

PARTY GOVERNMENT IN NOVA SCOTIA

1878 - 1897

BY

PHYLLIS RUTH BLAKELEY



PARTY GOVERNMENT IN NOVA SCOTIA

1878 - 1897

(A Thesis submitted by Phyllis Ruth
Blakeley in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the Master of
Arts degree from Dalhousie University.)

Prepared under the direction of
Dr. D. C. Harvey.

Dalhousie University

September, 1945.

CONTENTS

Party Government in Nova Scotia

1878 - 1897

	Page
Chapter I	
I The Federal and Provincial Elections of 1878	1
II Domestic Legislation, 1878 - 1882	17
III Relations with Ottawa, 1878 - 1882	38
Chapter II	
I Dominion and Provincial Elections, 1882	44
II Domestic Legislation, 1883 - 1886	65
III Relations with Ottawa, 1882 - 1886	100
Chapter III	
I The Repeal Elections	110
II Domestic Legislation, 1886 - 1890	129
III Relations With Ottawa, 1886 - 1890	157
Chapter IV	
I The Financial Election of 1890	159
II The Reciprocity Election, 1891	171
III Domestic Legislation, 1891 - 1894	185
IV Relations with Ottawa, 1891 - 1894	229
Chapter V	
I The Provincial Election, 1894	233
II The Dominion Election of 1896	247
III Domestic Legislation, 1895 - 1897	266
IV Relations with Ottawa, 1895 - 1897	282
Appendix I	
Provincial Elections	285
Appendix II	
Dominion Elections	295
Appendix III	
By-elections in Nova Scotian Elections	300

Prologue

In 1867 Nova Scotia ceased to be a separate colony under the British Crown, and became one of the four provinces forming the Dominion of Canada. Confederation was the issue which divided Nova Scotians from 1864 to 1872, and which led to a new alignment of parties.

The people of Nova Scotia had never elected an Assembly on the platform of Union or Non-Union. On September 18, 1867, they were able to express their opinions at the polls. The Confederates or "Canada" party advocated Confederation because they claimed that "Union is strength" and because Nova Scotians would benefit by belonging to a strong nation such as the Dominion of Canada. The Anti-Confederates or "Nova Scotia" party urged the people to elect their candidates as a protest against Union. They felt that Nova Scotia was being used as a pawn by the Canadian politicians, and that her independence and interests were being sacrificed.

The Anti-Confederates won an overwhelming majority in the elections - out of the nineteen members sent to the Dominion Parliament only one was a Unionist, and out of the thirty-eight members elected to the local Assembly only two were committed to the cause of Confederation.

The Anti-Confederate Government of Nova Scotia devoted most of its energies from 1867 to 1871 to attempts to obtain Repeal.

Some Nova Scotians, including Joseph Howe, objected less to Confederation than to the way in which it was effected, without consulting the wishes of the people. They also objected to specific details, particularly in regard to the financial arrangement.

Joseph Howe, and many other Anti-Confederates, became convinced that Repeal could never be secured, and accepted "Better Terms" from the Dominion of Canada. Although Nova Scotia accepted new financial terms, the bitter indignation against Confederation subsided very slowly.

In the Provincial election of 1871 the issues of 1867 still exerted a powerful influence on the general public. The Anti-Confederates won again in spite of a larger and stronger opposition.

The Anti-Confederates who had been elected to the Dominion Parliament in 1867 had worked for Repeal and had held aloof from both parties. Gradually these men joined the Government and worked for "Better Terms" or transferred their hatred from Confederation to Sir John A. Macdonald and his party. By 1874 the Anti-Confederates had coalesced with the two federal parties.

In the local election of 1874 it was clear that the federal parties were exerting a powerful influence on Nova Scotian politics. The Nova Scotian Reformers gave their unqualified support to the Mackenzie ministry at Ottawa while the Opposition in Nova Scotia adopted wholesale the policies of the Liberal-Conservatives.

CHAPTER I

SECTION I

The Federal and Provincial Elections of 1878.

In 1878 both the Federal and Provincial elections were held on the same day - September 17th, 1878. In both instances the local groups had identified themselves with the respective Federal parties. The Reformers were in power in the Federal Parliament under the leadership of Alexander Mackenzie, and in the Nova Scotian Assembly with the Hon. P. C. Hill as Provincial Secretary. The Reform party of Nova Scotia and the Reform press - THE CHRONICLE, THE ACADIAN RECORDER, and the NOVA SCOTIAN - worked for the re-election of Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Hill. The provincial Conservative party, aided by THE HERALD and THE REPORTER, fought for the defeat of both governments.

It was difficult to wage two political campaigns at once. Both parties concentrated on the issues of the Federal election. Each party tended to ignore the local contest, considering that the Provincial election would follow the lead of the Dominion one.

The chief issue of the Federal election was the severe Depression from which Canada had suffered since 1873. The election battle-cry of each party, "Protection" or "Free Trade" was merely the weapon that the party offered to grapple with the Depression and to restore prosperity. ¹

Most of the revenue of Canada was derived from a small duty on imports - "a tariff for revenue." During the Depression trade fell off and the federal revenue accordingly declined. An increase was necessary to fill the Treasury. Sir Richard Cartwright had raised the tariff two and one-half per cent. to seventeen and one-half per cent. The Reform government were determined

1. MORNING HERALD, September 14, 1878.

to raise the tariff a further two and one-half per cent. Its Maritime members protested against a further increase on goods they consumed but did not produce. The Mackenzie government acquiesced in their protest. Then the Conservative party began to advocate their "National Policy" - a tariff which would protect Canadian industries from foreign competition, increase the revenue, and create prosperity.

"The issue between the contending parties is that of Free Trade or Protection. Put in a few words, it is whether Canadian legislation shall be directed to the development of Canadian industries, agriculture, and commerce, or not, whether we will legislate to employ the labor of our own people, and retain the product of that labor to be spent among ourselves or employ the labor of other nations, and send our wealth to be expended in those countries." ¹

Both parties advanced general arguments about Protection, and in addition they indulged in detailed debates over the specific duties on flour, sugar, coal, and salt. Conservatives and Reformers alike recognized the importance of the people's choice between Free Trade and Protection:

"Ere a month has passed away, the most momentous election that has taken place since Confederation will have transpired and the full results become known." ²

The bold speeches of the Conservatives, claiming that Protection would cause Prosperity, caught the imagination of the people, who wanted to feel that the Government was doing something to relieve the Depression.

1. MORNING HERALD, September 14, 1878.
2. ACADIAN RECORDER, August 26, 1878.

Most of the arguments used in this election had been rehearsed in the by-election of the previous January, when under the Independence of Parliament Act (31 Vic Cap XXV) Mr. W. Vail and Mr. A. G. Jones had been compelled to seek re-election in their constituencies.

The Opposition Policy promised a Re-adjustment of the Tariff to make the duties fall more equitably, and to revive the West India Trade, to remove the present barriers to the development of the Mining Industries, to encourage Home Industries with Home Markets for Home Produce, to promote Shipping interests, and to protect the rights of Fishermen. They wanted economy in departmental administration and the management of the Inter-colonial Railway as a National work in the interests of Inter-Provincial trade and so to constitute Halifax the great grain and winter port of the Dominion.¹

The Reformers opposed the principle of Protection although some, like Laurier, admitted that a small amount of protection was necessary to foster the industries of a new country. Sir Richard Cartwright, the Finance Minister, had stated that he could do nothing more to relieve Hard Times. He and Premier Mackenzie admitted that Protection could give temporary prosperity, but that this prosperity could not last. Indeed, Cartwright blamed the American depression on over-production encouraged by extreme protection. The Finance Minister objected to any alteration of the fiscal policy which was based on the principle of "tariff for revenue."

The Reform press boldly proclaimed that Protection was not adapted to a Maritime country because the people thrived by ships and commerce, and that it would therefore be suicidal for the Maritimes to support Protection.

1. HERALD, September 11, 1878.

The ACADIAN RECORDER expressed its views as follows:

What Protection Cannot Do

"1. It cannot make us a manufacturing country. Because Ontario and Quebec are far ahead of us, and wages are too high in Nova Scotia to make it profitable.

2. It cannot lessen the price of a single article we use. The object of Protection is to make articles high by shutting out competition.

3. It cannot extend our trade. The design of Protection is to shut down trade and buy everything at home." 1

The NOVA SCOTIAN argued that Protection could raise the price of flour, cotton, woolens, boots, sugar, molasses, and everything that goes into daily household consumption; it could close foreign markets and destroy the trade with England, the West Indies, and the United States; it could nearly destroy the great fishing industries by merely increasing the price of salt; and that the "Tories", if elected, intended to place a duty of fifty cents a barrel on flour. The sole purpose of this "Bread Tax" was

"to compel the people of the Maritime Provinces to consume Ontario flour whether it suits them or not, and pay the Ontario producer a higher price for it than he could get without protection." 2

The Conservatives in the Maritimes (including Dr. Tupper) contended that protection would not affect the price of flour as Canada produced a surplus of flour.

The Reformers countered this with the retort that Canada does not produce a surplus of breadstuffs, and quoted many statistics in support of this statement. The Maritimes

1. August 29, 1878.
2. September 14, 1878.

had an extensive carrying trade with the United States taking local produce such as fish, vegetables, and lumber to their neighbour, and in return bringing back goods, chiefly flour, from the States. An increased tax on flour would ruin this profitable carrying trade.

Although both parties admitted that the West India Trade in sugar was languishing, and both agreed that the remedy lay in lowering the duty on raw sugar and increasing the duty on refined sugar, nevertheless, much time and many newspaper columns were devoted to a lengthy discussion of the Sugar Question.

Previous to 1873 Canada had possessed a flourishing sugar refining industry. From 1873 to 1877 the refineries had suffered from increasing competition from the United States. This competition was encouraged by a drawback given by the American government on the duty of all sugar exported. In the spring of 1876 the Redpath Refinery in Montreal had closed, with the result that the entire Canadian supply of white sugar came from the United States.

Merchants and industrialists who were interested in the sugar trade became convinced that if the duty on raw sugar were lowered, and the duty on refined sugar raised, the Canadian industry would be revived. The Canadian sugar interests began to demand that the government protect the sugar industry by legislation.

All Nova Scotia, and particularly the port of Halifax, was interested in securing the increased importation of raw sugar

and reviving the West Indian trade. The leaders of both parties made similar promises about the readjustment of the sugar tariff.

Dr. Tupper, in his speech at North Sydney on the vexed sugar question, assured his audience that the duty would be lowered with the consequent restoration of the sugar trade and the return of prosperity.¹

Mr. Jones, the Minister of Militia and the Reform representative for Halifax in the Dominion Parliament, and also a Halifax merchant, had long advocated a change in the sugar duties. He had protested against the action of the Americans, and in 1873 had asked the Macdonald government for government aid to the sugar industry. A contributing factor to Mr. Jones' election in the by-election of 1878 had been his promise to have the sugar duty lowered.

The discussion of the sugar tariff was complicated by the fact that the Liberal Conservatives, who were now in favour of lowering the sugar duty, had refused to change the tariff in 1873; and in 1874 had prevented the Mackenzie government from altering the duty. Accordingly, the Reformers blamed the "Tories" for the depression of the sugar industry, while the Conservatives retorted that Mr. Jones had been in the Cabinet for nine months and that he had failed to fulfill his election promise to assist the sugar trade.²

The question of a coal duty was eagerly debated because it seemed to promise prosperity. The coal industry was of vital

1. HERALD, July 29, 1878.

2. MORNING CHRONICLE, January 11, 1878.

importance to Nova Scotia. Five thousand men were employed in the coal mines, thirty thousand were dependent on the mines, and twelve million dollars capital had been invested in them. Moreover, the royalty of ten cents per ton contributed fifty to eighty thousand dollars a year to the provincial treasury. Nova Scotians were led to believe that the adoption of the National Policy would revive the coal industry, which was suffering from a severe depression.

While the sales of Nova Scotian coal had declined from 881,106 tons in 1873 to 634,204 tons in 1876, the amount of coal imported, free of duty, from the United States to Quebec and Ontario was increasing. The Nova Scotian mine owners naturally coveted this trade, and they insisted that a small duty would secure the Quebec and Ontario market for Nova Scotian coal.

The MORNING HERALD pointed out that a duty of fifty cents per ton on coal would either give Nova Scotia the sale of a possible million tons of coal, or would provide a half a million for the Dominion revenue. ¹

Dr. Tupper, acting as spokesman for the Conservative party, promised that a duty of fifty cents per ton would be placed on coal, and that this tax would restore the prosperity of Cape Breton. He claimed that Mackenzie and the Reformers had fostered the petroleum industry of Ontario by a duty of two hundred per cent., and he demanded to know why the Reformers or the people of Ontario should object to a tax on coal for the benefit of Nova Scotia. ²

1. HERALD, July 27, 1878
 2. HERALD, July 29, 1878.

The Reformers insisted that the duty on coal proposed by the "Tories" was too small to be of any value. Mr. Jones stated that the tax must be at least a dollar and a half a ton. In any event, he did not believe that Nova Scotia should ask the rest of Canada to pay a duty on coal for her benefit alone.

The Reform press repeatedly explained the evils of Protection to the electors. The fishermen were warned that the Conservatives planned to tax salt and so provide protection for the salt mines in Kincardine. Although six million dollars' worth of fish were exported each year from Nova Scotia, the fishermen obtained little enough profit from their labour. If salt were taxed they would be utterly ruined.

"And for what end, we ask, is this most unjust, oppressive, and iniquitous burden to be imposed upon the struggling fishermen of Nova Scotia? Simply to build up an artificial industry in Ontario, and make make two or three men who have money invested rich." 1

In a column called Housekeeping Under the National Policy the exponents of free trade gave specific examples of how protection would increase the cost of living so that a young married man earning fifteen hundred dollars a year would live no better than if he earned nine hundred dollars now. For example,

"Suppose he is renting a house of eight or ten rooms for about \$300 per annum. The first blessing he must be prepared to face is a raise in his rent. Under a Tory regime houses will be built with dearer lumber or protected brick; or protected nails or screws; each protected nail will be driven by a protected hammer or driver; protected saws and plains wielded by unprotected hands will do the fitting ... until the tenant will be extremely fortunate if he gets housed for \$400 instead of \$300... His boots will be made dearer by 58%..." 2

1. ACADIAN RECORDER, August 6, 1878.

2. RECORDER, September 11, 1878, reprinted from the TORONTO GLOBE.

Personal recriminations, veiled contempt, and ridicule towards opponents were certainly not lacking in this campaign. Sir John A. Macdonald and Dr. Charles Tupper were singled out for attack among the Conservatives, but Messrs. Richey and Daly were sneered at because they dared oppose such able and experienced men as Mr. Jones and Mr. Power. Premier Mackenzie, Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Jones were blamed for the sins of the Reform government.

The Reform press persisted in referring to the Canadian Pacific Scandal and to the corruption of the "Tory" party. The ACADIAN RECORDER reprinted the incriminating documents, including the telegrams signed by Cartier and Macdonald, under the caption "National Policy", leaving its readers to infer that a man who sold charters for public works was no person to lead a government.

Dr. Tupper, who had not been personally involved in the Pacific Scandal, defended Sir John, and insisted that his chief was not guilty of corruption.

The CHRONICLE urged the support of the Reform candidates, Jones and Power, because of their record. They had been true to Reform principles; they had supported a government which introduced vote by ballot, the trial of controverted elections by judges, the Supreme Court Act, the Temperance Act; and had spent \$750,000 in extending the railway into Halifax; and had made Halifax Canada's winter port. ¹

1. September 6, 1878.

2.

The election for the Nova Scotian House of Assembly was overshadowed by the federal contest. Only the "Tory organ", THE MORNING HERALD, devoted much attention to the local campaign. The ACADIAN RECORDER accounted for this by stating that the "Tories" knew that they could not win the Dominion election, but that they hoped that they might compensate for this defeat by a local victory.

