

tleman now, in almost every speech he delivers, pretend that there was some terrible combination between hon. gentlemen on this side and Mr. Potter, of the Grand Trunk Company? but, sir, I have challenged him, and I challenge him again to-night if it be of any use—to show a scintilla of evidence to justify the extraordinary allegations he has more than once made, and it has been of no avail. Why, Sir, it is well known that Mr. Potter and the Grand Trunk have always been my political enemies, and the enemies of the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. It is notorious that this Company has been a political engine operating against the Liberal party, and to this hour I know of no change.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER—The engine is reversed.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—The hon. gentleman says that it was a terrible thing for this Government to undertake to build a road from Lake Superior westward to the Pacific by 1890; but the hon. gentleman himself undertook solemnly, as I have pointed out, to build it from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific by the year 1881—within ten years—while we only pledged ourselves to complete two-thirds of the work in nineteen years. These hon. gentlemen endeavoured to leave this terrible incubus upon the country—a piece of folly which should have driven everyone of the perpetrators out of public life; and yet the hon. gentleman who is in part responsible for all this, charges us with dereliction of duty and extravagance, because we sought to keep faith with the Province which the hon. gentleman and his friends brought in the Union by false pretexts. If this bargain or solemn treaty through the hon. gentleman and his colleagues had not been entered into, do you imagine, Sir, for a moment, that he would have made the efforts we have made to provide for the expense of surveys? But all this has been undertaken in connection with so enormous an enterprise, for the single purpose of maintaining the national faith, as far as this was possible with our resources. But the hon. gentleman has not fairly

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.

represented what we did do. What we undertook to do in connection with Lord Carnarvon's recommendations was subject to the Act already placed on the Statute Book.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER—No! no!

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—The hon. gentleman may say no.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER—Show it.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—I can show it any time.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER—No!

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—The hon. gentleman will say “no” and “yes” to anything. What we have undertaken to do, even the modified part, is subject to the resolution under which it is provided that we shall not increase the taxation of the country. The hon. gentleman will find whether this is so or not; he will find that we will carry out our purpose to the very letter, and that purpose is intimated plainly in the Order in Council of last year. So much for the legislation regarding the Pacific Railway. I don't think it is necessary to say one word more on that subject.

The hon. gentleman also said that Sir John Rose wrote a letter criticising unfavourably the speech of my hon. friend. Sir John never wrote such a letter. He sent a communication to correct the malicious representations of the *Standard* newspaper; and every one knows that that paper is not the organ of the Conservative party. It is a Conservative freebooter, nor is it owned or recognized by the Conservative party in England, and of this I can furnish proof. Sir John simply did his duty, as a Canadian, in correcting the misrepresentations of that paper, but he did not correct the speech of my hon. friend.

The hon. gentleman says that the tariff of 1874 was ruinous to the country, and in the same sentence he declared that the Hon. Finance Minister deserved no credit for it, because it was a servile copy of the tariff of the hon. gentleman opposite. If that was so it would have a strong chance of being subjected to the opposite charge. He has not ventured to enlarge upon the deep distress in the country. There is a class