

of Halifax, before whom, no doubt, he will soon have to make his bow; he denounced them as unfair, dishonest and ignorant, and I call the attention of the electors to that charge, and I throw that charge back in his face; I say that language was unworthy of him, and could only be pardoned by hon. gentlemen stating that he labored under great excitement. He told the House to-night that the franchise was the right of free men, and that a Government who interfered with the exercise of the franchise should be denounced, and before he sat down he wanted to rob every man of his franchise; he wanted to put them back on their backs where he had them during the time he was permitted to aid in administering the affairs of the country. But I want to remind the hon. gentleman of the time when he had it in his power to threaten and coerce. It was all very well when he went before his electors to tell them, as he reads from his scrap-book to-night, that they were free men and could exercise the franchise as they pleased, and he scorned, of course, to coerce and intimidate those men. But when standing up as a candidate for the Dominion Parliament in 1874, before these same electors, before their rights had been taken away by a so-called Reform Government, the hon. gentleman spoke language that I am going to read, and I want him to reconcile it, if he can, with the language he uses now. In 1874, in the city of Halifax, as a member supporting the Reform Government in Canada, he spoke to the civil servants as follows:—

"So long as they served the State, they were protected in their offices, but if they disregarded that principle, and took a part against the Government, whose subordinates they were (?)"—

Not servants of the members of both sides of the House, not servants of the people, but subordinates, as slaves of the Government!

—"they took their offices in their hands."

This, Mr. Chairman, is language from an hon. gentleman who denounces my hon. friend and the party with which I am identified, for having coerced the civil servants, the Intercolonial Railway employes, and threatened them with loss of office. He says they would stand or fall with the party, that was the rule and that would be observed here, and to make the matter clear, the organ in the city of Halifax, that either controls the hon. gentleman or which the hon. gentleman controls, on the 10th of January, said:

"They are certainly not free to vote against Mr. Jones or against Mr. Power, and if any one of them votes, canvasses, or in any way opposes the Government of which he is a subordinate, he will do so at his peril."

That, I fancy, is explicit enough, and this has come from the organ of that pure party that we have in Nova Scotia, which has one cry here and altogether a different one at home. Then it goes on to say:

"Whatever benefit can legitimately be derived from the patronage of a political party, should be enjoyed by themselves and not by their enemies."

So, Mr. Chairman, in order to expose the hon. gentleman and to weaken the force of any harangue he may make here, it is only necessary to refer to the reports in his own press, of his own speeches, to show not only that he has no true sympathy with the Liberal party in that Province, but that he has in no sense worked in their interest. Now, we find that his political ally, his leader in Nova Scotia, only a year ago, in the House of Assembly, reaffirmed the position which my hon. friend took in 1874. He held the whip out to that effect over the backs of the employes of the Local Government. Then, my hon. friend's figures are a little wrong. He says that in the Intercolonial workshops, where he deemed it right to go, the immense majority was coerced. Why, it is only when men are employed on full time, when work is booming, at the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in Halifax, that there are 300 men all told, so my hon. friend would have difficulty in finding the 400 votes

who were allowed by that terrible franchise officer whom he has spoken of, to put their names on the list. But there is another more serious thing to which I wish to call attention. Everyone was surprised to learn the hon. gentleman who proclaims so much belief in political purity, fairness and freedom, that during the last election a gentleman holding a responsible position as a member of this House, not a civil servant or Intercolonial employe, but an independent member of this House, stated that he received a letter from the hon. gentleman when his party was in power, and he asked permission, in consequence of this statement made by the hon. gentleman, abusing the Liberal-Conservatives for coercing and intimidating their opponents, to remove the seal of secrecy from that letter, and he charged that hon. gentleman with having resorted to the same practices himself that he denounced in others, and from that time to this that hon. gentleman has not seen fit to remove the seal of secrecy from that letter. Until he complies with that request and allows that letter to be read, it will be difficult for him to stand here and claim that in all these matters himself and his party are without stain. I have another reference, if references are necessary, to show the hollow hypocrisy of the sentiments uttered by the hon. gentlemen who stand up and claim that they were not fairly and honestly beaten. I ask the hon. gentleman, the senior member for Halifax, to run back to the month of December previous to the June elections; does he recollect the argument that was made to the electors then? Because, no doubt, the hon. gentleman who used it agreed with him in thinking that the electors were ignorant, that they were corrupt, that they were unfair and dishonest, and that they could be bought off from this hallucination of repeal. Does the hon. gentleman remember when Mr. Anglin, one of the great Grit apostles of Ontario now, exiled from his native Province politically, paid a visit to his constituency? Has he got that gentleman's speech in his scrap-book—the speech of Mr. Anglin in the Temperance Hall or in one of the public buildings in Halifax, when he came there authorised by the leader of the Reform party of Canada, because neither the leader nor any organ of his party from that day to this has repudiated the statement made by that gentleman holding so high and important a position in the Liberal party of the Dominion? Does he recollect the style in which that gentleman placed the public questions before the people of Halifax? How was he on the question of subsidy, on the question of holding out bribes and spreading them by the bushel before the people? The member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) sat on the platform with Mr. Anglin; Mr. Jones cheered him. Mr. Anglin concluded his speech amid rousing cheers, and the hon. gentleman adopted and reiterated those statements made by Mr. Anglin; and I will ask the patience of the House while I read one or two extracts to show the promises held out by one of the purists of the party. Mr. Anglin, coming to this question, said:

"We feel up in Ontario that the people of Nova Scotia had something to complain about. We felt that, despite all the effort of the Opposition in the House, many of those burthens had been placed there, and, as I said, we knew that you had just cause to complain. \* \* \* We can change the character and tone of the whole fiscal policy, so as to materially encourage and revive the commerce of the country, and in that way render important service to the people of Nova Scotia. We can do a little more than that."

I wish the House to notice that that gentleman was willing to go one better than all the gentlemen who had preceded him or who afterwards succeeded him, and he spoke as to how far this Parliament could reach in point of legislation. He said:

"There are some questions between the Dominion and the Local Government as to subsidies and as to the means placed at the disposal of the Local Government for the carrying out of the important railway work. \* \* \* A Liberal Government, I think, if in power during