

1880-81.....	\$4,132,743	
From Dominion lands.....		\$ 131,124
1881-82	6,313,357	
Dominion lands		1,744,456
1882-83	7,064,491	
Dominion lands		1,009,019
1883-84	754,255	
Dominion lands		951,636
	\$18,264,846	\$3,836,235

Or, a grand total, including Dominion lands, of \$22,101,081, as compared with the total deficits of hon. gentlemen opposite of \$7,970,188; while at the same time the Government have relieved the people of this country, by an actual reduction of taxation, during the same term, amounting to \$5,551,566. In addition, the credit of the country has so improved that the Finance Minister has been able to place a loan at an excess of price over that obtained by the member for South Huron. The difference in interest charge would, in fifty years, wipe out the loan altogether. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim before the country that the people of Canada would be very much improved were they to again grant them their support. Now, I desire to bring under the notice of the House and the country the qualifications that they possess, so far as we can judge from their past administration and sayings, for governing this country in the future. I will trouble the House with a short extract from the Budget Speech of the hon. ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1878. After referring to the financial position of the country, he said:

"Now, under the circumstances, it may not naturally be asked by some members of this House, whether it would not be advisable, in view of the fact that we have now had, for two years, considerable deficits, to adopt such precautions as would render the existence of another deficit impossible. Well, Sir, I would say at once that if we possessed in Canada any tax equivalent to the income tax now in use in England, probably I would not hesitate to advise the House to have recourse to that means of increasing the revenue."

Take this statement in connection with the utterance made in 1876 by the same hon. gentleman, that no legislation could directly benefit the interest of the country. With these two statements before them, I hardly think that the majority of the people of this country will be in a very great hurry to again repose their confidence in the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. In reference to the general argument brought forward invariably in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, in regard to the merits and demerits of the National Policy, we find these hon. gentlemen having their annual wrestling match, as it were, not only with the Government of the day, but with the great majority of the people of this country. I make this statement, Sir, and I think I am justified, because it has been shown that the great majority of the people of this country are enthusiastic supporters of the National Policy. Then, Sir, there is a natural result of the National Policy which I do not recollect ever having heard referred to, and that is its effect on the national spirit of our inhabitants, the cultivation of which is as necessary to the growth and prosperity of a country as its financial policy. Again, what position do hon. gentlemen opposite occupy on the question of the application of the true principles and intention of responsible government? We find them, year after year, arguing with the same determination against the avowed will of the people as when the National Policy was first adopted, ignoring, according to my humble judgment, the characteristics of responsible government, which is acknowledged to be a great boon, and is often boasted of as such by hon. gentlemen opposite. In fact, I think they claim a large share of the credit of having that great boon conferred on this country. As I understand the principles of responsible government, it is the duty of the Administration of the day to carry out the well-understood and defined wishes of the people. On minor subjects the opinion of the majority of the people is not always clear; but in reference to this National Policy

there has been no uncertain sound on the part of the great majority of the people of this country. It was adopted in 1878 and re-affirmed and endorsed in 1882, and there is no evidence in the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and no constitutional indication, that in any degree have the wishes and desires of the great majority of the people of this country changed. Thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, for the kind indulgence you have extended to me, I would simply close by asserting, as my individual opinion, warranted by the present position of the National Policy, that it is the sheet anchor of the future prosperity of this Dominion. And, Sir, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite may continue to reiterate, as a matter of fact and a matter of judgment I am satisfied that it is now so embedded in the very soil of this country that no political party, coming boldly before the country and asserting that any material change will be made, so long as the Dominion remains in its existing circumstances in relation to other nations, will ever be supported by the majority of the people of this country. And it should be and is a source of congratulation, that the great project which is to complete Confederation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is so near its completion; and as the National Policy is the sheet anchor of the development and progress and prosperity of this Dominion, so the completion of that grand work is the key stone, as it were, of the arch of Confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. In continuing this debate, I shall endeavor to confine myself as closely as possible to the subject, so as to make my remarks as short as is consistent with a fair presentation of the case to the House and the country. But before entering on the general discussion of the Budget, which was so ably presented to this House several days ago, I may be permitted to draw the attention of the House to some remarks that fell from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The Government had told the country, he said, that although they were building that great national highway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, not one dollar would be added to the expense of the people, and that the work would be accomplished without increasing the burdens of the country. He then went on to state that there had been \$12,000,000 expended in that work, and he asked when he might expect to see a dollar of it returned to the people. I can only say that if there has been \$12,000,000 expended by the Government in that work, they have a very creditable showing to make to the people, in the construction of from 12,000 to 15,000 miles of railway; and when a comparison is made between that expense and the expense of \$13,000,000 made by the late Government, the comparison is strongly in favor of the present Administration. What was the condition of the road under the late Government? It was that, although \$13,000,000 had been expended on it, only 113 miles had been built at one end into the wilderness and 117 miles at the other end, and between them there was left a link, that could not be used for a great many years, so that the money was virtually expended without any special benefit arising to the country from that vast expense for years, had not the present Government pushed it to completion the way they did. In referring to the Finance Minister's Budget Speech, the hon. gentleman was pleased to say that the Finance Minister had treated this House to a shower-bath of words, for the purpose of convincing the people that their taxes had not been raised and that they were in a better condition than formerly; and the hon. gentleman said that in his opinion the Finance Minister had failed to make good his assertion. All I can say in reply is, that the hon. gentleman himself has been treating this House to a diarrhoea of words and sentences, resulting in a lamentable failure to establish the arguments he advanced. The hon.