The Reformers relied on the record of the provincial government to secure re-election. The Reform press published the Hon. P. C. Hill's address to the people without any comment. Mr. Hill reviewed the accomplishments of his government. He asked for a renewal of the confidence of the electors. The Reform government had earned its return to power in the Assembly of Nova Scotia because it had passed so many excellent statutes, e.g., it had established the trial of controverted elections before the Supreme Court instead of a parliamentary committee; improved the system of voting by ballot; changed the Education Act; built the Normal School at Truro; established the University of Halifax; abolished the office of Queen's Printer by opening printing to competition by tender and thereupon saving public money; by a movement towards economy by the amalgamation of certain offices such as the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the Attorney-General, and the Provincial Treasurer and Provincial Secretary. The revenue of the province had steadily declined due to the depression and the expiration of the additional subsidy of \$82,698 on July 1, 1877. The most strenuous efforts to get the

Dominion to continue this subsidy had failed. However, the Federal government did make an allowance of \$58,998 as a compensation for stores in lighthouses and railways taken over at Confederation. The provincial government had attempted to promote trade by the construction of railways. Liberal aid had been granted towards the completion of the Western Counties Railway and the Nictaux - Atlantic Railway, and the Eastern Extension had been put under contract.¹

The Conservatives concentrated on attacking the provincial government by accusations of corruption, and by the discussion of the railway tangle. The MORNING HERALD ran a series of editorials on "Eleven Years of Robbery and Ruin", attempting to show the sins of the government. This paper boldly stated that the Reformers had remained in office only because of Anti-Confederate feeling, corruption, and plenty of promises. It accused the local government of squandering three-fifths of the provincial credit at Ottawa on railroads. If the Opposition policy had been pursued, some of these schemes would not have been pursued, others would not have cost half the money.

Further, the HERALD accused the Reform government of corruption in the administration of crown lands, of paying unauthorized sums of money from the Treasury to the members of the government and their friends, of corruption in connection with the travelling expenses of the Executive Councillors and Road Advances and Immigration, and of paying the whole government grant to the Western Counties Railway for half the railroad and for inferior work on that half. The HERALD supported each

1. RECORDER, August 14, 1878.

accusation by quotations from the Journals or the Debates of the Assembly.

This paper also claimed that Premier Hill must be held responsible for any corruption in connection with Immigration, as he was a member of the Cabinet at that time. It also stated that in 1872 the Local government began to spend large sums on a system of immigration, amounting to \$41,511.85 by 1877, by which only twenty French families were brought from Alsace to work in the Pictou coal mines, and twenty-five families of Icelanders were settled in Shelburne and Musquodoboit. The direct charges from the settlement and support of these people amounted to \$74.28 per head by 1877, whereas the cost of the extravagant Immigration system of the Dominion government was only \$15.24 per head, including all charges.

"It is almost needless to say that nearly the whole of this \$41,500 found its way into the pockets of members and supporters of the Local Government ... in fact the 'scheme' was made to admirably serve the purposes for which it was designed, viz., the filling of Grit pockets and the purchase of dishonest politicians."¹

The completion of the Pacific Railway in fulfillment of the promise to British Columbia received little attention from either party in Nova Scotia during the election campaign of 1878. The management and rate schedules of the Intercolonial, the government's difficulties with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway and the Western Counties Railway were matters of far greater importance to the people of Nova Scotia.

In 1866 the Nova Scotian government had granted a charter to an English company to extend the Windsor line by

1. HERALD, August 28, 1878.

constructing a railway from Windsor to Annapolis. The charter guaranteed that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway should receive running rights to Halifax over the Windsor Branch. At Confederation the Nova Scotia Railway was taken over by the Dominion of Canada as part of the Intercolonial. Not until 1871 could the Windsor and Annapolis Railway make arrangements with the Dominion for exclusive running rights over the Windsor Branch on condition that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway should provide a certain service to the public and pay a rental of one-third of the gross earnings of the Branch. Any failure would terminate the agreement.¹

The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company experienced many difficulties and it let its government rental fall into arrears. After an investigation in 1873 by the Provincial and Federal governments, Sir John A. Macdonald's government resumed control of the Windsor Branch. The Dominion government resigned before taking further action. The Mackenzie government allowed the W. and A. to operate the Branch until September, 1877, when, without warning, it transferred the Windsor Branch to the Western Counties Railway immediately, on condition that the Yarmouth - Annapolis line should be completed before October 1st, 1879.

There was at that time a definite break in travel between Halifax and Annapolis. A passenger buying his ticket on either side of Windsor could only purchase it to that point. If he wished to continue he was obliged to buy a new ticket to his destination, have his baggage re-checked, and change cars.

1. M. Woodworth: HISTORY OF THE DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Train connections were erratic. The Windsor and Annapolis tried to make this as difficult for the Western Counties Railway as possible and to foster dissatisfaction among the public until public demand would force the government to restore the running rights of the Windsor and Annapolis. Freight also was moved only as far as Windsor, where it had to be transhipped to the cars of the other line.

This inconvenience and confusion in travel and dislocation of trade had caused a public demand that conditions be remedied. Halifax had suffered a loss estimated at five thousand passengers and six thousand tons of freight, because of the successful attempt by the Windsor and Annapolis to divert the trade in apples, potatoes, pears, and other fruits from Halifax to Annapolis.

Each party in Nova Scotia tried to blame the other for the tangled situation between the Windsor and Annapolis Railway and the Western Counties Railway. The CHRONICLE and the HERALD quoted the same statistics labelled "The Road to Ruin" - each inferring that the other party was responsible.

The HERALD naturally blamed the Local and the Dominion governments for the difficulty. It declared that Premier Mackenzie had deliberately caused the trouble by handing over the Windsor Branch to the Western Counties Railway and ignoring the claims of the Windsor and Annapolis. The Conservatives accused the Local government of exerting undue influence upon the Premier of Canada to force him to transfer the Windsor Branch to the Western Counties Railway in attempt to help the Western Counties Railway raise funds

to complete the railway. They stated in "The W. C. R. Swindle" that the provincial government had paid the government subsidy to the Western Counties Railway as the Company demanded so that the subsidy had been exhausted by 1877 before the railway was half finished.

The CHRONICLE praised Mr. Mackenzie for the delay of four years, and blamed Sir John Macdonald for giving the line to the Western Counties Railway. It objected to the subject being made political capital when it was already before the courts.

3.

On September 17th, 1878, the Reform government was defeated in both the Federal and the Provincial elections. The Liberal Conservatives won a majority of sixty-eight in the Dominion Parliament. Nova Scotia sent fourteen Conservatives to the House of Commons and seven Reformers. In the House of Assembly thirty Conservatives were elected, seven Reformers, and one Independent.

Some reasons for the defeat of Mr. Mackenzie were the fact that he led a divided party and that he did not have a strong cabinet. Mr. Mackenzie was both Premier and Minister of Public Works. He neglected his duties as leader of the party, and protected the Treasury funds so well from grafters and contractors that he offended many influential men. The Reformers were weak in Quebec. They were blamed for the depression and the deficit, while the Conservative National Policy stirred the imagination of the public.

The defeat of the Local Government was partly due to the end of the Anti-Confederate feeling, and to the desire of the people for a change, as the Reformers had been in power long enough to make enemies, but above all to the coalescence of the Federal and Provincial Parties. The Federal and the Local Reform parties were identical in the minds of the people. It was impossible to favour the Conservative party in the Dominion Parliament without preferring it in the local Assembly.

CHAPTER I

SECTION II

Domestic Legislation, 1878 - 1882.

SECTION II

Domestic Legislation, 1878 - 1882.

The new Government will have the fullest opportunity to carry out the numerous reforms that its members and their friends have, directly or indirectly, promised the country. Their course will be watched with interest by a people who will not be disposed to listen to excuses for failure. - NOVA SCOTIAN, October 26, 1878.

In the Nova Scotian Legislature from 1878 to 1882 the Liberal-Conservative party had an overwhelming majority. Of the thirty-eight members of the Assembly, thirty were Conservatives, seven Reformers, and Mr. Kinney, from Yarmouth County, was an Independent who usually supported the government, but who was capable of opposing both parties.¹ The Reform Opposition admitted that they were too weak to block government measures. They adopted the policy of stating their objections to government bills and permitting these bills to pass without a division. Very seldom was a division made, and the names recorded. Most questions were discussed on a non-partisan basis.

The real opposition to the government policies came from the Legislative Council. The Council amended or deferred many bills passed by the Assembly. In 1878 there were only five Conservatives in a Council of nineteen members.² Before relinquishing office the Reformers had secretly filled four vacancies in the Council.³

1. See Appendix I.
2. Creelman, Parker, Fraser, McKinnon and Cutler. See HERALD, December 20, 1878.
3. C. M. Boudrot, Arichat, C.B.; C. M. Francheville, Guysboro; John Dickie, Truro; and David McCurdy, Baddeck. See HERALD, March 7, 1879.

The Conservatives appointed Hiram Black, of Amherst, and James Macdonald, of Halifax, both of whom were pledged to vote for the abolition of the Council, to the Council in November, 1879. Nevertheless, the majority of the Council consisted of men of Reform principles. These members could usually discover that the important measures of the "Tory" Assembly were not wise, and that it was the duty of the Council to defer such hasty legislation in the interests of the province.

The members of the new Executive Council of Nova Scotia were appointed on October 22, 1879. The Hon. Simon Holmes (Pictou) became Premier and Provincial Secretary. John S. Thompson (Antigonish), later to become Premier of Canada, was made Attorney-General, and Samuel Creelman, the Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, William Troop (Annapolis), Nathaniel White (Shelburne), Charles Townshend (Cumberland), James McDonald (Kings), and Hector McDougall (Cape Breton), were Ministers without Portfolio. ¹

The first session of the twenty-seventh Parliament of Nova Scotia was opened with due ceremony on Thursday, March 6, 1879, by Lieutenant - Governor Archibald. The Governor directed the attention of the Assembly particularly to the financial affairs of the Province and to railways.

The reply to the Speech from the Throne, moved by Adam Bell (Pictou), was passed unanimously. In the debate on the Address, Mr. Gayton, the Leader of the Opposition, criticized the Government very mildly for the absence of any reference to the Fishery Award, and for Better Terms, and for favouritism towards the Eastern Extension. The Opposition policy of supporting all

1. NOVA SCOTIAN, October 26, 1878.

government measures for increased efficiency in public services and economy in public expenditures was endorsed by Dr. Campbell (R, Inverness) and T. B. Smith (R, Hants).

The chief subjects discussed were the Abolition of the Legislative Council; the County Incorporation Act; Finance, including the Fishery Award and "Better Terms"; Education; the Bridge Bill; and Railways.

The measure for the Abolition of the Legislative Council was strenuously debated. This topic had been the subject of much bickering in the press of both parties. Public opinion was aroused upon the question. In 1876 the Assembly had been unanimously in favour of the abolition of the Council, and the Council as unanimous in its refusal to agree to such a resolution. When Mr. Holmes had been in opposition he had advocated the abolition of the Council as a measure of economy. Yet Mr. Creelman, another member of the government and a member of the Council, had voted against the abolition of the Council in 1876.

The Conservative government felt that it was their duty to abolish the Legislative Council. On March 8, 1879, Mr. Creelman, (C), introduced in the Council itself a resolution for its abolition. Thomas Morrison, Reform leader in the Council, greeted the resolution with the remark that, "Wonders will never cease."

On March 11th, the Provincial Secretary moved a resolution for a conference between the Assembly and the Council to arrange for the abolition of the Council. ¹

1. JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY FOR NOVA SCOTIA, 1879, p. 17.

Premier Holmes "believed that throughout the length and breadth of the land there was a very general, almost universal sentiment in favour of the abolition of that body." The reasons advanced for the popular desire for Abolition were the expense of supporting a Council when it was of no value to the country since the curtailment of the legislative powers of Nova Scotia at Confederation; and the fact that the Council had failed to check unwise legislation passed by the Assembly, and especially had not prevented the province from plunging into financial difficulties. Government supporters and Opposition members were unanimous about the necessity for the Abolition of the Council. All felt that its Abolition would save money, and that the people wanted this measure. A Committee, which consisted of Premier Holmes, Hon. Mr. White, and Mr. Gayton, was appointed to confer with the Council about its abolition.

Meanwhile the Legislative Council had considered Mr. Creelman's resolution. The Councillors with Conservative leanings had supported the resolution, although they all regretted that it was necessary to abolish the Council. The arguments advanced were similar to those expressed in the Assembly, but the need for economy and the fact that the people were determined to have the Council abolished were stressed.

The Reformers in the Council opposed its abolition. They insisted that the Council was very valuable because it made useful amendments to bills passed by the Assembly. Also they declared the Abolition of the Council would save only ten or twelve thousand

dollars when the province needed a much larger sum to ward off the expected deficit of \$315,000. Mr. Morrison proposed that Mr. Creelman's resolution be struck out and his own resolution that "it is inexpedient and unwise to entirely abolish the upper branch of the legislature" be substituted. This resolution also proposed several methods of retrenchment such as the reduction of the membership of the Council and the Assembly, and a cut in the salaries of officials, which would save at least thirty thousand dollars a year. The Reform leader urged the Councillors to vote against Mr. Creelman's "suicidal, disloyal, and un-British resolution".

Mr. Creelman's resolution was defeated by a vote of 13 to 6. The Conservatives, except Mr. Fraser, supported it, while the Reform members unanimously rejected it. ¹

As the conference between the two branches of the Legislature failed on March 28, 1879, Mr. Holmes introduced in the Assembly "An Act to Abolish the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia." The Provincial Secretary stated that the House should pass a bill to abolish the Council so that the responsibility of rejecting it should rest upon the Council. The Assembly, without discussion, passed the bill unanimously, but it was defeated by the Council.

On April 17, 1879, the Assembly adopted an Address to the Queen respecting the Abolition of the Council. The petitioners asked Her Majesty to grant the Lieutenant - Governor the power to appoint nine additional Councillors who would be willing to support a measure for the abolition of the Council. ²

1. For the resolution: Parker (C), Cameron (C), Macdonald (C), Black (C), McKinnon (C), Creelman (C) - 6
Against: Oakes (R), McCurdy (R), Butler (R), C. Dickie (R), J. B. Dickie (R), Baker (R), Cochran (R), Morrison (R), Tupper (R), Fraser (C), Francheville (R), Boudrot (R), the President (R) - 13

2. JOURNAL OF NOVA SCOTIA ASSEMBLY, 1879. P. 108 - 110.

In 1880 the government announced that Her Majesty had not sanctioned the proposal to increase the number of Councillors to obtain a majority favourable to Abolition.

During the session of 1881 another attempt was made to abolish the Upper House. On April 12, 1881, Charles Townshend (C), of Cumberland, moved a resolution authorizing the Government to correspond with the other Maritime Provinces to arrange taking concerted action for the abolition of their respective Legislative Councils.¹

The underlying motive for this renewed attempt was exasperation because the Council had defeated two government measures and two or three others in which the government was interested. Mr. Townshend said,

"It was a most unprecedented state of things when the members of the House find themselves in the humiliating position of being unable to carry out the well-understood wishes of the people they represented. Why should ten or eleven men in an irresponsible body be able to thwart the action of the representatives of the people?"

All the arguments advanced during previous debates were repeated. Mr. Townshend's resolution was passed by a vote of 26 to 3. Three Reformers, Mr. McCurdy, Mr. LeBlanc, and Mr. T. B. Smith, voted against it.

In the session of 1882 the question of the Abolition of the Council was revived in the Council itself. Mr. Butler, a Reformer, changed his mind, and introduced a bill to abolish the Council. After a very short debate the bill was defeated on its second reading by a vote of 12 to 9. Butler was the only Reformer in favour of Abolition. It is interesting to note that McKinnon - a Conservative supporter - also changed his mind and refused to vote for the abolition because it was not a government measure.

The County Incorporation Act of 1879 was very important as it altered the method of county government and it provided the basis of the present organization of municipal government in Nova Scotia.

Until the County Incorporation Act came into force in the autumn of 1879 the counties had been governed by the Sessions.¹

The Provincial Secretary thought that "the people should have it in their own hands to say when they should be taxed and how much." He explained that the main feature of the bill was that every county would be incorporated. The existing electoral machinery would be utilized because each polling district would elect one county councillor. The County Council would manage the local affairs now administered by the Sessions, and in addition the Council would have the management of the road and bridge service.

The County Incorporation Bill was adopted by a vote of 28 to 7. The Conservative Party, supported by Mr. Kinney, voted for the bill, while the Reformers voted solidly against it. This was the only time in the session of 1879 that all the Reformers opposed a government measure.

The Conservatives were in favour of County Incorporation because they all agreed that the present vicious system needed to be abolished, and that the people should be governed by elective bodies responsible to them. Also, they believed that it would be simple,

1. The Sessions were composed of the Justices of the Peace assisted by a Grand Jury. The Justices of the Peace were in theory appointed by the Crown, but in reality by the Provincial government who from time to time made additional appointments in order to bring the government of the counties into accord with the views of the government. The Grand Jury was selected by ballot from a list of the ratepayers.

inexpensive, and would provide a better system of county government; and that each county would receive a fair share of the road and bridge grant. Attorney-General Thompson stated that,

"it is the duty of the Legislature ... to let the counties provide for their local services and at the same time sweep away the corruption incident to the present system of expending road and bridge service moneys." ¹

The Reformers condemned the bill because it would bring direct taxation, or increase taxation, or because incorporated bodies got into debt too easily. T. B. Smith (R, Hants) thought that the measure would throw the burden of the cost of roads and bridges upon the people. Mr. Gayton, the Opposition leader, wanted to consult his constituents before voting. All the Reformers voted to defer the bill.

