

spiracies that ever was concocted by anything calling itself a Government, or by any public man calling himself a Finance Minister, in regard to Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman wondered that I was not ashamed to name the word Nova Scotia in this House. Why should I be ashamed? Could I as one of the founders of the National Policy have a greater triumph than that at the end of eighteen years of trial of the National Policy, it had to be adopted by the leader of the local government as the means of carrying the province.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Then why did you oppose him, if he was supporting the National Policy?

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Because a person chooses to steal the clothing of another person, that is no reason why he should support him. It was an insult to the intelligence of the people of Nova Scotia. But the question as regards the National Policy is, how far does coal touch it? Let the hon. gentleman read what the "Witness" says on that point, and then ask what the position is. It says:

Mr. Fielding has assured us that there has been no collusion of any sort between him and his former colleague, Mr. Murray. If there has not, these coal constituencies are being misled.

Why did he say that? It was because Mr. Murray had declared that the great issue in the local elections in Nova Scotia was that the province would secure the retention of protection on coal by supporting the Liberal party. What does that newspaper further say:

If Mr. Fielding has surrendered the National Policy at its pivotal point to gain Nova Scotia, he will never be forgiven.

What does the hon. gentleman think of that statement? That is not the denunciation of an opponent; that is the declaration of a most tried and enthusiastic friend and supporter of the Liberal party, which declares that the policy on which Nova Scotia was carried was a pivotal portion of the National Policy. I want to know what the House thinks of the Prime Minister publicly declaring there would be free coal, and yet without any communication being made to any person in this House or out of it, the Minister of Finance, before bringing down his Budget, on the eve of the elections in Nova Scotia, declaring to certain parties interested in the coal business that his policy was going to be the reverse. I say it is a betrayal of the duties of the hon. gentleman's position, such as no Finance Minister has ever been charged with previously in the history of the country. It is a humiliation of the gravest character as regards his leader, to make that announcement under the circumstances under which it was made, and it was adopting a course that however strongly partisan any hon. gentleman may be, I do not believe he will

give his support and concurrence to any such advantage being taken by a public man for the purpose of carrying elections. But that is not all. What do the hon. gentlemen behind the Finance Minister, who thinks that Nova Scotia knows something about me, say in regard to this matter? I am glad to declare that if any public man ever had reason to be proud of his native province, I am that man. Hon. gentlemen may search the history of any portion of Canada in vain to find greater devotion and longer continued support than Nova Scotia has given to myself. The hon. gentleman prides himself very much on the defeat of the Liberal-Conservative party. Why should he, when he was compelled to do me the great honour and the great Liberal-Conservative party the honour of admitting that the only means by which the Liberal party could carry the elections was to adopt the policy and platform for which I have fought for years. What will hon. gentlemen behind him think when they know that this is not a trifling matter for them. In the Nova Scotia elections not alone was the coal question involved. It was a fact that the Liberals had stolen our policy and masqueraded about in our clothes in order to obtain the support of the people, but there was a much larger bribe than that. I hold the proof in my hand. Hon. gentlemen opposite will have to vote one million and a quarter dollars of public money in consequence of carrying the Nova Scotia elections. This is the manifesto which Mr. Murray, a former colleague of the present Finance Minister, and the present Premier of the province, issued and on which he carried Nova Scotia. I have already read the portion with respect to coal, and it continues:

The Government of Nova Scotia has made repeated efforts to obtain from the Government of Canada certain claims which were deemed just and equitable, on account of the Eastern Extension Railway and in respect of the Western Counties Railway, as well. The claim in respect to the Eastern Extension Railway was that it had become part of the Intercolonial Railway of Canada, which had been built as a national work and out of the revenues of the whole country, whereas the portion of it between New Glasgow and the Strait of Canso had received a subsidy from the provincial revenue amounting to \$671,836, which amount should be refunded to the revenue of Nova Scotia, as it can scarcely be deemed just or fair that the revenue of the province should be called upon to contribute to the construction of any part of a work undertaken and carried forward as a purely national undertaking.

The claim in respect of the Western Counties Railway is based upon the fact that this province contributed the sum of \$679,197 as a subsidy towards the construction of the work, and that, in 1887, the Dominion Government, by a special Act of the Federal Parliament, took this road out of the control of the provincial authorities and made it a railway for the general advantage of Canada, under the British North America Act. While not attempting to call in question the constitutional power of the Federal Parliament to