

understanding of what the road really was. I moved for those for years; they have been ordered for years, but not one as yet has come down. I have been this Session under great difficulties endeavoring to extract from the profiles, which are imperfect, that information which ought to have been given to us, and which, during my hon. friend's (Mr. Mackenzie) Administration, was submitted to Parliament even in advance of construction. The line I am now speaking of is a line actually located and which has been almost entirely constructed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see the Minister of Railways about it at once and endeavor to obtain the papers.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HESSON. If hon. gentlemen on this side have to crave the indulgence of the House while they take into consideration the question now before us and the debate on the tariff is thus prolonged, the responsibility rests with hon. gentlemen opposite; because, so far as the case of the Government is concerned, it might fairly have been allowed to rest on the excellent speech of the Finance Minister. That his statements should have been attacked continuously, as they have been, is not only a surprise to this House, but a surprise to the intelligence of every elector. I would not crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments did I not feel it necessary, were not the duty forced on me, as it is on other hon. members on this side, to answer the unfair statements in many cases, and the unfair manner in which the question before us is discussed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had the pleasure of listening to several Budget speeches from the Finance Minister, and I must honestly say, considering all the circumstances of the country, considering the state of affairs that exist the world over, in Europe, in the United States, and in this country, every Canadian ought to feel satisfied that the hon. gentleman was able to present to this House a case so strong and so satisfactory as the one he presented. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not disposed to accept the verdict of the people on the question; they have to be convinced over and over again; and it falls to the lot of hon. gentlemen on this side to re-assert, to re-affirm, to re-hash, if I may use the term, what has been said over and over again on every hustings, in every newspaper in Canada, since the introduction of the National Policy down to the present time. That we are still obliged to repeat what has been said so often does not show great intelligence on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are unwilling to accept the verdict of the people; there is not an elector in Canada who has not expressed his opinion on the policy of the Government, and if the majority is to rule in this country what have hon. gentlemen opposite to say? What has been the answer of the electors to hon. gentlemen opposite? Not only did the electors give a decided answer in 1878 against the policy of the late Government, but even during the period when the late Government was in power, the people took every opportunity of showing their want of confidence in the policy of that Administration. Not a constituency was opened but was wrested from them. Every constituency, I might almost say, was taken from them, year by year, as they were opened and the people had an opportunity of expressing their opinion. What was the fate of the late Government from the day they took office to the day they fell, 17th September, 1878? It was one continuous series of disasters, as constituency after constituency was thrown open. From the day my hon. friend, the Premier, and the little party then in Opposition propounded the policy which has since received the unanimous endorse-

tion of the people—a policy which hon. gentlemen opposite did not dare to propound—the people have shown on every occasion their approval of my hon. friend's course. What was his policy? He was prepared to nail his colors to the mast and to stand or fall by the policy of protection to Canadian industries. His policy was Canada for the Canadians, and when we went to the country in 1878 the response which the people gave was a glorious victory for my right hon. friend, and a most crushing defeat to hon. gentlemen opposite. Since then, day by day, and year by year, the answer of the people has been continuous and strong in favor of the National Policy, an answer so unmistakable that it requires no effort on our part to show what is the real sentiment of the people on this great question. To-day the Government are as strong in the hearts of the people as they were when returned to office in 1878. This is shown by the fact that, as each opportunity has arisen, the people have shown their continued support of the present Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite claimed that the Government had obtained a snap verdict, and contended that if opportunity were given the people they would reverse their verdict of 1878. Well, in 1882, that opportunity was given, and this Government was returned with a stronger majority than it previously enjoyed, showing conclusively that their policy had not lost any ground in the minds of the people, but on the contrary had gained in strength since its inauguration. Since then we have had several bye elections, and on each occasion the same approval of the people was manifested, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite will rise here and denounce the policy of the Government, charge the Government with all sorts of extravagance, I might almost say with corruption in high places. The people, however had a bitter lesson and will no longer trust hon. gentlemen opposite. They tried them once but found them wanting and are determined that we shall not see a revival of that brief period when the late Administration was in office, a period which was the saddest which the people of Canada witnessed since Confederation. In vain hon. gentlemen on this side endeavor to make this question clear to hon. gentlemen opposite. They will not learn: they have eyes and will not see and ears and will not hear. The electors have spoken to them; the verdict of the people is that the National Policy is as strong in their hearts to-day as ever it was, yet hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to accept that verdict. I would ask hon. gentlemen to take into consideration this fact. If the policy of the Government which has been in operation the last six years were injurious to the people would we not see this Table loaded down with petitions from the electors of Canada asking the Government to change its policy? Has a single petition been presented to this House, asking hon. members to reconsider the policy of the Government or to change it in one iota? No, on the contrary, what do we witness? We witness this fact that, if we have been called upon to change anything of that policy, it has been to lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes, and here and there we may be called upon to increase the protection, if it is found to be necessary in the interests of the struggling industries of Canada. That is the kind of application that has been made to the Government, not to relax in one single iota, but to pursue that policy and, if they have not gone sufficiently far, to go somewhat further still. Now, I propose for a few moments to direct my attention to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He chose the other evening to make certain statements, which I should have preferred answering there and then. My hon. friend very properly refused to be interrupted. I will not complain of that. Very often it is very unpleasant indeed, but it frequently occurs to me that it would be much more proper to the subject to answer there and then to a question that might be suggested by any member of the House who is looking for information or asking for an opinion.