

enlisted in behalf of the success of the Government candidate. In point of fact, we not only sustained a desperate attack, but we fought gallantly, and came out of the fight under circumstances that gave us good hope of carrying the county at the next election. Let me add, that it is asserted, and I believe with truth, that some one or other used money largely in addition to all the other influences that were used on the Tory side in that canvass. The hon. President of the Council boasts of his majority in Colchester. He seems to think that he should be held excused—indeed, I may say justified—for anything he had ever done, whether it was essentially right and proper or not, because he succeeded, by some means, in obtaining a large majority in the county of Colchester. Report said he was doubtful at first about the result; it said that if the people had gone to the polls on nomination day he would have been defeated by a large majority. Report says that extraordinary means were used, between nomination and election day, to induce that county to declare in favor of the Tory candidate and the Tory Administration. This may be calumnious. I myself believe that if there were any good grounds for such stories as these the matter ought to have been taken into the courts, which should have been invited to pronounce on the conduct of that hon. gentleman or his friends, whoever they were, who were charged with these malpractices. The reports and rumors in that direction were strong, so strong and so generally believed, that the moral effect of the victory throughout the Maritime Provinces is very small indeed. That, in brief, was the way matters stood in the county of Pictou. The hon. Minister of Railways is a host in himself. My impression is that if he had not gone into the county, Mr. Carmichael would have been elected. However, the majority was not a very large one, and it will be found that when an opportunity comes, the people of Pictou will do themselves the honor and credit of reversing their decision upon that occasion. But, Sir, if these matters are to be discussed at all, let me add this much: that instead of meeting charges by mere recrimination, instead of taking the course adopted by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulbee), the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Railways, of fiercely making charges against hon. gentlemen on this side, it would look better before the country for them to meet the charges in that cool and calm manner with which such charges are met by men conscious of innocence. The course taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side all through this debate is, I think, calculated very much to create the impression throughout the country that the charges made some years ago by the hon. President of the Council, against the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, had some foundation in fact, and that they have not, at all events, been thoroughly disproved or satisfactorily explained away.

Mr. BOWELL. The House, and particularly that portion of the members who have had the honor of occupying seats here for a number of years, must have been not a little surprised at the tone of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who, forsooth, has been selected by his party to hurl charges at members on this side of the House, and to read them a lecture on the necessity of retracting something they may have said, or articles they may have written, against those with whom they may have been in conflict at some former period. Certainly, that gentleman is not the one who should have risen in his place to read a lecture to any man, either in the House or out of it. I have a distinct recollection of the language used in a certain newspaper which he (Mr. Anglin) controlled, against gentlemen who were then opposed to him, whom he denounced as the vilest and most corrupt of men, and yet he was willing to accept from these same gentlemen and their colleagues, the seat that you, Mr. Speaker, now occupy. He has never to this day, either directly or indirectly, retracted one word of what he

then uttered against these gentlemen and the vast majority who sat in the House at the time. Not only that, but he denounced, in the same manner, the hon. gentleman now sitting on his left (Mr. Burpee), as being only fitted for a place in his own Province, where they teach people the trades. That is the language he used towards the hon. gentleman who is now his left hand supporter, yet he did not hesitate to accept the position which, as I will show presently, he used to his own personal benefit and the benefit of the party with which he is connected.

An hon. MEMBER. Feathered his bed.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; the Government gave him not only a feather bed to rest upon, but supplied him with the means to keep himself comfortable in future. Yet the same gentleman rises in the House and reads us a political lecture. Fancy a Speaker, the first Commoner in the land, occupying the most exalted position in the House, accepting it at the hands of those whom he had denounced as being fit only for the penitentiary, and then continue to occupy that seat in direct violation of the Independence of Parliament—in direct violation of every principle that should guide even a private member, sitting there and accepting contracts from day to day, from month to month, from year to year, in order to aggrandise himself. And this is the man who rises to administer a lecture to the members of this House, as if he had been selected by the leader of the Opposition to teach us parliamentary propriety. I think if ever we had a spectacle of cool political audacity we have had it exhibited to-day. The man who was only saved from being turned out of the House by the delay of the report of a Committee, which, if previously presented, would not only have expelled him from the Speaker's chair, but would have disqualified him from sitting in this House a single day, rises here to read us a lecture on propriety. This gentleman called attention to the language used by the hon. member for Colchester in 1856, at a time when they were fighting the great battles of their Province, and has endeavored to hold him up to execration because he then differed from the hon. the Minister of Railways, and now agrees with him upon political questions. Has he forgotten, has this House or the country forgotten, that the very man whom they denounced as being so corrupt that his very acts smelled to heaven, was, nevertheless, taken to their bosom and made a colleague a short time after? Did we ever hear one word of retraction from the hon. gentleman who then administered the affairs of this country? Did we ever hear of an apology by their then colleague, towards them, for his former acts? Nor did we ever have anything to show that they believed he was not as guilty and as corrupt as he was at the time that they denounced him. Not only did they take him to their bosom, not only did they take him to the Council Chamber and consult with him, but they made him the Governor of a great Province. Yet they are now horrified because the hon. member for Colchester differed from the hon. the Minister of Railways some fifteen years ago. It seems to be the policy of gentlemen opposite to hurl charges at the members, individually and collectively, of the Administration. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), says that because the Minister of Railways has not disproved these charges that have been made against him, *ergo* they must be accepted as true. Over and over again have those charges been repeated by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspapers since he sat in this House, and as often as the charges have been made, has the hon. gentleman retorted by challenging an investigation into any act of his life, parliamentary or otherwise, and not one of them to-day has dared to formulate a charge against his honor, personal or political. Does it follow, because these charges are constantly made, that they must be true? The logic of the