The difficult question of Finance presented many problems to the Holmes - Thompson government, although it never reached such magnitude as during W. S. Fielding's rule. Many members of the Conservative party had been elected on a reform platform of economy and retrenchment, and had persistently condemned the extravagances of Mr. Hill's government. The Holmes - Thompson government was faced with the situation that the provincial revenue was utterly inadequate, and that the debt credit at Ottawa had been almost exhausted by railway subsidies, and that there was a large deficit. The government began financial reforms and practiced many economies, and at the same time tried to obtain more money from the federal government of Sir John A. Macdonald.

1. Hitherto the provincial government had voted a grant for roads and bridges. The grant for each county had been drawn from the Treasury by the county representatives in the Assembly and expended under their direction on roads and bridges. Corruption had often resulted, to the detriment of the roads and bridges. Now the municipalities would administer this grant.

In 1879 the government introduced a bill for "Funding the Public Debt." This measure passed its first and second reading and the Committee of the Whole House with no discussion. On its third reading Mr. Gayton protested against giving the government such a large sum of money without knowing what appropriations were intended.

Provincial Secretary Holmes explained that the government was forced to borrow the money because there was a large deficit (\$355,000), and also heavy liabilities for railway construction. The Province had been borrowing money from the banks at 6% or 7%, and now proposed to fund the debts at 5% interest. Mr. Holmes thought that "if the House had confidence in the integrity of the Government it made very little difference whether one hundred thousand or one million dollars were named in the bill."

The bill was passed without division and sent to the Council after Dr. Campbell (R, Inverness) had demanded that a portion of the money be spent on railways in Cape Breton.

The Reform Press then aroused considerable outcry against the "\$800,000 Loan." The Council refused to agree to the government's bill for funding the public debt.

Premier Holmes was forced to ask the Assembly for the power to borrow a sum not exceeding \$800,000 without making any arrangements for funding the debt. He expressed his annoyance at the Council for defeating the funding act. Although the Reformers were inclined to believe that the sum was too large, several opposition members joined the Conservatives in voting for the Loan because the government had to have the money, and because they resented the action of the Council in interfering with a money bill.

In 1879 the government also started to obtain some increased revenue from the federal government. The Assembly unanimously passed an Address to the Governor-General of Canada on the Financial condition of the Province, asking for a share of the Fishery Award. No differences of opinion existed between the Government and the Opposition about Nova Scotia's right to share in the award. ¹

In the session of 1880 there was much discontent expressed over the failure of the Dominion government to reply to the Address. This discontent was directed towards the Federal government, not the Provincial.

Much time was occupied by a debate on obtaining a share of the Fishery Award and also an increased subsidy from the Dominion. The discussion was conducted on a non-party basis. Some Reformers criticized the government for not exerting more pressure on the Federal government, and hinted at Repeal if the Dominion failed to give the money to Nova Scotia. Both parties agreed that Nova Scotia must have a larger subsidy. A Joint Address was passed by the Council and the Assembly on the financial condition of the province and its claim to a share in the Fishery Award. ²

On March 25th, 1881, T. B. Smith, the Reform member for Hants, moved a resolution for an Address to be sent to the Queen praying her to make the Dominion Government hand over to Nova Scotia her rightful share of the Fishery Award.

Although Mr. Smith wished the question to be considered on a non-party basis it soon became apparent that party allegiance

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1879, p 102 - 105; also App. No. 11

2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1880, Page 4.

influenced the opinions of the members. Both parties were unanimous in their belief that Nova Scotia was entitled to a share of the Award. However, the Conservatives were inclined to think that Smith's resolution censured the government for not taking more definite action on the subject. They agreed with Attorney-General Thompson that it would be useless to appeal to Great Britain when a similar petition from Prince Edward Island had been refused. Pugh's amendment disapproving of the proposed Address and requesting that the government continue to press the provincial claims on the Dominion was passed by a vote of 24 to 5. Mr. Smith's resolution was defeated by a party vote.

The question of government aid to colleges was revived in 1881. This subject had caused much controversy in the Assembly and the Province at large since the founding of King's College in 1789. The Education Act of 1876 had intended to end the denominational colleges by the formation of a central college, the University of Halifax. The grants to the denominational colleges would expire in 1881 unless they were renewed by the Legislature.¹

In introducing the College Bill Premier Holmes stated that the Legislature must decide whether the policy of government aid to the colleges should be continued, and how it should be granted.

"He thought it was the duty of the Legislature to aid higher education as well as it was its duty to aid common school education."

1. The grants to the denominational colleges had been increased in 1876 on condition that they would expire at the end of five years. It had been expected that the University of Halifax would become a permanent teaching university supported by the people of the province while also granting degrees to candidates from the denominational college.

The government had decided to help higher education by returning to the system adopted in 1864 - by giving \$1,400 to each college. This would reduce the present grant by \$6,800 a year. The University of Halifax was to be abolished. Although the Provincial Secretary preferred to have one university supported by all the people and all the denominations in the province, he was convinced that the University of Halifax had been a failure. The denominations had ignored it. Only fifty-seven students had taken the examinations of the central university. Indeed, the denominational colleges were stronger than ever.

The debate on the second reading of the College Bill occupied only two hours. Very few members discussed it. Each speaker, regardless of party, reiterated the same arguments to the effect that the settlement of 1876 had not been final, that the government should provide grants for higher education, and that the people were in favour of grants to sectarian bodies. All agreed that the University of Halifax was useless, and that the two thousand dollars wasted on it could be spent to greater advantage on the roads and bridges.

It is impossible to decide how much the members feared the wrath of the denominations if they dared refuse aid to the sectarian colleges, and what influence such a consideration had on their opinions. Speaker after speaker repeated that the denominational colleges were strong, and that the people wanted government aid for the colleges.

A number of the members felt that they were not capable of discussing college education. They were willing to spend some

of the public revenue on higher education, but they were more interested in common schools and in the roads and bridges. For instance, W. A. Patterson (C, Colchester) said:

In the matter of higher education he scarcely felt like saying very much ... he felt as if the subject of higher education should be dealt with by highly educated men ... he felt for his own part that the first care of this country should be to common schools.

Mr. Kinney was the only member who opposed the College Bill. He thought that the Act of 1876 intended the college grants to cease in 1881, and he disliked endowing sectarian schools. The College Bill was passed 30 to 1, with Mr. Kinney dissenting.

On April 8, 1881, the Legislative Council deferred the College Grants Bill for three months¹ by a vote of 10 to 9. Although most of the Reformers opposed the College Bill, and the Conservatives favoured it, two Reformers, Boudrot and Butler, voted for it, while one Conservative, Fraser, voted against it. The Reformers considered the bill to be unsound in principle and also wished to embarrass the "Tory" government.

Thus government grants to colleges ended with the expiration of the Act of 1876. A bill was passed to deprive the University of Halifax of its annual grant.

In 1882 an important change was made relating to the education of the Blind. Instead of paying a lump sum of \$1,000 a year the Province would pay sixty dollars a year for each pupil sent to the School for the Blind.

1. Motion to defer: Oakes (R), McCurdy (R), C. Dickie (R), J.B. Dickie (R), Baker (R), Cochran (R), Morrison (R), Fraser (C), Francheville (R), Hon. Pres. (R) - 10.
Against: Black (C), Locke (C), Cameron (C), McDonald (C), McKinnon (C), Butler (R), Owen (C), Creelman (C), Boudrot (R) - 9.

In 1881 Attorney-General Thompson introduced a Bridge Bill. This forms an interesting precedent to the legislation of the next Assembly. Many features of this bill were similar to W. S. Fielding's famous Bridge Bills which provided for the construction of many iron and stone bridges in the province. John Thompson's bill proposed to create a funded debt of \$392,000 at six per cent. interest. Part of this would be retained by the province in settlement of the old road advances to the counties, while the remainder would be loaned to the counties for the construction of permanent bridges of iron or stone, the interest on such loans being deducted from the county road grant.

The Bridge Bill passed its second reading with less discussion than the members devoted to the amendments of the "Windsor Incorporation Bill." The members assented to the bill because it would settle the old "road advances" debt, and it would provide the counties with money for necessary bridge repairs.

The Legislative Council deferred the Bridge Bill for three months on the motion of Mr. Morrison by a vote of 11 to 7. The Reformers voted solidly to defer the Bill, while the Conservatives, with the exception of Mr. Fraser, voted against the three months hoist. Mr. Morrison (R) said that he was opposed to the principle of the bill - "Suffice to say that the bill was corrupt and diabolical." Mr. Black (C) contended that it was proper for a progressive government to erect permanent structures.

Although all the railways in Nova Scotia except the Windsor and Annapolis were taken over by the Dominion at Confederation, and although the Fathers had expected Canada to assume

responsibility for the construction and management of great public works, still railways continued to cause concern to the Legislature of Nova Scotia.

In 1872, notwithstanding her limited revenue, Nova Scotia embarked on a policy of subsidizing the construction of railroads. ¹

By 1879 two million dollars had been spent by Nova Scotia on railways since Confederation, and the government was liable for a further million and a half. The Conservative government decided to follow a policy which would complete the railroads because the public money would be wasted if they were not finished.

First the Holmes - Thompson government secured the completion of the line from Digby to Yarmouth by guaranteeing the sum of £55,000 for the Western Counties Railway, taking a first lien and mortgage on the line. When the Legislature met in 1882 the railway from Digby to Yarmouth had been opened, and continuously worked although it was not yet completed. The Province was forced to pay the interest (about \$30,000) on the £55,000 as it accrued. The members of the Legislature were unanimous in supporting any measure the government might make to secure the operation and completion of the Western Counties Railway.

1. Railway lines from Yarmouth to Annapolis (W. C. R.), Springhill to Parrsboro, New Glasgow to Louisburg (Eastern Extension), Lunenburg to Middleton (Nictaux and Atlantic) were authorized by the government, subsidies granted, and construction begun by contractors. In 1879 only the Springhill-Parrsboro was completed.

The Government was not as successful in its policy towards the Nictaux - Atlantic Railway as with the Western Counties Railway and the Eastern Extension.¹ In 1879 Mr. Best had some difference with the government over the amount of subsidy due him, and he failed to resume work and also to pay his labourers. No further arrangement was made until 1882. The original company offered to complete the Nictaux - Atlantic railway if the time were extended, and agreed to pay the claims against Mr. Best. The subsidy would be paid at the rate of \$1 from the Province for every \$2 from the Company.

The members from Queens, Lunenburg, and Annapolis rejoiced at the prospect of the completion of the line. The bill was passed unanimously.

In 1879 the legislation for railways was devoted to the Eastern Extension. The Holmes - Thompson government had refused to grant the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company a provincial subsidy of \$100,000, and also opposed the transfer of the Pictou Branch until the railway to Mulgrave was completed. A Conference was held at Ottawa in January, 1879, to make arrangements. It was decided that the Pictou Branch was not to be transferred to the Company until the line was completed to the Strait of Canso and operated to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

In the fall of 1879 the Eastern Extension was opened to traffic as far as Antigonish. However, the Company failed to complete the railroad by April 4, 1880. The Provincial Government

1. The work on the Nictaux and Atlantic had been begun by Walker, Clarke, and Roberts, who had absconded without paying the labourers or sub-contractors. Mr. Best, one of the assignees, had taken over the contract himself. The government had expended over \$100,000 on this line.

granted an extension of time on condition that the Province was given the power to resume possession of the Eastern Extension by paying the Company their actual outlay in cash, exclusive of subsidies paid by the Province.

On December 1, 1879, the Dominion government had resumed possession of the Windsor Branch, which was again returned to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. The Provincial Legislature passed an act for the regulation of all matters connected with the railways of the province, including tolls. The Act also contained provisions which would give the government power to prevent the dislocation of traffic similar to that between the Western Counties Railways and the Windsor and Annapolis in the late 1870's.

At the close of the session of 1881 the Assembly unanimously passed a resolution to authorize the government to enter into negotiations for the consolidation of all railway lines in the Province under one management, and for the construction of a railway for Cape Breton Island.¹

It was believed that this consolidation would make the railway service more efficient, and the railways more profitable than when controlled by competing companies. Many members favoured any scheme to relieve the government of assistance to the almost bankrupt W. C. R., and the W. & A, and others were delighted with the prospect of the construction of a railway in Cape Breton.

The government proceeded to take action under the terms of the Resolution. After negotiations with the Dominion for running rights over the Intercolonial, and with various companies, a contract was signed with Mr. E. W. Plunkett on September 6, 1881.

1. CHRONICLE, January 27, 1882.

Although the terms of this contract were known only to the Provincial Government and the Company, the MORNING CHRONICLE, an Opposition paper, published a copy of the railway contract on January 6, 1882. Immediately the CHRONICLE started a series of editorials condemning the contract which the government intended to have ratified when the Legislature opened.

On Monday, January 23rd, the Provincial Secretary stated that the government would lay on the table the next day an act for the consolidation of the Railways, and that the time for its ratification had been extended to February 1st so that there would be ample opportunity for a full discussion of the matter.

On Wednesday, Premier Holmes moved the second reading of the Railway Bill with a long speech reviewing the history of railroads in Nova Scotia and the railroad policy of his administration.¹

He explained that the Company proposed to acquire at its own cost the Eastern Extension, the Windsor and Annapolis, and the Western Counties Railway, and to complete the line from Yarmouth to Annapolis, and to thoroughly equip and repair all these lines, and in addition to construct one hundred and thirty miles of railway, and would complete the Nictaux and Atlantic. In return, the Company was to receive two thousand acres of crown land per mile and leases of mineral land in Cape Breton, and a Provincial guarantee of its debentures amounting to \$224,840 yearly. The Province would receive \$1,350,000 from the Company, and at the same time secure the completion of all existing railways and one hundred and thirty miles of new railways.

1. CHRONICLE, January 26-7, 1882. Debates.

The next day Premier Holmes devoted his attention to refuting the main objections to the scheme, viz.; (1) the increased responsibility assumed by the Province; (2) the want of security; (3) monopoly. He proved to the satisfaction of most of the members after much juggling with figures that the increased responsibility was only \$73,062, and that the Province would have a first mortgage on the railroads, and that the Company would never become a monopoly because the government had the power to regulate tolls. The Premier concluded, "I say it is a good bargain for the Province, and it is just as good a bargain for the company."

The Reform opposition to the Railway Bill was admirably summed up by T. B. Smith (R, Hants). He expressed one opinion which was frequently echoed by many other members who found the legal intricacies of the bill too difficult. Mr. Smith stated that "He did not clearly understand them (the contract and the Act of Incorporation) as he was not a legal gentleman." He objected to the bill because the Company was not sound, because it was a monopoly, and because the people had not been consulted, because there was no guarantee that the deposit would not be used in corruption to return the "Tories" to office, and because the Province would have to pay the interest on the Company's bonds.

Dr. D. Campbell (R, Inverness), seconded by Mr. Smith, moved a number of amendments to the bill. The most important of these was one that the bill be not read a second time because the construction of the Cape Breton line was optional, while the construction of the Western Counties Railway was guaranteed. The government convinced the Conservative representatives from Cape Breton that the Company would build the Cape Breton Railway.

On February 3rd, 1882, the Railway Bill passed its second reading, 25 to 5, and on February 7th its third reading by a vote of 28 to 5.¹

The Railway Bill was supported by a large majority and by both parties in the Assembly, although the Opposition press protested against it. The Conservatives supported it because it would secure the construction of lines which would cost the province \$2,800,000 to build, and it would return \$1,350,000 of the money expended on railways. This sum would vastly improve Nova Scotia's financial position, and in addition the Company would provide employment and improve trade. The Conservatives never expected to have to pay the \$225,000 interest that the province would guarantee.

Bartling (C), and Ford (C), objected to the bill because it did not guarantee the completion of the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway.

Only three Reformers, Campbell, Smith, and McCurdy, voted against the Railway Bill. Both Campbell and McCurdy represented Cape Breton constituencies, and they believed that the Bill discriminated against Cape Breton.

Local interests influence the vote of the others. Gayton, Kinney, and Robicheau represented counties which would benefit from the Completion of the Western Counties Railway and voted accordingly.

