

hon. gentleman, whom he designated as a great high priest of corruption, and by various other hard names, that the President of the Council should come forward and declare to us that it was all a mistake, that this all happened in the unregenerate days when he violently opposed Confederation, and refused to recognize the hon. Minister of Railways as the incarnation of all that is great and good.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I am sure it must be gratifying to this House, and I am sure it will be gratifying to the people of Canada, to know that the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, especially the hon. gentleman from West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), take such a lively interest in the welfare of the country. They have not much to do, it is true, now with the conduct of its business, but they are able to criticize it as conducted by others. It is satisfactory to know that so much good feeling exists. The hon. member for West Durham is especially anxious that there should be no lack of harmony, no lack of a feeling of true community amongst the members of the Government—that they should all be in accord, and all agreeing well together. He seems to doubt whether that can be so, because he rakes up some old story of a quarter of a century ago, when strong men, fighting hard fights, said hard things, as men always do. But men are especially apt to say sometimes more than they exactly mean, and it is not a very good thing for society generally to bring up those things, because if we were to rake them up we would find that very awkward things might occur. Much later than a quarter of a century ago, even the hon. member for Centre Huron found it necessary to give a very different statement of what he thought to be true. He went to England to borrow money, and he conducted our affairs there in such a shape that he thought his credit was not very good, and he had to present, as he said, the silver side of the shield. When he came back here he presented the other side; but, of course he was only acting the part of a statesman, he was only trying to get money for Canada, he was only cajoling the unfortunate people of Egypt—or England—to some purpose, and it was not out of the way. I might also call that hon. gentleman's attention to something still later, and something that I do not think can be fairly urged against him except as an arm of party warfare. I only cite it as an example. Not long since we have heard his organ, the powerful newspaper we all respect and admire, the *Globe*, pointing at him as a sort of heaven-born financier, a man by whom the financial destinies of the country might safely be conducted, a man who would take care of our affairs. If he turns back to the files of that paper twenty-five years since, he will find himself designated as a mixer and muddler of figures—a man who was utterly unable to carry on any business whatever. Now, which of these things are true? Is the hon. member for Centre Huron a heaven-born financier, or is he a miserable mixer and muddler of figures, unable to carry on a Division Court clerkship? The *Globe* said he was the one thing, and it says he is the other. The people of Canada, carried away by the great influence of that paper, believed the *Globe*; they thought that he was simply a mixer and muddler of figures. Now, I cite things only to show that we should be careful not to attribute to men an evil disposition in the conduct of national affairs, because at one time or another they have been in antagonism, and there is no reason now to attribute to the President of the Council or to the Minister of Railways any ill-feeling at all. To the credit of the Minister of Railways I can say that all the men from his own Province who opposed him long years since are now here working in cordial harmony with him. Such is poor human nature. We have another example here before us. The air is full of rumors that even now there is strife and disunion, and that parties are being

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

rent asunder among hon. gentlemen on the other side. We hear that there is some little trouble, that their little domestic matters are not conducted with perfect satisfaction. Well, all we can do is, entering into this matter with the same peaceful spirit as manifested in the elegant language of the hon. member for West Durham, to hope that they may get these matters healed, that they may be able to frame a policy such as will satisfy themselves, if not the country, and that at least they may be able to agree decently and harmoniously together. It is an advantage to the country. We are so strong on this side of the House, the Government is supported by a party so massively strong in the country, that even if there were little dissensions among us, it would not make any difference. But those gentlemen cannot afford to have any dissensions; there is not enough of them; if they were to divide up they are so few that there would be two on one side and one on the other. The thing becomes unsafe. I submit that perhaps in these matters it is as well that we do not, in this debate, do anything more than deal with the business before us, and not try to rake up issues of five and twenty years ago, for the purpose of showing that one speaker used strong and abusive language towards another.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House, I think, will be a little surprised at the tone which the hon. leader of the Opposition and his former colleague, who sits beside him, have adopted on the present occasion. It is usual, I believe, on occasions of this kind not to exchange exactly the kind of courtesy that these hon. gentlemen have felt it their duty to use on the present occasion; but, Sir, I am not at all surprised that, placed in the very embarrassing position in which those hon. gentlemen are, smarting under the continued defeat which they have met with, they should now go out of their way to rake up the old quarrels of Nova Scotia, so long ago as 1866. I am glad those hon. gentlemen, goaded as they have been by the party lash of the paper that sustains them, have not ventured to assail my position in this House with anything more recent than the events of that period. Since I have occupied the high position of Minister of Railways and Canals, it has been my duty to make contracts involving an expenditure of something like \$130,000,000. The country has been told from year to year that when Parliament met I should be called to account. Those hon. gentlemen have been goaded by the party lash of the *Globe* newspaper to assail me in my position in this House, and yet, down to the present hour, there is not a man among them who has dared, in his place in Parliament, to do so. I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to challenge the integrity of my conduct, and I invoke a comparison of my conduct with that of my predecessor who now sits on that side of the House. When those hon. gentlemen are ready to bring forward anything that interests the Parliament of Canada, and which comes within the purview of this Parliament, they will find me *non nunquam paratus*. I am ready to meet them on every issue, and with evidence to confront any charges they may make, and I challenge the closest scrutiny of my public acts here or elsewhere. It is true, Sir, that in the old party struggles of Nova Scotia, where very intense and strong feelings existed between parties, strong and embittered language was sometimes used between political rivals. But these hon. gentlemen ought not to forget that when I came into public life in 1855, nearly twenty-seven years ago, it is a matter of history, that I stood confronted by the old Liberal party, the old Reform party of that Province, numbering at least a dozen able, prominent and influential leaders in its ranks; and it is my proud boast to-day that, fierce as had been the battles, contests and encounters between myself and them, every man of them who has since died—and many of them are gone—died my personal friend and my warm political supporter. And every man of those