

man will pretend to say that, whoever may have benefitted, the hon. Minister of Railways never personally benefitted by that contract. Therefore, all the insinuations that have been made against him by the hon. gentleman opposite are unworthy of repetition on the floor of this House. The hon. member for Centre Hurok has insinuated that I have changed my position in the parties, and he says that, not only in Nova Scotia, but in other Provinces, there have been changes in the party feelings of public men. I suppose the hon. gentleman is a very good authority on that matter. But the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) has referred more pointedly to me as having changed my party on the floor of this House and in the country. He has spoken of me as having sat on the opposite side of the House and holding certain views, and a short time afterwards coming to support the party who now rule this country. Let me say to the hon. gentleman and to this House, that when I was first elected to this House in 1867, I was not sent to support any particular party. I was elected on a certain pledge I gave to the electors of the county of Colchester. At that time the question of Confederation was before the people of Nova Scotia. The Confederation Act had been passed, and at the very first meeting held in my county, after I was nominated, I said to the people: "The Confederation Act is an accomplished fact, and we have to accept that Act; but I believe the terms of Confederation are unjust to the Province of Nova Scotia, and if I am elected as your representative, I will seek to modify and improve the terms with that Province." I was elected upon that pledge, the only pledge I have ever made upon the hustings, and with the help of others I succeeded in securing a modification of the financial terms of Confederation, and my pledge to the people of Colchester was redeemed. I then supported the party and the men who I believed were working in the best interests of the Province of Nova Scotia and the Dominion at large; and, Sir, I never had occasion to regret that. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that I am a lucky politician; but I do not see any great amount of luck in being called to the Cabinet after twenty-five years of public life. But I was surprised to find the hon. gentleman opposite bringing against me the charge that sixteen years ago I had delivered a certain speech in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and that I had ventured to come on the floor of this Parliament without making the declaration that I was then wrong. I have already stated that when the whole history of the railway was revealed, it showed that no personal benefit accrued to the hon. the Minister of Railways from the construction of that work; and now, believing that the course pursued by the hon. the Minister of Railways is that best suited to serve the interests of Nova Scotia and the Dominion at large, I am proud to give him my support. It is true that men differ in opinion and sentiments, and very often use strong expressions in debate; but it is no discredit to a man, after having used those strong expressions, if he can lay them aside, and join with another in promoting the general interests of the country. I would rather stand in that position of having forgiven even my enemy than in the position of having betrayed my friend.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I am a little surprised at the course of my hon. friends on this side of the House. They seem to be astonished that they should be attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, how can they be surprised at that? I do not want to go back sixteen or twenty years, but I want to call attention to the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last Parliament and during this Parliament. Can my hon. friends here be surprised at such ungenerous treatment, when the hon. the leader of the Opposition, at the time he supported the hon. member for Lambton, would go out of the House instead of supporting and

standing by him? Need any one be surprised who saw the course the hon. gentleman then pursued, tripping up from day to day my hon. friend from Lambton, making every move to belittle him and oust him from the position he occupied until finally he succeeded. Can my hon. friends be surprised then that the hon. leader of the Opposition should go back for twenty years to rake up something that we know nothing about. I do not believe that this discussion, brought on by the two hon. gentlemen opposite, is likely to be of any great advantage to this country. I do not see what advantage is to be gained by bringing up old dead issues, and declaring that two hon. gentlemen who acted on different sides at one time have since come together. All those who formerly opposed the hon. Minister of Railways in Nova Scotia, have since then given him their support. What better proof could we have of the confidence of the people of that Province in that hon. gentleman, than the fact that every strong man there has rallied to his support. I can understand that this House should feel indignant, because the character of every member, the character of the House, is involved, and that the hon. gentlemen who have been attacked should rise indignantly to repudiate the aspersions cast upon them; but the course pursued is only on a par with that followed by hon. gentlemen opposite in the past.

Mr. ANGLIN. Some remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways renders it necessary that I should take part in this debate, although such was not my intention. Before coming to that matter, let me congratulate the hon. Minister of Railways upon the fact that the introduction of this topic by the leader of the Opposition has contributed in so great a degree to complete the triumph of which he boasts. He triumphed in the fact that he had brought Mr. Howe to his side by some means or other. He boasted of the fact that he had brought the hon. President of the Council by some means or other; but he was not able to boast that he had induced the hon. President of the Council to withdraw, in as public a manner as that in which he had uttered them, a single one of the charges made by him against the hon. Minister of Railways. Nor was it until the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had repeated the demand made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the Hon. President of the Council was forced to say the little he did. For sixteen long years, according to his own account, he has allowed that grave circumstantial charge of corruption of the grossest character to stand unretreated, unapologized for, and unqualified. To-day it remains unretreated, but it is somewhat qualified. The hon. Minister of Railways, perhaps, not expecting that his new found colleague would have been willing to go quite so far in the way of self-humiliation, tried to divert attention from the real nature of the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition by the skilful dodge of carrying the war into Africa, and making charges in return, incriminating the hon. leader of the Opposition. We are all accustomed to that; we found it previously tried by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton), who is always ready to come to the protection of the Government when he finds it in a very difficult position, by either distracting the attention of the House from the real question at issue or forcing the debate to a close. We are accustomed to hear the hon. Minister of Railways, when a charge is made against him, declare that since such charge was first made he had gone back to the people of Nova Scotia, and had been triumphantly sustained by them, and that, because he had been successful at an election, the charge, no matter how strong the evidence or respectable the person who made it, must be considered as thenceforth and for ever disproved. That is not logic or good sense. We know that elections do not always turn on those grave personal charges. We know they are very often determined by influences which blind a