1. Railway Consolidation Bill, 3rd reading.

For: Prov. Sec'y (C), Att.-Gen. (C), White (C), Townshend (C), McDougall (C), McDonald (C), Bill (C), McGillivray (R), LeBlanc (R) A. Campbell (C), Kinney (I), Pugh (C), Harrington (C), Shaffner (C) Morrison (C), Gayton (R), Spence (C), McGray (C), C.A. Smith (C), Hadley (C), A. N. McDonald (C), Patterson (C), Blair (C), Van Blarcom (C), Bell (C), James (C), Robicheau (R), Vickery (C) - 28.
Against: D.J. Campbell (R), T. B. Smith (R), McCurdy (R), Bartling (C), Ford (C) - 5.

The battle over the Railway Consolidation was transferred to the Legislative Council. The Councillors presented essentially the same arguments as the members of the Assembly. The Bill was passed in the Council by a vote of eleven to nine. The Conservatives were supported by Mr. Boudrot (Arichat, C.E.) and Mr. Oakes, both Reformers.¹

1. For the Railway Bill:

Whitman (C), Owen (C), Locke (C), Cameron (C), McDonald (C), Black (C), Boudrot (R), Oakes (R), Parker (C), Creelman (C), McKinnon (C) - 11

Against: McCurdy (R), C. Dickie (R), Francheville (R), Butler (R), Morrison, (R), Cochran (R), J.B. Dickie (R), Fraser (C), Boak (R) - 9.

L. E. Baker (R), of Yarmouth, did not vote. Mr. Baker was the President of the W.C.R., and had stock in it, therefore he wanted the bill to pass. Mr. Creelman asked that the procedure for voting be observed, i.e., vote by seniority, junior members voting first, instead of informal voting from President's right to left around circle. Thus Boudrot and Oakes voted before Baker. The editor of the CHRONICLE hinted that if Boudrot had failed to support the bill Baker would have done so to avoid defeat by a 10 - 10 vote.

CHAPTER I
SECTION III

Relations with Ottawa.

1878 - 1882

Railways, the Fishery Award, and Subsidies were the topics which influenced relations between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Nova Scotia from 1878 to 1882.

The questions which arose about railways were settled amicably. Charles Tupper, federal representative for Cumberland, was Minister of Public Works. He was the real leader of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, and he had long experience in politics and an intimate knowledge of the province's problems. He was willing to make every effort to reach a solution that would satisfy the Conservatives in Nova Scotia.

In 1878 the Holmes - Thompson government refused to pay a hundred thousand dollar subsidy due the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company for work on the Eastern Extension. ¹

The government also objected to the transfer of the Pictou Branch to the Company under the terms of the contract. In a Memorial forwarded to Sir Charles Tupper Premier Holmes explained that the province wanted security that the line would be completed before the Dominion transferred the Pictou Branch to the Company. ²

Finally, the Dominion government requested the Nova Scotian government to send a delegation to Ottawa to arrange matters with representatives of the Company. Arrangements satisfactory to all parties were made. The agreement provided that the Pictou Branch would be held by the Dominion until the Eastern Extension was completed to the Strait of Canso and a steam ferry was operated to the

1. Sir Hugh Allan, of Pacific Scandal fame, was President of this Company, although Harry Abbott handled the negotiations with Nova Scotia.
2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1879, Appendix No. 13.

satisfaction of the provincial government, then it would be transferred to the Company. If the Company failed to complete and operate the Extension, the line was to become the property of Nova Scotia.¹

The dispute over the Windsor Branch was settled to the satisfaction of Conservative opinion in Nova Scotia when the Dominion returned it to Windsor and Annapolis Railway.

When the Provincial Government was considering the consolidation of the Railways it was absolutely essential to the success of their plan to obtain running rights over the Intercolonial from the Dominion to provide a connection between the eastern and western systems. A delegation to Ottawa received a promise of running rights over the Intercolonial from Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Railways.²

The financial relations between the Dominion and the Provinces were always important since a large portion of the Provincial revenue came from the Dominion in the form of subsidies.

Little cordiality existed between Ottawa and Halifax over the question of the Fishery Award and an increased subsidy. There were real differences between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Nova Scotia about these subjects.

The Fishery Award and the subsidy were two sides of the same coin - the absolute necessity for Nova Scotia to obtain more revenue, preferably from the Dominion. Nova Scotia must have more money to meet her mounting deficit. First, Nova Scotia's right to share in the Fishery Award was emphasized until the Dominion Parliament decided to use the award for the benefit of Canada as a whole

1. JOURNAL, 1879. Appendix 13, P. 24.

2. N.S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY. Appendix 17, 1882.

and for the protection of the fisheries.¹

The dissatisfaction which existed in Nova Scotia over the failure of the Dominion to increase the provincial subsidy or to grant a share of the Fishery Award was not a matter of party feeling.²

A Conservative government was in power in both the Dominion and the Province. However, every member of the Provincial Legislature - whether Conservative or Reform, or with Confederate or anti-Confederate sympathies - wanted an increased subsidy and spoke angrily against the Dominion for not acceding to their request. Each Financial Address and delegation received unanimous and whole-hearted support from the Assembly.

On January 2, 1879, the Provincial Secretary forwarded a Memorial to Sir John A. Macdonald on the financial condition of the province. Nova Scotia asked for a sufficient share of the Fishery Award to provide the province with an annual income of one hundred thousand dollars a year. The Memorial declared that seventy-three per cent. of all vessels and forty-nine per cent. of the men of the Dominion who were engaged in fishing were from Nova Scotia, and that more than half the fish caught in Canada was caught in the waters of Nova Scotia.³

1. In April, 1880, the Dominion Parliament considered granting a share of the Fishery Award to Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. Sir John Macdonald's amendment to retain the Award for Dominion purposes was passed by a vote of 126 to 30. Twelve out of the twenty-one members from Nova Scotia voted against Sir John's amendment, ten Conservatives and two Reformers. Only three Nova Scotians dared vote for the Premier's amendment - Charles Tupper, James MacDonald (Pictou), and Mr. Wade, though some refused to vote. The Conservatives from Nova Scotia in the House of Commons believed that their province should receive a share of the Award - See CHRONICLE, April 7, 9, 10; 1880.
2. The Washington Treaty of 1871 had given U.S. fishermen the right to fish in Canadian waters for twelve years in return for a sum of money to be settled by arbitration. This amount was fixed at five and a half million by the Halifax Award in 1878, and paid to the Dominion government.
3. N.S. JOURNAL, 1879. Appendix 11

Further, Mr. Holmes explained that Nova Scotia already had a deficit of half a million, and that the province would have an annual deficit of \$145,000 unless the revenue could be increased. He declared that it was impossible to reduce the expenditure on Education or Roads and Bridges. He asked for a revision of the present subsidy so as to place the province on an equal footing with her sister provinces. For example, Ontario received \$1.96 per head, Prince Edward Island, \$3.45, New Brunswick, \$2.16, and Nova Scotia, \$1.29.

In January, 1879, the delegation to Ottawa approached the Dominion government about the financial condition of the province. They stated that

"there are strong grounds to hope that they have secured from the Government of the Dominion such consideration for the claims of the Province as will result in a substantial amelioration of its present financial difficulties." 1

The Holmes - Thompson government continued its efforts to obtain a larger subsidy or a share of the Fishery Award. The Dominion government failed to reply to Nova Scotia's financial Memorial of 1879 until February, 1880. Premier Holmes' frantic telegrams begging for a reply before the opening of the Assembly of 1880 received the polite answer from the Minister of Finance that as soon as the Estimates and Budget were ready the Memorial should have precedence.²

In February, 1880, Premier Holmes and Mr. Townshend were sent to Ottawa as delegates. They proposed that the Dominion Government should relieve the coal owners of the coal royalty of ten cents a ton paid to the Province, and that the Dominion should pay

1. N. S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1879. Appendix No. 13
 2. N. S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1880. Appendix No. 10.

Nova Scotia a compensation of two hundred thousand dollars per annum for five years. ¹

In the session of 1881 the arguments of the previous session in favour of a larger subsidy and a share of the Fishery Award were repeated with increased bitterness and resentment toward the Dominion. ²

Another Memorial was forwarded to the Dominion. ³

In the sessions of 1881 and 1882 there were only scattered references to a larger revenue and to the Fishery Award because the members were occupied with other matters.

In March, 1881, the Holmes - Thompson government received a definite answer to their Memorials and Addresses. ⁴

The Dominion Cabinet refused to give Nova Scotia a larger subsidy. Their decision was based on the conclusion that Nova Scotia had not contributed fully towards the general purposes of the Dominion, and that the Dominion Parliament would not be favourable to granting Nova Scotia "Better Terms", and that Nova Scotia had not been treated unfairly in comparison with the other Provinces, and that she could pay her own way by using care and economy.

This refusal was not made public until the correspondence was published in the Journal of 1882. The government and the Legislature accepted the Dominion's decision as final for the present

1. N. S. JOURNAL, 1880. App. 10, P. 12.

2. Debates, CHRONICLE, March 9, 1880.

3. N.S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1880, March 19.

Dr. Campbell (R, Inverness) became exasperated at the Dominion for not granting an increased subsidy and he proposed a resolution for the secession of Nova Scotia from Canada. See CHRONICLE, April 10, 12, 17, 1880.

4. N.S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1882, App. No. 14.

time. There was no condemnation of the Dominion government for its refusal to grant a larger subsidy chiefly because the need for more revenue was not so urgent. The Province had had a small surplus in 1881. The Legislature was occupied by the Railway Consolidation scheme. The members directed their attention to the possibility of recovering part of the amount spent on railways.

CHAPTER II

SECTION I

Dominion and Provincial Elections, 1882.

Dominion and Provincial Elections, 1882.

1.

In Nova Scotia both the federal and the provincial elections were held on June 20th, 1882. In the election of 1882 a national Liberal party appeared for the first time in opposition to the Liberal Conservative party which had absorbed the men of all parties who supported Confederation. The various provincial parties which had opposed Confederation had united under the name Reformers to oppose the Macdonald government and to support Alexander Mackenzie. When Edward Blake succeeded to the leadership of the Reformers in 1880 his supporters began to be called the Liberal party. The Liberal-Conservatives in Nova Scotia then started to refer to their Reform opponents as "Grits".

The election campaign was very short - only a little over a month long. Politicians of both parties had been expecting the early dissolution of the Dominion Parliament, suspecting that Sir John would choose a time that promised victory instead of waiting for the expiration of Parliament. The Conservatives advanced the plea that capitalists must be shown the views of the Canadian people on the tariff. Nova Scotia must have an election during 1882 so Premier Holmes decided to follow the practice of the last election and to hold the provincial election on the same day as the federal.

Although a short campaign usually favoured the party in power because its organization could be built quickly around its representatives, the Liberals were well organized in Nova Scotia and often started their county campaigns before the Conservatives.

During both elections in Nova Scotia attention was concentrated on the federal election and national issues. The Conservatives emphasized the success of the National Policy, the prosperity of the country, the C. P. R., and the Fishery Bounty. The Liberals gave the National Policy a major place in their speeches and editorials but they mentioned Provincial Rights, the North-West, high taxes, corruption, and the Fishery Bounty.

The National Policy attained a position of overwhelming importance nearly equal to its significance in 1878. The Conservatives supported the National Policy, and made every effort to convince the people of the benefits of National Policy and to convince them that Canadian prosperity was caused by National Policy. They insisted that the National Policy had been functioning for three years to the great benefit of the country, creating prosperity, reviving old industries and starting new ones, and improving trade and commerce, and they quoted numerous statistics to show increased production and employment. They argued that if the "Grits" were elected this prosperity would end.

"The dominant question of the policy of protection to native industries may truly be said to be waiting for the people's verdict - a verdict upon which hangs the issue of its life ... The great mass of people ... will be struck ... with the universal disaster which would follow upon a repeal of the National Policy ..." ¹

The Conservatives claimed that the National Policy alone had caused the good times which Canada was enjoying, and contrasted this prosperity with the depression under the Mackenzie rule.

1. MORNING HERALD, May 24, 1882.

"Instead of the universal prostration of four years, from 1879 to now ... manufactures have been increasing in number and extent from one end of the Dominion to the other. Cotton factories, woolen factories, sugar refineries, and other public works are giving employment to thousands, and large profits to capitalists. Wages have increased in every department of industry ... The National Policy has given this life and sustains it."¹

The arguments advanced in the previous elections on the subject of the bread tax or the flour duty, the duty on salt, the coal duty, the sugar duty, and protection for labour, were repeated in this election with the addition of new arguments by the Conservatives which attempted to show that these duties had contributed to the prevalent prosperity, and evidence provided by the Liberals to prove that these duties were unjust and excessive taxes.²

For instance, the Conservatives stated that by the National Policy Canadians had saved two million dollars on the sugar duty, and at the same time had created flourishing sugar refineries. The refinery at Halifax provided steady work for one hundred and forty-five people in the refinery, and for "countless" others such as truckmen, railwaymen, stevedores, and coal miners. The Conservatives proudly pointed to this industry as proof of the benefits of National Policy.

The Liberals attacked the National Policy. They admitted that Canada was prosperous, but they refused to believe that the protective tariff had caused this prosperity. They claimed that the good times which had begun late in 1879 were due to a world-wide revival of trade and not to National Policy, and they accused the "Tories" of giving exaggerated reports of Canadian prosperity in

1. HERALD, May 24, 1882.
2. ACADIAN RECORDER, April 4, May 19, May 29.
CHRONICLE, 1882, May 16, June 17
HERALD, 1882, May 24, June 1, June 9.

order to gain more praise for the National Policy. The Opposition party also pointed out that Nova Scotia was not an industrial province, and that the protective tariff had increased the price of many articles consumed but not manufactured in the Maritimes. They tried to convince the people that the Government had broken its pledge to bring back prosperity without increasing the cost of living.¹

The tariff on breadstuffs was very unpopular in the Maritimes, and consumers protested against the tariff on coal. The Liberal press made a great outcry against these two taxes in particular because the tariff increased the cost of living and deprived Nova Scotian vessels of a profitable carrying trade in bringing flour to Nova Scotia from the United States.

"Ontario pays a tax of over half a million on coal, and the Maritime Provinces pay several hundreds of thousands of dollars tax upon bread. Both of these are peculiarly obnoxious taxes, and injuriously effect not only every family, but every industry, by increasing the cost of living and protection ... There was once a time when the Government undertook to justify these taxes upon the ground that they were necessary for the purposes of revenue... This year Sir Leonard Tilley boasts of a surplus of over four and a half millions ... Why should this immense sum be taken out of the poor man for no reason whatever."²

The Liberals tried to convince the farmers and working men that they suffered from the National Policy, and that they had to pay high taxes on the necessities of life while wages were low and unemployment rife.³ The electors should

"Vote for measures against jug-handled protection. Vote for men against puppets. Vote for Jones and Fuller."⁴

1. RECORDER, May 29, 1882; CHRONICLE, June 17, 1882.
2. RECORDER, April 4, 1882.
3. CHRONICLE, June 17, 1882
4. CHRONICLE, May 16, 1882.

In this election we have the spectacle of the Government being attacked because it has a surplus. Sir Leonard Tilley, Minister of Finance, had proudly announced that the Dominion Government would have a surplus of thirteen millions at the end of 1882. The Conservatives rejoiced at this proof of prosperity and contrasted it with Cartwright's deficits. The Liberals asserted that this surplus should be used to lighten the people's burden of taxation, and they accused the "Tories" of excessive taxation, and insisted that the tariff should be reduced.

"Inasmuch as they (The Dominion Government) simply took it (the surplus) out of the pockets of the people, where it ought to have stayed, instead of praise they deserve condemnation. This thirteen million withdrawn from circulation and hoarded in the Treasury, if redistributed, would put \$16 in the purse of every family in the Dominion ... We leave it to the commonsense of the people if they should not have this money for their own use, instead of it being placed in the hands of a reckless and unscrupulous Government, to be squandered on the West or wasted on pleasure trips to Europe." ¹

The Conservatives defended themselves vigorously. They said that taxation had already been reduced, and that the surplus had been used to reduce the debt and to pay for the Pacific Railway.

