

and the construction of our railways have been the work of the Conservative party and of the National Policy. And if to-day our workingmen can earn bread for themselves and their families they owe it to this National Policy, which we defend, and which I hope will last long. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) said last night "the people are with us." Unfortunately, they do not vote with you. However, he mentioned the election in L'Islet, and said this election proves it. We have had there fair-play, he said; we have met on equal ground and with equal arms, and we have brought them down. I will take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to differ with the hon. member. I say that in the recent election in the county of L'Islet the question of protection versus unrestricted reciprocity has not been so frankly, so honestly put as he said last night. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the county of L'Islet was a former Liberal stronghold, that we had by accident, so to speak, carried at the general elections of 1891. It was not, therefore, a county where the two parties were on the same footing as to their respective strength; but moreover the election of the hon. gentleman for L'Islet has not been made on the question of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, as was said by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) the question of protection versus reciprocity was not squarely put. Consequently no such conclusions as those drawn by the member for Montmagny can be derived from this election. The member elected at L'Islet was not the candidate of unrestricted reciprocity, but rather the representative of protection, if I am to believe his declarations. I hold in my hand several extracts from his newspaper—the newspaper which he has edited for many years—the late "Le Canadien." And what did he say in this paper? Let us see, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. member for L'Islet appreciated the Liberal policy, and we will see that he is far from holding the same views of his neighbour for Montmagny:

Whatever may be said, on the whole our affairs are very prosperous. It is evidently wiser to continue with new ardour the works which we have so well begun, rather than to unsettle our people, paralyze its efforts by projects impossible to realize.

This was written on the 2nd June, 1887. Referring to unrestricted reciprocity, the main programme of the Liberal party, he, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), now one of the Liberal leaders of the province of Quebec, the leader of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), wrote on the 14th August, 1887:

We conclude that in any project of development of our commercial relations with the American republic, we shall also have to be guided by the principle of protection for our national industries. This will be an efficient means of obtaining reasonable compensations for the concessions which we may think fit to make. It is easy to see by what we have just said that we strongly disapprove those who continue the untimely movement in favour of unrestricted reciprocity.

Again, on the 28th May, 1888, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), one of the Liberal leaders who supports the Opposition, one of those whom the member of Montmagny supports, wrote the following:—

If the opposition makes the political blunder of continuing before the electoral body the campaign, which it has so ingloriously conducted in the House of Commons in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, all the friends of protection for our national industry shall have to join their forces in order to oppose an invincible resistance to those who so strongly misappreciate the interests of Canada, and the result of the new struggle will not be doubtful. The national policy will triumph for a fourth time.

These are, Mr. Speaker, the very words of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), one of those whom the hon. member for Montmagny supports, and the election of whom he holds up as an evidence that the people is against us and does not want the protective policy. What did the member for L'Islet say again on the 3rd of November, 1888? and I wish especially to draw the attention of the House to the words which I am going to quote. I will also point to the hon. members of the Opposition that these words do not come from us, but from one of their leaders of this day. On 3rd November, 1888, the member for L'Islet wrote:

Our farmers have now an excellent market in their own country, and they will not commit the folly of handing it over to foreign competition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, was I not right in answering as I did the assertion of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) when he said that the fight in L'Islet had been square against protection, and that the result showed that the people are against the policy of the Conservative policy, and favourable to that of the Opposition. In claiming this, he made a mistake—a grievous mistake. It was a protectionist who was elected in L'Islet, and not a supporter of unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Montmagny spoke of the L'Islet election as an evidence that the people is against protection and favourable to the political programme of the Opposition. Where then were the people in the various by-elections which took place in the district? In Quebec West, how is it then that the hon. member who represents that division was elected by a larger majority than had ever been given in that riding for a great number of years? Was not the policy of unrestricted reciprocity crushed down at that election where the Conservative majority reached a figure unheard of until then? After having returned a Liberal, has not the county of Montmorency elected in 1892 a Conservative, my hon. friend, Mr. Turcotte, who so worthily represents that county? What happened at that election? Did the policy of unrestricted reciprocity carry the day? Is it not true, on the contrary, that the Oppositionist candidate felt that the popular feeling was so strong against him that he had to withdraw from the struggle and allow the Con-