

fields as well as here something about the true inwardness of that party which claims to represent the true principles and spirit of Liberalism. I have heard in the legislature of Nova Scotia a very distinguished Liberal coolly and openly proclaim that the Liberal party was a great and good party and that the other party was made up of the common working people and the aristocrats, and that these had no claim whatever on the protection of the Liberal party. Now, that is a very strong doctrine, and we ought to thank the Minister of Railways for preaching it so frankly and openly. We did not expect, even if it were, as we have reason to believe, the policy of the Liberal party to treat their opponents without consideration and dismiss them, whenever it suited them, in order to put their own friends into positions, that a gentleman, occupying so high a position as the Minister of Railways, would proclaim, with such unblushing frankness, that, so far as he was concerned, the poor workingman had no rights which should be respected. I would not care to call upon the workingmen of the country to make capital of this somewhat extraordinary statement. I do not think that would be a proper act, because it would savour of appealing to them as a class; but I must say, as far as this side of the House is concerned, that the statement of the Minister of Railways meets with no response whatever. We do not, on this side, see any reason why the poor man who has to live on \$1.15 per day, deserves no consideration whatever at the hands of the Administration and is to be handed over deliberately by the Administration to be destroyed and ruined, simply at the dictates of a defeated politician. Now the Minister of Railways, if he was not misrepresented, did say, in the course of his canvass in Queen's county, that railway men might vote as they liked, that, so far as he was concerned, no penalty would be visited on them for voting against the Administration or against him. I have not had time to verify the statement, but it was made openly, and I believe it is correct; and yet we find him here, just as soon as the workingmen have served his purpose, abandoning that most creditable position and deliberately announcing his set purpose to dismiss from office, without trial and without sympathy, every man whose head is demanded by any politician of the Liberal party, whether that politician be in office or has been refused a seat in Parliament by the people. A more dangerous doctrine I could not imagine. And yet, remarkable to relate, when hon. gentlemen on this side raise their voices in protest against this open, cold-blooded, unfeeling proclamation, they are greeted with laughter from the other side. The fact that they rose to make a solemn protest against such a doctrine was the ground apparently of well enjoyed merriment on the other side. I wonder do these hon. gentlemen think that this is a

laughing matter for the thousands of workingmen who, according to the authority of the Minister of Railways, are existing in such a state of uncertainty, that, at any moment, their heads may be taken off. I wonder if any one of these workingmen, who have to look forward to a coming winter and keep house and maintain a family on their small allowance of \$1.15 per day, will read that statement with laughter? Not so. It must be a most dreadful threat to those workingmen to learn that their chances of making a decent living depend on the accusation brought against them by some defeated politician, unsupported by any evidence and without inquiry of any kind. On such an accusation, without inquiry, brought against them by some man who has not been able to secure the confidence of the people, who has been discarded by his county, they are liable to be deprived of their means of existence. One hon. gentleman on the other side assumed that the doctrine had been accepted by this House, that those persons who took any part in politics were to be dismissed, and that the price of their continued existence in office was absolutely neutrality. That doctrine has not been accepted by any one on this side; and I need scarcely say that this heartless cruel extension of it, promulgated by the Minister of Railways, cannot meet with acceptance on this side, but must meet with our most indignant condemnation and protest. I had hoped that the Minister of Railways had declared this in an unguarded moment, but he repeated it twice or three times in the course of the afternoon. I would like to know on what basis the hon. gentleman draws the distinction he did. He told us that he drew the line so that it would exclude from the region of mercy and hopefulness the men who most required protection. If the workingmen should use his power in the state in the light of the statement made by the Minister of Railways that hon. gentleman would see that to this legislature very few hon. gentlemen will come who are capable of meeting with laughter the protests made against the announcement of the Minister of Railways to-day. On this side of the House, we cannot accept the doctrine enunciated by the hon. gentleman. We cannot allow the country to believe that we agree in the proposition that it is to be left to our opponents, to defeated politicians, in many cases, to dismiss without trial men who have come under their dislike and ill-will. To show how dangerous it is, take the case of the dismissals made in Pictou by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That gentleman assured us, in the House, that he had grounds for dismissing Messrs. Noonan and Davies, because he knew they were active, aggressive and offensive politicians.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous debate.