The Fishery Award caused considerable discussion. The Conservatives claimed the support of the fishermen because the Dominion Parliament had voted a fishery bounty of \$150,000 in 1882. The Liberals declared that "the grant is simply an electioneering trick." ²

They reminded the people that Sir Charles Tupper had shown no concern for the welfare of the fishermen until the election

1. CHRONICLE, June 13, 1882.

2. CHRONICLE, May 16, 1882.

became imminent, and that the Dominion government had

held that Nova Scotia was not entitled to a farthing, that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces had no claim to a penny of the Award. They laughed at all protests, and snapped their fingers at all petitions. This policy suited for four years, but now comes a General Election. ¹

The fight for Provincial rights in Ontario was not of vital importance in the campaign of Nova Scotia, but it caused the Liberals to echo Mr. Blake, and to state that

the Liberal party contends for the free and untrammelled exercise of the rights of each Province, and resists the undue and arbitrary interference of the Dominion government in matters which pertain exclusively to Provincial authorities. ²

1. CHRONICLE, March 31, 1882.
2. Ibid. The principle adopted by the British North America Act was a Federal Union. The central and local governments were each to have separate powers which could not be encroached upon by the other. After Confederation the Conservative party made every effort to strengthen the Dominion government and to centralize power in its hands. In the disputes over the action of the Dominion government for its dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, the disallowance of the Ontario River and Streams Bill, the Manitoba charter to the South Western Railway Company, and its refusal to accept the Ontario Boundary Award, the Liberal Party condemned the action of the Dominion government. Edward Blake, the Liberal leader, became an ardent champion of Provincial Rights and furiously assailed the unwarranted attack by the Dominion on the rights of the Provinces.

The editor of the ACADIAN RECORDER prophesied cheerfully that "the Tory government at Ottawa is crumbling to pieces as fast as any concern possibly can ... their unconstitutional and arbitrary usurpation of Provincial rights will furnish one solid nail for their political coffin." ¹

Edward Blake, during the session of 1882, had made a speech in which he advocated that Canada should have Commercial Independence. He had moved a resolution that the necessary powers be obtained for Canada to enter into negotiations about commercial matters with any British possessions or foreign state, and that these commercial treaties receive the assent of the Canadian Parliament alone, ratification by the British Parliament to be unnecessary.

This demand for Commercial Independence became part of the Liberal platform for the 1882 election. Mr. Blake believed that none but Canada knew so well what she wanted, and if she could negotiate her own treaties the delay of the present system would be avoided and practical steps could be taken to develop Canadian commercial interests.

This proposal by Mr. Blake raised a howl of protest from the Conservatives. They insisted that talk of commercial independence was disloyal and that commercial independence would lead to complete independence from the British Empire.

A great interest in immigration to the North West was shown by the Conservative party and newspapers. In 1882 sixty thousand settlers had swarmed into Manitoba and nearly three million acres were entered by homesteading, pre-emption, or sale.

¹
1. CHRONICLE, March 31, 1882.

"The fact that the C.P.R. is being pushed towards completion at so remarkably rapid a rate will be a strong inducement to immigrants to avail themselves of the advantages which it will present for bringing their produce to market." ¹

The Conservatives intimated that their party deserved all the credit for encouraging this rapid settlement in the North-West and for the successful construction of the Pacific Railway.

"Neither the Grit party nor its organs is responsible for it. One plank in the Grit platform has always been slander of the North-West. It has constantly been decried as a cold, barren waste, unfit for human habitation ... its lands have been described as worthless and its development and organization into territories and provinces has been utterly opposed by the whole of the present Opposition." ²

The Liberals were extremely critical of the Conservative Land Policy in the West. They argued that the Dominion Government should encourage settlement in the West by its land regulations because more settlers there would contribute to the reduction of the rate of taxation, and by improvement of their farms would add to the material wealth of the country. They accused the Government at Ottawa of adopting the policy of selling most of the lands to speculators. Friends or supporters of the Government obtained large areas of land which they retailed to settlers at a huge profit. A Liberal Ministry would take care that the actual settlers, not the speculators, obtained the land, and so encourage settlement.

The Exodus of Nova Scotians to Manitoba aroused the concern of the Liberals in Nova Scotia more than the land regulations in the West. This Exodus was just another illustration of how the National Policy had failed. Times were so poor that the people were forced to emigrate.

1. MORNING HERALD, April 1, 1882.
2. Ibid, April 13, 1882.

The editor of the MORNING HERALD defended this "Alleged Exodus". He claimed that they should be glad that Nova Scotians were settling in the West and not in the United States. "Never have so few of our people migrated to the United States as during the last year."¹ Nova Scotians had gone West because men were restless and because they were confident of a great future in the West, not because National Policy has made Nova Scotia so poor that her people must emigrate or starve.

The Liberals refused to believe that Nova Scotia would gain from an Exodus to the North-West and continued to blame the "Tories" for the emigration.

"It makes little difference to Nova Scotia whether the people go to Manitoba or Greenland; Nova Scotia loses them. The merchants and tradesmen who see their customers going away will hardly find much satisfaction or profit in reflecting that the emigrants may seek homes in the North-West."²

In the session of 1882 the Dominion Parliament had redistributed the seats in the House of Commons according to the census of 1881. Ontario was entitled to four additional members. The resulting redistribution gave rise to the "Gerrymandering" Bill of 1882 in which the "Tories" "hived the Grits", i.e., the polling districts were altered so that the Liberal vote was concentrated in one district, and the Conservatives were found to have a majority in several surrounding districts.

Indignant protests were made by the Liberals who furiously resisted this manoeuvre by the "Tories." The Liberals bitterly condemned the party which would go to such lengths in

1. MORNING HERALD, April 13, 1882.

2. MORNING CHRONICLE, April 15, 1882.

an attempt to retain a majority.

"Nothing is more contemptible than an attempt on the part of a Government to carve up constituencies to suit their own purposes ... Never was such a shameless attempt at gerrymandering ever attempted." 1

The MORNING CHRONICLE referred to the "Gerrymander" as a "Muzzle of Public Opinion." The Liberal press was forced to explain the bill to the people of the Maritimes because they knew so little about Ontario. The Liberals appealed to the people not to permit Sir John to take away the right of the people to protest through their representatives at an election, and not to allow him to survive to prosper. The attempt

"will hopelessly and miserably fail. There is no possibility of a party gaining anything by such tactics in a free country like Canada. These schemes will react upon the people that concoct them." 2

The Canadian Pacific Railway was an important factor in the election of 1882. The Conservatives praised the wisdom of the Dominion Government for entering into a contract with a Syndicate that possessed ample capital to construct a road with speed and vigor unexampled in railway construction. The Government had saved four millions in building its sections of the Pacific road while the C.P.R. was constructing a first class railway. The C.P.R. would soon have a through line from Port Moody to Halifax on Canadian soil. The Conservative Party was responsible for such progress in railway construction, and therefore they should be re-elected.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, April 15, 1882.
2. ACADIAN RECORDER, May 2, 1882.

The Liberals found it difficult to obtain a hearing for their criticisms. The prairie section of the C.P.R. was being built. The railway called for men, tools, and supplies. Land speculation was rife. Men were making fortunes in the West. It was useless to question the financial strength of a company which was setting new world records for rapidity of construction. It was useless to attack the government's lavish terms before men who were making profits from the activities these grants had caused. The seemingly assumed success of the C.P.R. was an overwhelming argument in support of the administration.

Nevertheless, the Liberals in Nova Scotia attacked the C.P.R. as a monopoly which would make its members millionaires at the public expense. The Liberals thought that the Dominion Government should grant charters to competing lines to force the C.P.R. to keep freight rates low.

They reiterated their dislike of the Government contract with the C.P.R. The Dominion government had already granted ten million dollars and twenty-five million acres of land to the Pacific Railway, yet the Company was begging for more money and would continue to do so until the road was finished. At the suggestion of Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Railways, the Dominion Parliament permitted the Syndicate to change the route over the Rockies to save seventy-nine miles, yet Sir Charles never asked that the government subsidy be reduced! The people should remove from office this party which squandered public money.

Charges and counter charges of corruption were not neglected during the campaign. Sir Charles Tupper and the Conservative Government at Ottawa were assailed vigorously by the

Liberal press and party for the "Port Moody Job." The Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, had invited tenders for the construction of part of the C.P.R. from Port Moody to Emory's Bar, B.C. The amounts tendered varied from \$2,277,000 to \$3,531,832. The lowest tender was that of McDonald and Charlebois for \$2,277,000, and the next lowest \$2,486,255, by Andrew Onderdonk.

The contract had been awarded to Onderdonk. Sir Charles had explained that the cheque for \$20,000 sent by McDonald and Charlebois as a deposit was dated January 23rd and marked good for two days only. He was unable to accept this tender as the cheque was invalid. Documents were produced which showed that Sir Charles had made enquiries, and before awarding the contract the manager of the head office of the Bank of Montreal had wired that the cheque was good.

The Liberals made very bitter attacks upon the Minister of Railways. They claimed that Sir Charles wanted Onderdonk to receive the contract, and had seized upon the excuse of the cheque to ignore McDonald and Charlebois. Thus the country had been forced to pay \$209,255 more for the construction of the railway. It was hinted that Onderdonk would pay Sir Charles for awarding the contract to him.

"Labor has put, and most reluctantly, about \$200,000 into the fat purses of Onderdonk and his associates without any return." ¹

Among the charges and suspicions of corruption that were hurled at the Government by the Opposition was bribery.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, June 10, 1882.

"The patronage of the railway works has been handed over to the proprietor of a certain Richmond public-house. When men apply for work they are referred to the hotel keeper. He takes them one by one into his back room, where the following enquiries are made:

Where do you reside?

Have you a vote?

Will you vote for the Government ticket if we employ you?

If the answer is 'Yes' to the last question, the applicant for work is employed. If 'No, I have no vote' the reply is, 'You are not wanted.'

Respectable men called on us yesterday and assured us of such treatment. Poor Richey and Daly! Does their cause require such desperate remedies?"¹

The Chignecto Ship Railway Scheme was characterized by the Opposition as an "electioneering kite" for Sir Charles Tupper's constituency of Cumberland. A Dominion subsidy of \$150,000 per annum for twenty-five years had been granted to Mr. Ketchum to build a ship railway across the Isthmus of Chignecto. The Liberals hinted that this was an electioneering bribe to gain support for Sir Charles at the next election. They enquired why the Dominion Government did not have the Government engineers examine the scheme and then ask for tenders instead of granting four million dollars to Mr. Ketchum without enquiry.

The Liberals summarized their position as follows:

By voting for the Liberal ticket the elector votes

Against monopoly

Against the tax on Breadstuffs

Against railway mismanagement and false economy

Against jobbery and waste of the public money

Against high tariff and oppressive taxation

And votes for

The recognition of Provincial rights

The equal and fair distribution of the tariff

The reduction of taxation

The benefits of a revenue tariff

The establishment of industries on a healthy basis. ^{2.}

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, June 10, 1882

2. Ibid, June 7, 1882.

The ACADIAN RECORDER asked the people to condemn the bread tax, the excessive cotton tax, the discrimination against the poor man, contract brokering, the Pacific Bargain, Railway Monopoly, Onderdonkism, the slaughter on the Intercolonial, the inequalities of the tariff, and Gerrymandering.

They asked the people to support Edward Blake, Honest Government, Economy in Management, Equalization of the Tariff, the Right to Negotiate Commercial Treaties, an Honest Land Policy for the North-West, an Elective Senate. To vote for the "Tories" would be to support the policy of Taxation and Monopoly, Maladministration, and Land Grabbing.

The Conservatives asked the people to endorse their policy. They did not have a constructive policy like the Liberals. They asked the people to vote for Cheap Tea, Sugar, Ploughs, Molasses, Blankets, Cloth, Sewing Machines, and other things, with the inference that the National Policy enabled such goods to be manufactured more cheaply at home. A vote for the Conservatives would be a vote for Progress, Prosperity, Protection, Good Times, Increased Wages, the Winter Port, New Industries, the Grain Elevator, Bounty to Fishermen, Canada for Canadians, Low Freights on the Intercolonial Railway, Extension at Richmond, Large Increase in Exports, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Development of the Golden North-West.

2.

The Provincial issues occupied very little attention of either party in 1882. The Federal issues were thought to be more important, and so they were stressed. Each party hoped that the Federal campaign would exert sufficient influence on the local one so that success would be won at both Ottawa and Halifax.

Both Liberals and Conservatives knew that the Provincial election must be held in 1882. In January the Liberal press began to fight the Provincial Government over the Syndicate Bill, and the MORNING HERALD and EVENING MAIL defended the action of the local government. The MORNING CHRONICLE had declared war on the local Conservative Government immediately it was elected. Every act of the Executive had been ridiculed or subjected to harsh criticism for four years. The Liberals had vigorously opposed the legislation proposed by the "Tory" Government; for example, they had opposed the Abolition of the Legislative Council, the Bridge Bill, Grant to Colleges, and the Railway Syndicate. When the election campaign began in May 1882 the people of Nova Scotia were perfectly familiar with the record of each party in the arena of Provincial politics. Both parties were able to concentrate on the Federal contest with only occasional references to Provincial affairs.

Premier Holmes retired from the Provincial Conservative government during the election campaign to become Prothonotary at Halifax. The previous Prothonotary, J. F. L. Parsons, resigned to run for the Local Assembly as candidate from Halifax. The Liberals said that Mr. Parsons had been appointed Prothonotary on the under-

standing that he would resign when Mr. Holmes wanted the office. Mr. Holmes' resignation seriously weakened the government. "Vote against the warming pan Prothonotary Parsons. He has already had his reward at the rate of \$6,000 per year." ¹

John S. D. Thompson became Premier and Attorney-General, and A. C. Bell Provincial Secretary, Hon. Mr. Creelman remained Commissioner of Mines and Works, and C.J. Townshend, W. B. Troop, and J. S. Macdonald remained Ministers without Portfolio. ²

Mr. Thompson's government was ridiculed by the Grits as a makeshift.

"With every desire to treat the matter seriously, one must be permitted to laugh at this. Everybody knows that Mr. Thompson, it has been understood, is seeking a judgeship, and has assurances that his wish will be gratified when a vacancy occurs. Mr. Creelman will remain only until after the elections. Mr. Bell is the only one who will retain office if the Government gets a majority. Mr. Bell is one of the ablest and most respected men on the Conservative side." The three members without portfolio, Townshend, Troop, and McDonald, had drawn frequent amounts for Travelling Expenses to which they were not entitled. "They hadn't any regular salary, but picked up what they could get." ³ Mr. Thompson did not dare fill the three vacancies in the Council until he saw who was elected.

The utmost contempt for the "Tory" Government was expressed by all the Grits:

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, June 16, 1882.
2. ACADIAN RECORDER, May 26, 1882.
3. MORNING CHRONICLE, May 27, 1882.

"A more hopelessly imbecile Government never existed on the face of the earth. They have been in office for nearly four years, and they have not done as much work of any kind or description as three ordinary men could have accomplished in a month. We defy their most enthusiastic admirer, or their most toadyish supporter, to point out anything they have done at all worthy of statesmen of the most common type. The creation of an office for a needy supporter; the dismissal of a few good officers to make room for pensioners; a futile attempt to plunge the Province into needless debt; and a final denouement in the way of a curious Syndicate scheme - which bids fair to collapse - this is the record of four years of humiliating government." ¹

The Provincial government of 1878 - 82 had failed to pass its important legislation such as the Bridge Bill, the Abolition of the Legislative Council, grants to colleges, and Provincial Loan, and had also failed to obtain a share of the Fishery Award from the Dominion. The Syndicate scheme for the consolidation of the Railways proved unpopular with many people. Others were angry because work on the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway had been suspended.

The subject of the Road and Bridge grant caused considerable discussion. The Liberals charged that the "Tories" had failed to keep the promises made by Mr. Holmes and the other "Tories" while they were in Opposition, to spend large sums on public highways. On the contrary, the Tories had permitted the roads to degenerate to "man and beast traps."

"Everyone in the country knows that instead of increasing the road grants the present imbecile and hypocritical Government reduced them to about half the amount they formerly were, the result being that our roads and bridges are in a scandalous condition. The disgraceful manner in which the present Government had violated their

1. ACADIAN RECORDER, May 2, 1882.

election promises, and neglected the road and bridge service of the country, deserves the hearty condemnation of the people from Cape Sable to Cape North." ¹

The people were urged to vote for the Liberal candidates:

"Vote against the late Local members who have neglected the roads and bridges. Vote for new blood - Power, Fielding, and Foster." ²

The resentment about the failure of Nova Scotia to obtain a share of the Fishery Award was directed towards the Dominion, not the Nova Scotian, government. The Liberals pointed out that Holmes had promised that if the "Tories" were in power at Ottawa he would obtain the renewal of the special grant of 1869. When Manitoba received an increased subsidy the Liberal press became very indignant. Mr. Holmes was "too sleepy by half."

