

Conservative. When two gentlemen who held different views and principles in relation to public affairs, for the sake of office or of denouncing a Party, joined together to form a Government, all that the hon. member prejudged as the result of such a combination must be expected. We had been told that a deputation of Protectionists had waited upon the Minister of Finance, and that he had said to them, not that he was a member of a Free Trade Administration, but he had the candour to admit that he himself was at one with them in their views as to Protection, although he could not pledge the Government.

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT said that was not a correct report of that meeting. It had not been his habit to contradict newspaper reports.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said that if ever there was an occasion on which a newspaper statement should have been contradicted, this was one. The *Montreal Herald* had, more than a month ago, stated in the most explicit manner that the tariff was going to be raised. If there was a proposal which the Government ought to have kept to themselves, it was the proposal to touch the tariff of the day in the slightest degree. When the Minister of Finance found that it was declared in the newspaper that he was with the Protectionists, he was bound for his own sake, as well as in consideration to the trade and business interests, to give such an important and such an authoritative statement the fullest contradictions. What more did we find? These gentlemen went next to the Premier. Did he tell them that he could have nothing to do with their policy? No. He told them he was a Free Trader, but "he was not going to knock his head against the wall."

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he delivered what he considered was a very good Free Trade speech.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman should have contradicted the reports which had appeared in the newspapers, but he said that if he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) was mistaken, and he was bound to accept the statement of the Premier, that he was in a position to show the gentlemen who waited upon the Minister of Finance, the Premier left them with entirely the same sentiments as were reported in the newspapers, for, no doubt, if these gentlemen were not of that opinion they would have taken occasion to correct the newspaper reports. He was sure the House would acquit the late Government for having anything to do with the late elections. The late House have been quite willing to give the present Government a fair trial. Again what could the late Government have had to do with the double election about which the Hon. Minister of Finance had spoken? Could the Premier say that they had prompted him to do what he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) thought had never been done before—that was to run twelve Ministerial elections, and, before having warmed their seats, to spring on a general election?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: I acquit you of this.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER wanted him to acquaint himself, after his boast that he had a majority of twenty-five in the late House. Nor was the late Government responsible for the extra session any more than the present. They had been quite prepared to go on without an extra session. Before deciding to extract from the toiling millions of Canada additional taxation, the Minister of Finance was bound to

look fairly in the face the question if he could not by some other mode remedy what he considered the financial condition of the country.

With regard to the cost of the railways in the smaller Provinces, he showed that the Local Government had projected their railways. It was not with the hope of the receipts being above the expenditure, but that they might have the effect of stimulating trade and thus in another way add to the revenue of the country; and in this respect they had been productive of good results. The speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance had been such as to foresee the throwing-over of the Pacific Railway.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said he could gather no other conclusion from that speech. Having united this country from ocean to ocean, he felt there was nothing more vitally important to make Canada a great Dominion than to create the line of union and intercourse that all history showed was fraught with such advantages to those countries who had adopted similar ones. The late Government had felt it their duty to grapple with this question. He deprecated the statement made by the Finance Minister that the route of the Pacific Railway was through a desert. The country on the route was very fertile. The late Government never proposed to expend \$160,000,000 for the construction of that railway. Their estimate was \$30,000,000, and the responsibility for that policy not being carried out rested with the hon. gentleman opposite, and when that policy was presented to the House we found that the ablest financiers and the wealthiest men in Ontario and Quebec were contending with one another to get the contract, and the most gigantic capitalist in England was ready to take hold of it.

There was a gentleman sitting in the House who knew that when the contractors were in England a combination of the Northern Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies hounded them from door to door in order to overthrow the Government of Canada, and they had succeeded; and on their shoulders rested the responsibility of having defeated this policy, which had been unanimously accepted by the House.

Now the Hon. Premier, in making his first ministerial speech, had pledged himself to build the Pacific upon the credit, and at the risk of, the Treasury of the Dominion. He might have supposed from the speech of the Finance Minister tonight that the Premier had been misrepresented in the report of that speech, were it not for the telegram which he had sent to British Columbia. We had the premier propounding a policy, and the Finance Minister getting up in his place and calling that policy ludicrous. The hon. gentleman had said that he was justified in saying that we could not look for an increase. Suppose that this attempt to break down the late Ministry had failed; suppose the Pacific Railway scheme had been successful—did the hon. gentlemen think that the late Government had not a right to expect that the policy which they had pursued up to that hour would have been successful—a policy which inspired confidence to bring foreign capital and millions of people into the country?

He had listened with pain to that part of the speech of the hon. gentleman in which he said the route of the Pacific was through a