

the next five years will be able to arrange that question somewhat to the satisfaction of the people of Nova Scotia."

Could any more monstrous bribe, according to the rules laid down by the hon. gentleman, have been offered to any constituency? I wonder the hon. gentleman does not blush when I read it. The hon. gentleman spoke of what constituted corruption on the part of a Cabinet. Here is a promise held out by Mr. Anglin to the electors whom the hon. gentleman represents, and made in his presence, that if a Liberal Government obtained power it would be able to make a satisfactory arrangement in regard to these terms, or this "raid" on the public Treasury of Canada. That is the favorite term of the *Globe* and in the backwoods of Canada, and it is used by demagogues who endeavor to stir up feelings of animosity among the people of Nova Scotia. Mr. Anglin further said:

"Now, I have no doubt whatever that if the Liberal party were in power to-morrow, Mr. Blake would be willing to reconsider the whole plan of Confederation, and not only give you more for your railways but accord to your necessities all that you are entitled to. He would be willing to look at the whole question fairly with the eye of justice, not to be too exacting to the smaller Provinces, but to give them, if possible, a little more even than they are strictly entitled to."

Railway subsidies must not be promised, railway aid must not be promised! It must be denounced in the House of Commons at Ottawa, but in Cape Breton, Colchester, Cumberland and other counties, every supporter of the Government must be denounced for not having procured railway aid! The position is absurd. And I may further say that the hon. gentleman's own leader in this House, who led the Local Government in Ontario, differed from the hon. gentleman in regard to this question of political morality when he defeated John Sandfield Macdonald's Administration. Everyone knows that he made a boast, and he did so during the last election where it caught my eye in a speech delivered before a western constituency, that when he came into power in Ontario and found that John Sandfield Macdonald's Administration had voted some million odd dollars for the purpose of aiding local railways in the Province, he immediately doubled the vote and adopted a bold and vigorous railway policy. Well, if that is all right for those hon. gentlemen to do, surely Parliament will listen with very little patience and attention to an indictment against the Government, not for having introduced a general Railway Bill, promising railway aid everywhere, but for telling the people of the country that the legislation they had adopted ever since 1882 would be moulded into substantial results, and having grappled with those great questions in the west they would be able at once to take up the railway question in the east. Both parties were always expressing their great desire to aid railway enterprises in Cape Breton and the western counties, and the only difference is that the people understand that the hon. gentleman's party is a party of promises, while the present party in power is a party of performances, and that is where the thing sticks.

Mr. JONES. I thought it very likely my reference to these Minutes of Council would call up my hon. friend instead of the senior member of the same name.

Mr. TUPPER. I am old enough to know what a Minute of Council is.

Mr. JONES. I think the hon. gentleman's excitement is excusable under the circumstances. I had no doubt that when reference was made to the transactions that took place in Pictou and the influences that were used there to secure the return, as I pointed out, of the Government candidate, not only in that but in other counties, the hon. gentleman would feel some disturbance in his own mind. But the hon. gentleman is not going to draw me away from the real argument. I told him at the commencement that so far from being opposed to granting subsidies to railways in Nova

Mr. TUPPER.

Scotia, I was in favor of such a policy, that I had always contended that the Government of the Dominion while expending large sums in the west had never substantially recognised the importance of public works in the Province of Nova Scotia, and, therefore, when the hon. gentleman made those promises, so far from taking exception to them, I, on the contrary, was one of those who approved of them, and I approve of them to-night; but I take exception to the time, to the mode, to the occasion, and that makes the whole difference. This Government was in power for eight years. They knew very well that the gap between Annapolis and Digby had not been completed. They knew that great efforts had been made by both Governments to secure the completion of that piece of road, and still they left it until the last moment, just before the writs were issued. They voted it down last Session, and then, just before the writs were issued, they issued a Minute of Council, pledging the resources of the Government to carry that work to completion. Now, I say that on the face of it there was a deception; there was on the face of it an intention which the people of Nova Scotia recognised, that it was only done for a party and election purpose. And the same remark applies to the Minute of Council which was passed with reference to the Short Line Railway. Here is the Minute of Council, dated on the 31st of January, and after reciting all the circumstances connected with the road, and setting forth that it shall be made a public work, "the Minister further recommends that a Bill be prepared and submitted to Parliament next Session accordingly." Now remember this was only a fortnight before the elections, and, therefore this expenditure of public money, which would perhaps be justifiable under any circumstances—and I am not saying it would not—was extremely suspicious, when you take into account the fact that these Minutes of Council were issued only a few days previous to the election writs.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to misrepresent the facts.

Mr. JONES. Certainly not.

Mr. TUPPER. Can you tell, if you know, when the legislation was passed in Parliament? Does the hon. gentleman know the dates, because that is the point. I say that legislation preceded every Minute of Council.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman is not—as he said the other night—going to get away from me in that way.

Mr. TUPPER. I want you to stick to the facts.

Mr. JONES. There was a certain subsidy or subvention promised to the Short Line, under which it was to be constructed as a private enterprise.

Mr. TUPPER. There was more than that.

Mr. JONES. No, I say that is all there was, and after the money was expended, after the House had voted a certain sum of money to pay the laborers the whole thing collapsed. It was left *in statu quo*, with not a shovel, or a pick or a man at work upon it, and then, on the 31st January, the Government came down with a Minute of Council, giving it an entirely different character, giving it the character of a public work, and pledging the Government to bring in an Order in Council to carry it on. This was done immediately previous to the election. The hon. gentleman says that I have stated, that promises were made for a very large amount. But I forgot some of the railways. There was one railway respecting which the Minister of Finance was interviewed—one from Halifax to Pictou, about ninety miles long—and I was given to understand, by a gentleman interested in the work, that the Minister of Finance had pledged that the Government would vote a subsidy to that line.