"It would be unkind to twit him with not having obtained a renewal of the subsidy, or even a share of the fishing award, as he is so soon to make his exit from power ... The electors see that the favors he anticipated from Ottawa have not been showered upon him, and that he has not possessed sufficient energy to demand them with vigor." ³

The Railway Consolidation contract with the Syndicate was still criticized by the Liberals, who repeated their arguments that the Nova Scotian government would have to pay the \$225,000 guarantee, and that the Company was not sound, and it would never raise the five and a half millions necessary to consummate the contract. The people must "Vote Against Monopolies."

The Liberals gave five reasons why the electors should vote against the candidates of the Local Government:

"1. The Government has failed to fulfill the promises made before the election of 1878.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, June 16, 1882.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid, May 12, 1882.

2. When in power they did things for which they had condemned the former Government, and failed to do what they had declared should be done, e.g., in the matter of the Eastern Railway Extension, of the coal duty, and of appointments to the Legislative Council.

3. Having promised in 1878 to improve the road and bridge service, and secure increased grants for it, they have cut down the grants to about half what they had been under those who went before them, and by doing so have seriously injured the agricultural, fishing, and mining interests which they had promised to foster.

4. They have pledged the credit of the Province to the extent of \$225,000 a year to a railway syndicate, which, as far as can be shown, possesses no capital of its own, and will probably extract the full amount of the guarantee without conferring any corresponding advantage on the people.

5. They came into power with the present Dominion Government, sustained them in all their iniquitous acts to the detriment of the Province, should share in their punishment." ¹

The Liberal Conservative Government appealed to the electors for the continued support and confidence of the people in a pamphlet in which they contrasted the period of Prostration, from 1874 to 1878, with a similar period of Prosperity, from 1878 to 1882. They accused the Reform Government of squandering the debt account at Ottawa and bringing the province to the verge of bankruptcy by their jobbery and corruption. They explained the policy of economy and retrenchment their Government was forced to adopt, and argued that the road and other services had to be reduced as a consequence of the Reformers' extravagance. They reviewed the advantages of the Funding Bill, the County Incorporation Act, the Bridge Bill, the abolition of the Legislative Council, their railway policy and the Railway Syndicate, and blamed the "so-called" Liberals in the Council for the defeat of beneficial measures like the Bridge Bill and Funding Bill.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, June 15, 1882.

Within three years the Provincial government had rescued the Province financially from the condition of virtual bankruptcy. Under their rule the revenue from the Mines department doubled, the Crown lands quadrupled, and the extortionate charges connected with Public Printing ended. Much beneficial legislation was passed. Under the County Incorporation Act the counties managed their own business. Acts for the better regulation of Mines, for the management of Railways, of Crown lands, for the encouragement of agriculture and the improvement of Education were carried into effect.

If the "Grits" were elected now the Province would be plunged into debt by their extravagance and corruption. Prosperity in mining, lumbering, and fishing, the development of home manufactures, and progress in railway construction would cease entirely under "Grit" rule. "They stand forth to-day, the avowed opponents of industrial development and political progress."

Let every elector, therefore, who remembers the stagnation and depression which pervaded every department of industry during the dark period of 1872 - 78, as contrasted with the progress and prosperity which have characterized the past four years of Liberal-Conservative rule, give his support, his energy, and influence in favour of a party whose continuance in power means a continuous and progressive increase of the present prosperity of the country.¹

The Conservative party won the Federal election by a majority of 139 members to 72 - almost exactly the same majority as in 1878. Nova Scotia returned fourteen Conservatives and seven Liberals, the same as in the election of 1878. The Dominion Government had chosen their time for the contest. They had a strong policy. The country was too prosperous

1. Four Years of Liberal-Conservative Government in Nova Scotia,
P 26.

to seek a change. Manufacturers, shareholders in North-West colonization companies, dealers in Railway supplies wished the Conservatives to remain in office. The country wanted the C.P.R. The people were satisfied with the National Policy and the railway policy. The Tories wielded an immense patronage which undoubtedly exerted some influence. So the Dominion government received a two to one majority.

The Conservative party was defeated in the provincial contest. The Liberals were swept into power with twenty-four supporters out of thirty-eight.

The re-organization of the Nova Scotia Government on the eve of the election had undoubtedly weakened the Conservatives. Mr. Thompson did not have time to assume leadership of the party and conduct an active campaign. Many of them were too confident. No definite policy was put forward by the government. There was dissatisfaction throughout the province about the Railway Policy, the Bridge Bill, the Funding Bill, the Bill for the Abolition of the Council, Better Terms, and the reduction of the Road Grant. The Conservatives had lost the confidence of the people, so the Liberals succeeded them.

CHAPTER II

SECTION II

Domestic Legislation

1883 - 1886.

William T. Pipes (Cumberland) became Premier of Nova Scotia and the head of the new Liberal Government. The other members of the Executive were Alonzo J. White (Cape Breton), Attorney-General; Charles E. Church (Lunenburg) Provincial Secretary; Albert Gayton (Yarmouth), Commissioner of Works and Mines; and Thomas Johnson (Shelburne), Dr. Duncan Campbell (Inverness), A. M. Cochran (Legislative Council), and Thomas F. Morrison (Legislative Council), ministers without portfolio.

Angus McGillivray (Antigonish) was chosen Speaker by a unanimous vote. Charles B. Whidden (C) had been elected member for Antigonish in place of John S. D. Thompson (C) who had resigned to become a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. Angus McLennan (C) had been elected a member for the county of Inverness in place of Duncan J. Campbell (L), deceased. This altered the membership of the parties to twenty-three Liberals and fifteen Conservatives.¹

In 1884 a change occurred in the membership of the Executive Council when William S. Fielding (Halifax) became Premier of Nova Scotia. On July 14, 1884, W. T. Pipes, the Premier, had resigned from the Council for personal reasons. Mr. Pipes had suggested to Lieutenant-Governor Matthew Richey that he consult with W. S. Fielding. Although Mr. Fielding had resigned as Councillor two months previously,² his resignation had never been accepted. On July 26, Mr. Fielding recommended that all members of the Executive except Mr. Pipes and Mr. Gayton be re-appointed.

1. T.E. Corning (Yarmouth) was elected as an Independent, but as he was regarded as a Conservative by the members of the Assembly, I have followed their example.
2. He had entered the government as minister without portfolio,

The new government consisted of W. S. Fielding, as President of the Council and Provincial Secretary; A. J. White, Attorney-General; C. E. Church, Commissioner of Public Works and Mines; Thomas Morrison, Thomas Johnson, Isidore LeBlanc, and James W. Longley as ministers without portfolio.¹

The editor of the HERALD claimed that this change had been caused by the dissatisfaction of the Liberal party and members of the Assembly with the Pipes government. He stated that W. Pipes had been induced to resign as Premier, while Mr. Fielding and Mr. Longley had been put in office because they would be amenable to control by Liberals outside the Legislature.

The twenty-eighth Assembly was characterized by considerable partisan feeling and long debates. Mr. A. Bell (Pictou), Leader of the Opposition, stated that his party "were disposed in every respect to give the government a fair opportunity of carrying on the business of the country, and did not intend to offer any factious opposition."²

However, party differences were soon revealed in the debates over Executive Councillors' Fees and the bill for Sheriffs.

On February 14, 1883, Mr. W. Fielding, (Halifax), introduced a bill to regulate the indemnity paid to the members of the Executive Council by paying the actual travelling expenses of each Councillor and four dollars a day for actual attendance upon the Council. He charged that the people had come to believe that the allowances given to the Councillors were

1. MORNING HERALD, February 20, 1885.

2. Opening debate, 1883.

excessive, and that the previous government had used the question of excessive travelling fees merely as an election cry because "when they came into power they conveniently forgot all about the matter and quietly put their usual fees in their pockets."

The Conservatives resented this statement by Mr. Fielding, and they accused him of being unduly anxious to secure credit for a paltry reform.

The debate on the second reading of the bill was very bitter. The Liberals agreed that the bill was important because it put an end to the scandals in connection with the payments to the Executive Councillors. No longer would a Councillor receive thirty cents a mile railway allowance when he travelled free on the Intercolonial.

The Conservatives said that they would support the bill as a necessary economy even though it was a "paltry reform". Finally, after the debate had degenerated into a squabble over the merits and defects of the respective parties, the bill passed without division.

On February 22nd, 1883, the two parties revealed their strength in the vote on the second reading of the "Bill Respecting Sheriffs." Premier Pipes had proposed a bill providing that Sheriffs be selected and appointed by the Governor-in-Council instead of by a Committee of two Judges and two Executive Councillors. Adam Bell (Pictou) had led the vigorous opposition made by the Conservatives. He had protested because he feared that the bill would make the Sheriffs political appointees subject to undue

influence from the party in power.

The reason for this apprehension was that the Sheriffs acted as Returning Officers in the elections. The Conservatives believed that if the Government obtained the power to appoint the Sheriffs they would appoint political sympathizers and dismiss Conservative Sheriffs, and that the Liberal Sheriffs would favour the Liberal party at the next election.

The Liberals in the Assembly insisted that this bill would not improve the Sheriff's position, and that it would enable the government to dismiss incompetent men and to retain efficient ones.

The "Bill Respecting Sheriffs" passed the House by a vote of twenty-two to fifteen giving the Liberals a majority of seven on a strict party vote. ¹

During the sessions of 1885 and 1886 there was considerable party feeling, but the excessive bitterness and the personal quarrels of the two previous sessions had disappeared. The members were content to state their position and to argue their differences with dignity. Party lines were much stricter than under the Holmes-Thompson government because Mr. Fielding had a much smaller majority. Members were forced to sacrifice their personal opinions to their party's safety.

1. For the Sheriff Bill:

Premier (L), Hon. Prov. Sec'y (L), Att.-Gen. (L), Com. Works and Mines (L), Fielding (L), Johnson (L), LeBlanc (L), Mack (L), Buchanan (L), MacCoy (L), Weeks (L), Longley (L), McCurdy (L), McNeill (L) Cook (L), Power (L), H. Munro (L), Dodge (L), Haley (L), Ross (L), Fraser (L), Robicheau (L) - 22.

Against:

Bell (C), McLennan (C), Campbell (C), Corning (I or C), Townshend (C), Blair (C), Patterson (C), C.H. Munro (C), Hockin (C) McDonald (C) McRae (C), Whidden (C), Spence (C), Harrington (C), Harris (C) - 15.

On March 14, 1883, McRae's (C, Richmond) resolution to secure economy by reducing the membership of both houses of the Legislature was vigorously debated for three days. At the same time the abolition of the Legislative Council was discussed.

J. W. Longley (L, Annapolis) advocated the abolition of the Council because no necessity existed for its continuance, and because it would be a substantial economy, and he moved an amendment:

Resolved, that in view of the successful experience of the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, and the special need of economy in the administration of our Local affairs it is expedient to abolish the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia as soon as can be done consistently with the existing laws and prerogatives of this Legislature.¹

This was seconded by W. S. Fielding, who believed that the Province could afford to dispense with the Council although he praised its usefulness.

Many members objected to the reduction in the number of members of the Legislature; others merely disliked any change. Some protested against wasting the Assembly's time when the Council would never consent to its abolition. Others agreed with Mr. Hockin (Pictou) that it was not useless to discuss the abolition because the Councillors might be convinced that such was the will of the people.

Mr. Longley's amendment was passed by a vote of twenty-five to five. The Conservatives felt that they had been committed to the principle of the abolition of the Council by their acts while in power.

1. JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NOVA SCOTIA, 1883, p. 58.

No definite action was undertaken to obtain the abolition of the Council. One policy advocated for achieving the abolition was to refrain from making appointments to the Council until it ceased to exist. The Liberals had seemed to follow this policy until April, 1884, when three government supporters - M. H. Goudge, of Windsor, I. V. Dexter, of Brooklyn, Queens County, and Alex. McKay, of North Sydney - were appointed to the Council to vote for the Railway Bill.

On April 16, 1884, Townshend (C, Cumberland) moved a vote of censure against the government for appointing three Councillors without pledging them to vote for the abolition of the Council. Premier Pipes denied that he had made any such pledge, and the vote of censure was lost by a vote of eight to fifteen.

In 1886 W. A. Patterson (C, Colchester) introduced a resolution that no appointments should be made to the Council until after the general election. This resolution was defeated by a party vote: five Conservatives for it and fifteen Liberals against it, although the Liberal leaders repeated their views that the Council should be abolished. ¹

The subject of Education was discussed on a non-partisan basis. In 1883 Mr. W. D. Harrington (Halifax) again introduced his bill, "To Secure Better Attendance at Public Schools." This bill provided that unless a child between the ages of seven and fourteen attended school for a minimum of eighty days the

1. Debates of N. S. Assembly, 1886, P 391, 511 et seq.

parents were liable to a fine of ten dollars, and the act became law at the option of a majority of the ratepayers.¹

Mr. Otto Weeks (L, Guysborough) refused to vote for the bill. "He believed that attendance upon school should be free and voluntary." Mr. W. S. Fielding (L, Halifax) "was strongly in favour of compulsory education ... Education was something more than a privilege. It was a duty ... it was necessary to see that this duty of securing a certain amount of education was recognized and acted upon by all." The Bill passed by a vote of twenty-five to eight.

In 1884 the School for the Deaf was given the same government support as the School for the Blind. The municipality and the province each paid sixty dollars towards the support of each pupil. In 1886 these grants to the School for the Blind were increased to seventy-five dollars per pupil.

The system of Academic Education was altered in 1885. On April 8 the Provincial Secretary, W. S. Fielding, moved the second reading of the "Bill to Encourage Academic Education." This bill attempted to rearrange the grants to high schools on an equitable basis. Mr. Fielding said that

"As respects the academic branch of our educational system, there has been dissatisfaction for some years." ²

The bill tried to eliminate the evils pointed out by Dr. Allison (Superintendent of Education) in his last report. ³

1. This Act had been introduced by Mr. Harrington on Jan. 30, 1882; consideration deferred on February 13, 1882, and ordered to be printed for information of electors. Published in App. No. 5, xxviii, Journal of Assembly, 1883.
2. Debates of N.S. Assembly, 1885, P 312.
3. Each county received an annual grant of \$600 for a County Academy. In some cases the sum was expended for the support of an ordinary school. No allowance was made for the fact that some counties had a larger school population than others.

This bill did not limit the academy grant to six hundred dollars a year, but the grant varied, similar to the common school grant, according to the work accomplished; and it might be given to any high school in the county, not always to the one in the shire town. The grant was to be distributed in this manner:

When one duly qualified teacher is employed with a properly certified yearly average of at least fifteen high school pupils a grant equal to two thirds of the salary paid such teacher, provided the grant shall not exceed five hundred dollars. ¹

For two teachers and forty pupils the grant was \$1,000; three teachers and eighty pupils, \$1,500; four teachers and one hundred and twenty pupils, \$1,600. Halifax and Pictou academies were to receive their grants under this system.

Adam Bell (C, Pictou) stated that he would be glad to support this bill, which placed the County Academies on a permanent basis. The Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Hockin (C, Pictou) felt that Pictou Academy had received fair treatment.

In a short debate both Liberals and Conservatives expressed their concurrence. They supported the bill because it encouraged merit instead of distributing money in an arbitrary manner, and because it would increase teachers' salaries, and improve teaching in high schools.

On its second reading the bill was carried by a division of twenty-nine to four. J. M. Mack (L, Queens), John McNeill (L, Digby), Joseph Cook (L, Queens), and John A. McDonald (C, Victoria) opposed it because they thought that the bill encouraged and helped the larger and more populous and more wealthy districts, and that this was unfair to the poorer districts.

1. Op. cit. P 312 - 318; N. S. Laws, 1885, P 17. This bill was commonly called the County Academy Bill.

The Committee on Education amended the Academic Education Bill to allow \$1,720 to an academy employing four teachers. As this would benefit only Halifax and Pictou, it was opposed by William MacCoy (L, Shelburne), but his motion was lost, and the bill received its third reading unchanged. ¹

The Agricultural Education Bill of 1885, introduced by Mr. Fielding, was welcomed as an indication that the Council of Public Instruction was considering popular demand in expending part of the grant on agricultural education. Although an Agricultural College was required, the Province was unable to afford to purchase a farm and to provide teachers. This bill made provision for a competent man to be placed in the Normal School to instruct young farmers and pupil teachers in agriculture. Teachers who had obtained an agricultural diploma would receive a hundred dollars additional government allowance. The bill was passed with very little debate.

In the same year an important amendment was made to Chapter 39 R.S - "The Encouragement of Agriculture." For some years past there had been a general dissatisfaction with the management of affairs by the Central Board of Agriculture. ²

Acting on the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture, the Government had decided to abolish the Central Board, and to transfer all the powers and duties of the Board to the Governor-in-Council, and to appoint a Secretary of Agriculture to assist the Executive.

