

serve as a programme during the next struggle. The figures which he gave in perfect good faith, I believe, but which in the face of public documents are shown to be incorrect, may perhaps deceive a few people in his own county; but in all the other counties of the Province of Quebec, we shall see at the next election a repetition of the judgment rendered by the people in 1878, viz.: Down with those who can only govern by imposing taxes, and power to those who work with their whole heart to foster the interests of the country. After a few years of power, we are face to face with a surplus exceeding \$4,000,000, and we are enabled to diminish the duties on tobacco and on many other articles. The word tobacco reminds me of what the hon. member said in his speech; it deserves to be taken up. He said:

"The duties on Canadian tobacco have existed since a number of years; they were imposed by the Conservative party and kept in force by the Liberal party for revenue purposes."

This assertion is perfectly harmless, Mr. Speaker, but, in order to be perfectly true, the hon. member should have added that not only were they kept in force but increased by the Liberal party. Those duties were increased by it to 10 cents, and when the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc) presented a motion for the reduction of the duties on tobacco, we saw the hon. member who preceded the hon. member for Lotbinière in this Parliament, Mr. Bernier, vote in favor of that amendment; but we have seen the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and other leaders of the party, vote against that motion.

Mr. RINFRET. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) should speak to us about his own vote in 1880 on a motion similar to that of the hon. member for Beauce, and about the vote of the hon. member for Beauce himself.

Mr. LANDRY. I am glad that the hon. member for Lotbinière should have raised that objection, and I will answer him in the very words of his leader, as he delivered them on the 23rd April, 1878:

"There is no one in a civilized country who would pretend that tobacco should be exempt from taxation; it is, of all others, an article on which every Government levies duties. At the present time there is not a civilized country that would venture to abolish this Excise duty and exempt tobacco from duty."

It is probably for that reason that last year the hon. member was one of that phalanx of eleven members who, during the past Session, tried to overthrow the Ministry on that question. Here is the further opinion of the hon. member for Quebec East, who adds:

"In the second place, it is impossible to levy a duty on foreign tobacco without levying the same duty on Canadian tobacco. If the duty is taken off native tobacco, the result would be to destroy entirely the revenue coming from that source. I am of opinion that tobacco is one of those articles that should be taxed, and that consequently it would be an erroneous and ruinous policy, so far as the revenue is concerned, the removing of the tax."

The hon. member for Quebec East goes further than any other Liberal member has gone up to this date, or than any other friend of the people, in the sense of the hon. member for Lotbinière. Another thing that deserves consideration is the following one; the hon. member, whilst explaining the increase of expenditure and of the public debt under the Liberal Administration, said:

"I do not intend to speak here of the enormous amount spent for the Canadian Pacific Railway, as every one knows who is responsible for this gigantic undertaking."

Well, Mr Speaker, if that sentence is not intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people of the Province of Quebec, and of the whole of Confederation, provided always that the speech of the hon. member be read throughout the country, if that sentence was not spoken with an electoral purpose,

Mr. LANDRY.

I think the hon. member should withdraw it. Better than any one else does he know how that matter stands. Let us now make the acquaintance of the friends of the hon. member. On the 12th September, 1882, I think it was under the Macdonald Administration, the following memorandum was presented—

Mr. RINFRET. That is a thing of the past.

Mr. LANDRY. The hon. member thinks it is a thing of the past, yet it is a memorandum drawn up by his party in 1882, and we are going at any rate to see what was the opinion of the Liberal party with regard to the Pacific Railway. A convention was held under the auspices of the three Governments of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that convention drew up the following memorandum:—

"The undersigned, representing the three Governments of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, assembled to consider the despatch of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated 12th April, 1882, concerning the Intercolonial Railway, having given the most careful attention to the important points raised in that despatch, have come to an understanding on the following points, to wit:—"

The question then at issue was the obtaining of a guarantee for a loan for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and one of the reasons given for making that request was the following. And among those points is the subjoined one:

"5. That the undersigned, in arriving at this conclusion, were principally guided by the firm opinion that a railway between Halifax and Quebec would form an essential link of a long and uninterrupted line of communication, crossing British possessions from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a road, in the construction of which all the Imperial interests in British North America are closely involved. And the undersigned, with the object of submitting in a proper manner that part of the question to the Imperial authorities, have decided that the three Provinces will shortly act in unison to demonstrate the high political and commercial importance of the western extension of the projected line."

(Signed),	J. S. MACDONALD,	L. V. SICOTT,
"	J. MORRIS,	WILLIAM McDougall,
"	W. P. HOWLAND,	U. J. TESSIER,
"	F. EVANTUREL,	T. D'ARCY MCGEE, etc."

Such was the opinion of the Liberal party in those days; and if we refer to the speech made by Mr. Mackenzie, at Sarnia, we find the following declaration:—

"It will be necessary for us to complete our great national road across the continent, and I think it will be the duty of the Government, as it is its wish, to put into execution every plan that might tend to bring about such a result."

The *Globe* of that date is less explicit; it speaks as follows:—

"Nothing is further from truth. The speech of Mr. Mackenzie at Sarnia, distinctly gave to understand what was the line of action he intended following, and subsequent declarations have explained and developed all the ideas that had been then suggested. There is no doubt as to whether the Pacific Railway should be constructed or not. This question has been irrevocably settled in the affirmative, and there is not a single statesman in Canada who would undertake to defend the negative position on that point, on which every one is agreed."

But, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes to know the opinion of his own leader in the Province of Quebec, in the Federal House, this is what he said:

"Mr. LAURIER. We are all agreed upon this that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be built on Canadian soil; there is no difference of opinion on that point."

"Mr. LANGEVIN. Really!"

"Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there are two opinions held on the subject."

"Mr. LANGEVIN. Your opinion differs from that of your leader."

"Mr. LAURIER. No; he said that we should proceed with the construction of the road gradually, as the country needed it. I have never heard any opinion expressed here against the construction of the Pacific Railway."

Well, after such testimony, I think that the little sentence ejaculated by the hon. member for Lotbinière should return into obscurity. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude the few remarks I have made on the question submitted to this House by