon. friend. But what was the result? The hon. gentleman spoke, at all events, an hour and a half, in reply to this two hours and a half speech. I do not think the hon. gentleman came best out of the argument.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. We, on this side, think differently.

Mr. LANGEVIN. The fact is, the hon. leader of the Opposition did not meet the arguments, and the historical statements of the hon. Minister of Railways. The historical portion seemed to be particularly unpleasant to the hon. gentleman. He thought evidently that the history of the old scheme, and of all the transactions with reference to this railway, was not such as would warrant his meeting the arguments of my hon. friend. The truth is, he did not meet them, but reserved himself to go into certain details of the measure, as I shall show presently. He sneered at my