1. Debates, 1885, P 379, 381, 389.
2. The Central Board consisted of one Cabinet member, and six other persons, chosen to represent various districts by the agricultural societies. See N.S. Debates, 1886, P 430.

Also, the district exhibitions, which had been unsuccessful, were to be abolished in favour of a Provincial exhibition which would be held every five years; County exhibitions would be subsidized by the government.

Some members objected to the abolition of district exhibitions, while others declared that the Governor-in-Council knew nothing about agriculture, and that sea captains would be expected to encourage farming. However, the bill passed without division.

Most of the session of 1884 was occupied with the discussion of the Revised Statutes, Fifth Series. Three Commissioners - Judge W. Johnson, of the County Court, Mr. Otto S. Weeks (L, Guysboro), and Mr. J. W. Longley (L, Annapolis) - had been appointed at the last session in spite of harsh condemnation of the government by the Conservatives for appointing members of the Assembly to positions of emolument under the Crown.

In these years Finance began to assume the importance that it was to achieve in succeeding Legislatures. The Liberal government which came into power in 1882 spent with a freer hand than the Holmes - Thompson government, but not with the liberality of earlier administrations. This Legislature also witnessed the beginning of William S. Fielding's career as Provincial Secretary and guardian of Nova Scotia's finances.

In 1882 Nova Scotia had no funded debt. Previous Provincial governments had provided themselves with funds by withdrawals from the debt account at Ottawa. In 1878 this account

had been almost exhausted. The Holmes-Thompson government would have inaugurated borrowing but were frustrated by the Legislative Council. Thus, by the Loan Bill of 1883, the Legislature created a capital account and Nova Scotia issued bonds for the first time since Confederation.

The debate over the Loan Bill was influenced by the feelings aroused over the Syndicate Resolutions which had preceded it. On April 11th, 1883, Premier William Pipes moved the second reading of the bill to raise a loan of \$2,400,000. Of this sum \$1,500,000 was to pay for the Eastern Extension, \$400,000 for the construction of other railways, \$500,000 for the rebuilding of the larger bridges, and \$60,000 to pay the floating debt of the Province.

The Leader of the Opposition, Adam Bell, criticized the Provincial Loan because it was excessive, and because the question of bridges should have been considered in a separate bill. He protested against increasing the public debt. "The whole net result of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is going to be the creation of a liability on the part of the Province of \$142,000 a year for thirty years - an amount larger than the whole road grant for this year." He claimed that to offset this enormous liability the Province would have a railway that might or might not make money.

The remainder of the long debate on the Loan Bill was a discussion of the government's railway policy, not the question of finance.

Premier Pipes failed to float Nova Scotia's bonds in London. Sufficient bonds were sold at home at five per cent. interest to create a sizeable capital account.

On April 17, 1884, Premier Pipes moved the second reading of a bill, which passed without division, authorizing the payment of certain money to Baring Brothers. In the Syndicate contract between the government and Mr. Plunkett, Nova Scotia had received £52,000 from Baring Brothers. It was supposed that this money would be forfeited if the contract were not carried out. When Mr. Pipes was in London he had discovered that Baring Brothers claimed the deposit and had made an application for its return, and that Mr. Holmes had promised to return the deposit if the contract was not ratified. After obtaining legal advice, the government had decided to return the money.

The Opposition agreed that this deposit should be returned, and objected to the government's delay. It was suggested that the failure to return the deposit had harmed Nova Scotia's credit in England, and that the repayment was essential for the honor and credit of the Province.

However, the sum received from Barings had been deposited in the Debt Account at Ottawa. The Dominion Government refused the Province's application to pay Baring Brothers from this account because withdrawals could only be made for "local improvements." Premier Fielding was forced to take the amount from the Public Works Fund.

In 1883 the Liberal government began to remove the responsibility for Bridges from the municipalities. Bridges were one of the few subjects which were considered on non-partisan grounds. One clause of the Loan Bill of 1883 appropriated \$500,000 for the construction of permanent bridges, and a Bridge Bill giving the Governor-in-Council power to spend it was passed unanimously.

On March 16, 1885, Premier Fielding moved the second reading of a Bridge Bill which authorized the Governor-in-Council to increase the bridge allowance to any county by fifty percent. He explained that some counties had already expended their share of the bridge grant, and required more, and that it was advisable for the Province to borrow a large sum for the Bridges, and to permit the municipalities to draw upon the Province because the Province could borrow at a lower rate of interest.¹ The municipalities paid interest on the sums borrowed, the Province deducting the amount from the road grant.

The motion for the second reading was carried on division by a vote of twenty-one to fourteen.² The majority of the Liberals voted for the bill, and a majority of Conservatives opposed it. However, three Liberals, J. Mack (Queens), John McNeill (Digby), and Robicheau (Digby) voted against the measure because they were dissatisfied with the distribution of the money, and three Conservatives, Alex. Campbell (Inverness), Angus McLennan (Inverness), and William Harrington (Halifax) voted for it because they were satisfied with their county's share.

1. $4\frac{1}{2}\%$, as compared to 6% or 7%.

2. Debates of N.S. Assembly, 1885, P 180. Also P 114 - 126, 166 - 188

Most of the Liberals supported the Bridge Bill because they felt that the construction of the great bridges of Nova Scotia was a provincial obligation, and that this construction should be carried out under the supervision of the Provincial Engineer, and also because the Province could borrow money more cheaply than the municipalities. Some believed that if Nova Scotia did not provide the money for the bridges the municipalities would be forced to resort to direct taxation, and that this calamity must be staved off as long as possible.

The Conservatives tended to oppose the Bridge Bill because it committed the government to borrowing the \$1,600,000 necessary to reconstruct all the large bridges. They objected to a large sum of interest being deducted from the road grant as this would make the grant inadequate for road repairs. Some members claimed that half a million was sufficient, and that the government was being given unparalleled powers, and, furthermore, this additional \$250,000 would be used for corruption.

This administration was also confronted with the problem of an inadequate revenue. It was absolutely essential that Nova Scotia have more money. Accordingly, the government concentrated on trying to obtain a larger grant from Ottawa. From the beginning the Executive openly declared that their financial difficulties were traceable to Confederation, and should be remedied by a larger subsidy. In 1884 the federal government conceded the demand that the increased debt allowance given in 1873 ought to date back to Confederation, and in consequence \$793,400 was added to Nova Scotia's debt credit at Ottawa. ¹

1. 1884 Dominion Laws, C 4. This concession was caused by pressure from Sir John A. Macdonald's Quebec supporters.

This concession did not satisfy the government of Nova Scotia. Further attempts to obtain a larger subsidy eventually ended in the Repeal movement.

The Railway question continued to be of importance during the entire session of the Legislature from 1883 to 1886. The Syndicate Act, which had aroused the interest of all Nova Scotians, had not been carried into force when Mr. Pipes' government had succeeded the Holmes - Thompson administration.

It was hoped that the railway problem had been settled by the Syndicate bargain. However, the Syndicate Legislation proved to be a failure. On February 27th, 1883, Mr. Pipes presented the papers in connection with the Eastern Railway Extension.¹ The Syndicate Contract required the government to exercise its power to acquire various provincial railways for the Company. The Eastern Extension had to be bought immediately or Nova Scotia's right to acquire it would expire. The government of Nova Scotia had prevented the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company from gaining control of the Pictou Branch by refusing to grant a certificate of completion, and requested the Canadian Minister of Public Works to serve as arbitrator.

At first, a Nova Scotian delegation to Ottawa proposed that the Dominion acquire the Eastern Extension while giving Nova Scotia the option to buy the line at any time within two years. When this was refused the local government decided to exercise its right to buy the Eastern Extension, the amount to be paid being decided by arbitration. Premier Pipes declared that this sum

1. See JOURNAL OF N.S. ASSEMBLY, 1883, App. No. 12.
2. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1883, Feb. 27, March 1, 3, 6.

would be at least \$1,200,000, but that in return the Province would receive one hundred and thirty-one miles of railway, 150,000 acres of Crown land, rolling stock valued at \$225,000, and in addition an annual revenue from the Pictou Branch of \$80,000.

Opposition Leader Adam Bell pointed out that the Administration was only reaping the benefits of the wise railway policy of their predecessors, and that it was impossible for the Conservatives to oppose the bill because it was their own work. Dr. McLennan (C, Inverness) alone objected until he was convinced that the government would provide railways for Cape Breton.

The mutual goodwill which permitted the Eastern Extension Bill to be passed unanimously did not last long. Intense party feeling, hatred, and bitterness were frequently shown in this Assembly, and party conflict reached its height in the debates over the Railway Resolutions introduced by the Conservative leader.

On April 5th, 1883, Mr. Bell introduced a Resolution censuring the government for its delay in carrying out the measure for consolidating the Railways, and requesting that the Government inform the Legislature of the railway policy they intended to adopt.

This was a vote of confidence against the government, and accordingly the Liberals united in support of their party. Mr. Bell's resolution was defeated by a party vote of fourteen to twenty-one. ¹

The Conservative party had been responsible for the Syndicate Bargain, and although now they were in Opposition they

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1883, P 97.

believed that their scheme for consolidation offered the best solution for Nova Scotia's railway problems. They had assented to having the Government acquire the Eastern Extension as a step towards consolidation by the Nova Scotia Railway Company. Now that the Government had stated that the Syndicate Bargain had failed, the Conservatives were opposed to government ownership and management of the Eastern Extension.

On April 9th Mr. Bell moved his Syndicate Resolutions, which read in part:

"That the action of the Government in their negotiations and transactions with the said Company, in their unnecessary delay, illegal demands, and in the appointment of the Hon. W. B. Vail as agent, has not been such as to merit the continued confidence of this House."¹

The Conservative leader declared that while the members of the Government assured the people of the success of the Syndicate scheme they privately spoke "of that scheme ... as a thing not to be treated seriously."

In his reply Premier Pipes betrayed his anger and extreme exasperation. He hoped that this time the Conservatives would suffer an ignominious defeat, and defended the actions of his government, stating that Mr. Vail was an agent in whose prudence they had confidence, and who would not make concessions that would endanger the interests of the Province, but who would concede all that the contract required. For two days the Syndicate Resolutions were vigorously debated in long speeches.²

1. N.S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1883, P 103.

2. Townshend, Spence, and Corning supported the resolutions, while McCoy, White, Gayton, LeBlanc, and Fielding defended the Government. Mr. Fielding in a speech two and a half hours long attacked the past record of the Conservative party, and all its members in the present house. See CHRONICLE, April 30 to May 10, 1883.

There was much vituperation. The debate degenerated into undignified bickering while the arguments expressed in the last session for and against the Syndicate were repeated ad infinitum. Finally, the resolutions were defeated twelve to nineteen, by a party vote - a majority of seven for the government on a vote of confidence.¹

The violence aroused by the Syndicate Resolutions influenced the debate over the Loan Bill which immediately followed. As this bill would provide the money for the purchase of the Eastern Extension the question of the Provincial Loan rapidly became the question of Railways.

Adam Bell criticized the Loan Bill because it did not provide for the extension of railways into Cape Breton, and because it did not make any arrangements towards consolidation. Until the Government proved that the Syndicate Scheme had failed the Opposition must oppose this

"hermaphrodite scheme containing no promise of railway consolidation, and holding out no prospect of advantages to the Province, and certain only to burden us with a huge public debt."²

Then Mr. Bell moved in amendment that negotiations be resumed with the Nova Scotia Railway Company. Very bitter feeling raged during the ensuing debate which reviewed Nova Scotia's railway policy from Joseph Howe onwards. The Liberals claimed that the Conservatives were trying to kill the Loan Bill by their factions objections, and by long delaying speeches in which they talked nonsense. The debate continued until midnight on Monday, April 16th,

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, May 10, 1883.
2. MORNING CHRONICLE, May 12, 1883.

when the Loan Bill was passed by a vote of twenty to thirteen, the Liberals retaining their majority of seven in this party vote. ¹

In 1884 attention was focussed on the proposed transfer of the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension to the Dominion of Canada. ²

On March 27, 1884, Premier Pipes explained that in accordance with the legislation of the last session the Government had arranged to take over the Eastern Extension for a sum fixed by arbitration at \$1,088,000, but that the Dominion had refused to transfer the Pictou Branch. A delegation sent to Ottawa had been informed that before the Pictou Branch would be transferred to Nova Scotia the province must agree to allow the Dominion to regulate the tariff on the line, and that Nova Scotia must provide rolling stock and complete the Canso ferry. ³ The provincial government had decided that it would cost about \$100,000 annually for interest and sinking fund to equip the railway to comply with the Dominion's conditions while the line would only earn about \$35,000, so the Government had arranged for the Dominion to take over the railways and manage them.

Premier Pipes enumerated various advantages of having the Dominion control the railways, viz., it would benefit the coal and iron trade because the Dominion could afford to carry coal and iron at cost, and it would mean lower rates generally, it would consolidate several lines under one management, and the Dominion would construct railways in Cape Breton. He stated that the Dominion

1. JOURNAL OF N.S. ASSEMBLY, 1883, P 113, 116.

2. JOURNAL OF N.S. ASSEMBLY, 1884, App. No. 11

3. See Debates in MORNING HERALD, March 29, 1884.

would pay Nova Scotia \$1,200,000, and that this sum would repay the province for its outlay in purchasing the Eastern Extension. The Premier closed with the plea "if we believe this policy to be the best, let us vote for it." 1

The Conservatives furiously assailed the Government for what they declared was a base surrender of provincial property because in the proposed transfer Nova Scotia received no compensation for the provincial subsidy spent on the Eastern Extension. They also claimed that this was a breach of faith with Cape Breton because the Dominion had not guaranteed to construct railways in Cape Breton. 2

Mr. Bell declared that the government's opinion of the value of the Pictou Branch had decreased as their difficulties multiplied. He hinted that the Liberals had been forced to turn the roads over to the federal authorities on any terms because their incompetence, blunders, and neglect made it impossible for them to obtain the necessary funds to take over the railway. He computed that if the Province would operate the railway it would receive a surplus of \$12,000 a year. 3

James A. Fraser (L, Guysboro) made a very strong speech against the bill because he could not support the confiscation of provincial property. W. S. Fielding (L, Halifax) occupied the House for four hours with his speech. He condemned the Dominion government for its most unjust and illegal demands in connection with the transfer of the Pictou Branch, and he quoted at great

1. HERALD, 1884, March 30.

2. See Editorials of HERALD, 1884, April 2, 3, 4, and Debates, April 5th.

3. HERALD, March 31, 1884.

length from the Conservative press in an attempt to show that the "Tories" were in favour of the surrender.

The Railway Bill passed its second reading in the Assembly on Friday evening, (April 4, 1884) between six and seven o'clock by a vote of twenty to seventeen. ¹ The Conservatives, joined by two Liberals, Weeks and Fraser, voted solidly against the bill, reducing the government's majority to three. However, Bell's motion to defer the bill for three months had been defeated fifteen to twenty-two.

The Government held a special evening session to rush the bill through the Committee of the Whole and its third reading that night. Although the Railway Bill had been passed through the Assembly in such haste, it was not introduced into the Legislative Council until April 12th. In the Council the Railway Bill became law after the three months' hoist was defeated. ²

1. For Railway Bill - Pipes (L), Att.-Gen. (L), Johnson (L), Com. Works (L), Prov. Sec'y (L), Robicheau (L), Buchanan (L), H. Munro (L), Mack (L), LeBlanc (L), Fielding (L), McCoy (L), Longley (L), Haley (L), McCurdy (L), McNeill (L), Cook (L), Power (L), Dodge (L), Ross (L) - 20
Against - Bell (C), Fraser (L), Weeks (L), McLennan (C), Campbell (C), Corning (C), Townshend (C), Blair (C), Patterson, (C), C. H. Munro (C), Hockin (C), McDonald (C), McRae (C), Whidden (C), Harris (C), Harrington (C), Spence (C) - 17.
 Fraser would not surrender public property to the Dominion, and Weeks could not believe that the line would not be profitable.
2. Vote on 3-months' hoist:
For: Creelman (C), Parker (C), Owen (C), Whitman (C), Black (C) - 5
Against: Morrison (L), Fraser (C), Francheville (L), J. B. Dickie (L), Butler (L), McKinnon (C), McCurdy (L), Goudge (L), McKay (L), Dexter (L), Boak (L) - 11

The Railway measure had been in danger because one Liberal member refused to vote for it so three new government supporters - Goudge, Dexter, and McKay - had been appointed to vote for it. ¹

Acting on resolutions passed by the Assembly in 1884 the Government opened negotiations with various companies to secure the completion of the railway between Annapolis and Digby, and the consolidation of the lines from Halifax to Yarmouth.

The Government railway bill for this consolidation of the western railways was delayed until May 4, 1886, because of difficulties in negotiations with various companies and because of obstacles encountered in arrangements with the Dominion. ²

Mr. Fielding explained that the bill first dealt with the railway problem in the island of Cape Breton. The Dominion subsidy of \$3,200 a mile had been found inadequate. The government of Nova Scotia now proposed to grant

"First, a cash subsidy of \$3,200 a mile, not exceeding in the whole \$256,000... It is proposed also to grant a land subsidy of 2,000 acres per mile, not exceeding 160,000 acres. not to be given to the company until the completion of the whole line contracted for. In the third place we provide a right away gratis to the company."

If no company would construct a through line from the Strait of Canso to Sydney the Governor-in-Council was given the power to apply the subsidies to shorter sections.

One clause offered a cash subsidy of \$3,200 per mile and a land subsidy of two thousand acres per mile to any company offering to construct any line in Nova Scotia provided that the

1. Work on the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway was resumed in 1884, and an extension of time granted.
2. Debates of N.S. Assembly, 1886, P 392 et seq.

company should furnish evidence to the Governor-in-Council of possessing ample security for completing such a road.

After prolonged negotiations with several companies over the completion and consolidation of the western railways the Government had decided to accept the offer of the Joint Stock Association, an English company.

A delegation consisting of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Longley had been sent to Ottawa. After much correspondence it was decided that upon the acquisition of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway by the Nova Scotia government immediate possession of the Windsor Branch would be given to the government or their assigns. Upon completion of the Western Counties railway, the surrender of the Windsor branch in fee simple to the Nova Scotia government or their assigns would follow without delay. An agreement for running powers over the Intercolonial railway into Halifax, clearly defining the terms, conditions, and facilities to be granted should be valid for twenty-one years. The grant of the Dominion subsidy of \$64,000 for the railway from Annapolis to Digby would be made to a company mutually acceptable to the Province and the Dominion.

Mr. Fielding stated that the Joint Stock Association with whom the government had made arrangements was not a company to build railroads but was a financial association whose business it was to find capital and to organize working companies. The Company agreed to acquire the Windsor Branch, the Western and Annapolis, and the Western Counties Railway, to complete the nineteen miles from Annapolis to Digby, and to operate these two hundred and two miles as one consolidated system.

The Company proposed to raise new capital by a provincial guarantee of £40,000 (\$200,000). This would be only a twenty-year guarantee, not a perpetual one. The Company promised to float the guaranteed bonds at satisfactory prices or forfeit £5,000 to the Nova Scotia Government. The money raised from the sale of bonds would be used to pay \$1,350,000 to the Treasury of Nova Scotia to be deposited at Ottawa and to buy the Windsor and Annapolis, and to provide compensation for various interests in the Western Counties Railway, building the missing link, and for general repairs.

The Premier said that Nova Scotia was not assuming any severe burden of debt because the \$1,350,000 deposited at Ottawa would provide an annual interest of \$100,000, and the western railways were already earning \$60,000 a year. The Province only guaranteed to make up any deficiency in the \$200,000 interest required on bonds.

Mr. Fielding admitted that the scheme might not succeed. It would fail if the Company, which he was convinced was a strong one, was unable to float the bonds, and if the Dominion should refuse to carry out their promises about the Windsor Branch and the subsidy. He was convinced that the Province would not have to pay the guarantee.

"We cannot afford to see a large sum of money, four and a quarter millions of dollars, invested by the province in these western roads, producing the limited results they produce today ... we can better afford to move forward and take some degree of risk than to stand idly by and let things drift."

The Leader of the Opposition protested against having to discuss the railway bill at twenty-four hours' notice, and criticized the government for their long delay. He characterized the bill as being

of something of the lobster persuasion we were led to understand that it would be, and, certainly, as we regard it now, with its tail inadequately spread out over Cape Breton, its body resting on the Western Counties, and its numerous claws, all terminating with something in the nature of suckers, spread out over the other counties. ¹

This bill was merely an election kite to catch votes at the approaching election. The clause providing a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile and 2000 acres of land for short lines was intended to mollify the non-railway counties.

The Conservatives pointed out that this was a Syndicate Scheme. How did the Liberals dare to propose a Syndicate after their attacks on all Syndicates in 1882? Each Conservative member contrasted Holmes' Syndicate scheme with Fielding's, to the great advantage of the former. They said that the Premier's railway bill placed the Province at the mercy of an unknown Joint Stock Association, and guaranteed \$200,000 interest per year for the construction of only eighteen miles of railway. The Province would not obtain sufficient security or any payment for its interest in the railways.

Mr. Bell stated that he

will never vote for what is in my mind a fraud, a transparent humbug ... I have said already that I believe a better scheme can be placed before the people of the province ... I shall not discuss this question further. I say that I am ready to commit our cause, with the utmost confidence in the decision, to the verdict of the people of Nova Scotia. ²

1. Debates, 1886, P 398 - 417, especially 398 and 417.

2. Ibid.

The Railway Bill passed its second reading on May 7th, being carried nem. con., and was immediately considered in Committee. On May 8th it received its third reading.

All the members from Cape Breton supported the Railway Bill because it provided "Justice for Cape Breton." Mr. LeBlanc declared that if Cape Breton did not get her railways her people were determined to ask for Repeal from Nova Scotia. The members from Annapolis, Digby, and Yarmouth all supported consolidation because it completed the missing link. Others supported the Railway Scheme because they dared not defeat the clause offering subsidies for construction in non-railway counties. The Conservatives did not insist on voting against the Western Consolidation Bill because they knew they could not defeat it. They merely stated their objections, and allowed the bill to pass. ¹

From 1883 to 1886 the demand for Better Terms for Nova Scotia gradually grew until it culminated in a movement for Repeal from the Union with Canada. In 1883 the cry for Better Terms received scant attention because the Legislature was engaged with the Railway Policy. After some experience of struggles with an inadequate revenue the Legislature in 1884 sent an Address to the Dominion of Canada asking for a larger subsidy. Difficulties in negotiations over the Eastern Extension and other railways, and over the payment to Baring Brothers had embittered the men in

1. In 1885 the electoral franchise was extended to give the vote to every male subject of Her Majesty who was at least twenty-one years old, and who was assessed to the value of real property worth \$150 or real and personal property combined, or personal property alone to the value of \$300 or who was a bona fide yearly tenant of real property assessed at \$150, or the son of such a person. The Conservatives submitted a resolution in favour of manhood suffrage, but this was defeated by a vote of 14 to 19.
See Debates, 1885, P 344, and JOURNAL, 1885, P 82, 88, 101-115.

the local government, and had convinced them that the men in the Canadian government cared naught for Nova Scotia. A Conservative government, with Sir John A. Macdonald as Premier, was in power in Ottawa. Consequently, little cordiality or co-operation existed between Ottawa and the Liberals at Halifax.

The absolute necessity to obtain a larger revenue - preferably by an increased federal grant - and the delays and final refusal of the Canadian government changed the demand for Better Terms to a movement for Repeal. This revival of the Repeal movement was chiefly caused by financial desperation, and by a great bitterness and hatred by the Liberals for the "Tory" federal government, and by a patriotic feeling for Nova Scotia.

The question of Better Terms was one of the few subjects which was discussed on its own merits, and which was not continually influenced by party prejudice. Both parties were united in a sincere desire to get a larger subsidy.

In the Speech from the Throne in 1884 the Ministry declared that

"the experience of each succeeding year strengthens the conviction that the allowances to Nova Scotia from the Federal Treasury for local purposes are inadequate, and that they should be increased."

In the debate on the Reply to Lieutenant-Governor Matthew H. Richey members from both parties expressed the opinion that it seemed an opportune time for Nova Scotia to try to obtain a larger subsidy when Quebec was also pressing for an increased federal grant.

On February 27th, 1884, James Fraser(L, Guysboro) showed the future development of this demand into Repeal when he moved a resolution that it was the duty of the Government to earnestly press upon the attention of the Federal Government the necessity for granting to Nova Scotia an increase of subsidy, and failing to receive this, it would become the duty of the Government to demand a repeal of the B. N. A. Act. ¹

Mr. Fraser pointed out that

Hitherto the province had been able to struggle along ... by what has been called a system of cheeseparating economy. Could we do so in the future? ... ²

He said that the people of Nova Scotia paid at least \$2,460,000 a year in tariff duties to the Federal Government

while our railways were unbuilt, the great roads and bridges falling into decay or repaired with borrowed money, the business of the country depressed ... Should we always continue to truckle to the politicians at Ottawa or again be free and independent subjects of Her Majesty without having to wade to her glorious throne through the slums and pitfalls of Canadian politics? It was for this legislature, for the people of this Province to answer. ³

The government was not yet ready for such strong measures.

On March 4th, Premier William Pipes stated that Mr. Fraser had withdrawn his resolution, and proposed instead that an Address be submitted to the Governor-General asking for a larger allowance.

The Government had thought it better that this claim and representation should come from the house, as it were, from the whole people of Nova Scotia. ⁴

1. JOURNAL, 1884, P 19 - 20.
2. HERALD, 1884, February 29, P 1, debates for February 27th.
3. Ibid, P 2 Col. 1.
4. Ibid., March 5, 1884, Debates.

This resolution met with the approval of both parties and was carried unanimously.

The Dominion government failed to reply to this Address although repeatedly requested to do so by the Nova Scotian government.

When the session opened on February 19, 1885, the Government was forced to admit that the Federal Government had not yet reached a decision on the Address adopted unanimously by both Houses last session. ¹ In the debate on the Address in Reply to the Lieutenant-Governor, T. R. Black (L, Cumberland) said

"we could not help seeing that our government had a very just claim on the government of the Dominion. When our tariff was low, this province had means in its hands for carrying on its public works and was the most prosperous of all the provinces on entering the Union. It had the right, therefore, to demand to be kept in that position." ²

On February 24th, Mr. Fraser gave notice of a motion similar in character to the one proposed last year, respecting the separation of Nova Scotia from Canada, and the establishment of a Maritime Union. The government was engaged in correspondence with Ottawa over an increased subsidy. They always failed to fix a day for the discussion of Mr. Fraser's resolution. Premier Fielding thought the resolution should lie on the table as he expected a favourable reply within a few days to the claim for Better Terms. Not until March 12th was Mr. Fraser given the opportunity to move his resolution.

1. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1884, P 102-106.
2. HERALD, February 20, 1885. Debates
3. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY OF N.S., 1885, P 38.

Mr. Fraser's resolution declared that since the financial and commercial condition of the Province was in a very unsatisfactory state, and there was no prospect of improvement while it remained part of Canada, the interests of the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island would be advanced by withdrawing from the Canadian Federation and forming a Maritime Union. If New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island refused to withdraw from the Union, then Nova Scotia should return to the status of a Province of Great Britain. It authorized the government to enter into negotiations with New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to ascertain their views on the subject so that the Legislature could be fully informed at the next session, and be prepared to place this vital question before the people at the next election.

Under the guise of Maritime Union the subjects of Better Terms and Repeal were discussed. The government did not accept Mr. Fraser's resolution. On March 25th Mr. Fielding moved an amendment to the effect that the feeling of discontent with regard to the financial arrangements was more general and deeply fixed than ever before, and therefore it is resolved

"that if the Government and Parliament of Canada fail to make provision, during the present session of said Parliament, to place the Province of Nova Scotia in a better financial position in the Union, this House affirms that it will be necessary to consider the advisability of taking steps to secure a severance of the political connection between the province and the Dominion of Canada." 1

1. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY OF N.S., 1885, P 57.

Premier Fielding stated that he cordially agreed with
Mr. Fraser

"in the opinion that not only was Confederation forced upon the people of this province against their will ... but beyond that, it was of the greatest disadvantage to the province ... I believe further, that if it were now possible to obtain a release under fair conditions the province would become happier and more prosperous than it is I take it for granted that ... all admit that, if we cannot obtain relief from our present unsatisfactory financial condition, then it is our duty to resort to some further step ... while some here may not be willing to commit themselves to a declaration in favour of a repeal movement ... we are bound to press that question upon the government and parliament at Ottawa."¹

The Liberals protested against the tariff policy of the Dominion as unsuitable for Nova Scotia. They insisted that Nova Scotia was not prosperous, and showed their indifference to Maritime Union.

The Conservatives contended that Nova Scotia was prosperous, and that she received ample returns for her share of Dominion taxation. They declared that the people had become reconciled to Confederation.

On March 27th, William A. Patterson (C, Colchester) moved an amendment to the amendment of the Provincial Secretary that unless an improvement of Nova Scotia's financial position was granted by the Dominion before the end of the present session the Government advise the Lieutenant-Governor to dissolve the House in order that the question of Repeal be submitted to the people at the polls. This proposal was defeated, eleven to twenty-two, the Opposition voting for it, and the Government supporters against it.²

1. Debates, 1885, P 213.

2. JOURNAL OF N.S. ASSEMBLY, 1885, P 57.

The Provincial Secretary's amendment was adopted by a vote of twenty to thirteen. Nineteen Liberals and one Conservative, Alexander Campbell (Inverness), voted for Mr. Fielding's amendment, and ten Conservatives and three Liberals, James Fraser (Guysborough), Jason Mack (Queens), and George Ross (Lunenburg), voted against it.

The Conservatives appeared eager to force the issue of Repeal at the polls while the Government remained extremely moderate.

In the Speech from the Throne in 1886 the Executive was forced to admit that the Dominion government had given an unfavourable reply to the Address asking for an increased subsidy. The Federal Government insisted that the Dominion had made a final settlement of Nova Scotia's financial objections to the Union in 1869, and that the province did not pay an unfair share of the Customs' duties.

This refusal aroused a storm of protest in the Legislature and among the people. Discontent and irritation were increased. The Legislature adopted a Memorial in answer to the reply sent by the Dominion in which they repeated their demands for an increased subsidy. This Memorial was adopted unanimously by the Assembly on April 14, 1886, although James Fraser and Premier Fielding and several other members felt that the Dominion would never grant their request. 1

1. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1886, P 91 - 96, Debates, 1886, P 215 - 232.

This unanimity between the Liberals and the Conservatives disappeared when Mr. Fielding moved his Repeal Resolutions on May 8th, 1886. These resolutions stated in part:

"That the members of this branch of the Legislature of Nova Scotia are of the opinion and do hereby declare their belief, that the financial and commercial interests of the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island would be advanced by these provinces withdrawing from the Canadian Federation and uniting under one Government;

That if it be found impossible, after negotiations for that purpose, to secure the co-operation of the respective Governments of the sister provinces in withdrawing from the Confederation and entering instead into a Maritime Union, then this Legislature deems it absolutely necessary that Nova Scotia, in order that its railways and other public works and services may be extended and maintained as the requirements of the people need them; its industries properly fostered; its commerce invigorated and expanded; and its financial interests placed upon a sound basis, such as was the case previous to Confederation, should ask permission from the Imperial Parliament to withdraw from the Union of Canada, and return to the status of a Province of Great Britain, with full control over all fiscal laws and tariff regulations within the Province, such as prevailed previous to Confederation;

That this House thus declares its opinion and belief, in order that candidates for the suffrages of the people at the approaching elections may be enabled to place this vital and important question of separation from Canada before them for decision at the polls." ¹

Though both parties intended to make Repeal an election issue, it was so near the end of the session that the debate lasted only one day. It was more important to prorogue the Legislature so that the members could state their opinions directly to the people.

Premier W. S. Fielding said:

"We have waited year after year in vain for a re-adjustment of our financial position. I do not contend that the settlement of this financial question would satisfy all our requirements. There are complaints deeper down than that ... I fail to see, after we have adopted the Address of 1884 ...

1. JOURNAL OF N.S. ASSEMBLY, 1886, P 147-149.

and after a positive refusal to entertain our demands, I fail to see, I say, anything left to us but to declare that we are deeply dissatisfied with our present condition, and to ask to be released from the Confederation, if they won't do us justice, to ask them to loose us and let us go." 1

Mr. Fielding expressed his belief that though it would be difficult to repeal the Union it would not be an impossibility:

"I believe that the people of Nova Scotia are in favour of a repeal of the union, and I am not afraid to submit that issue to them." 2

The Conservatives admitted that there was dissatisfaction in Nova Scotia over financial conditions but they wished to reach a satisfactory solution within the Union. They were utterly opposed to breaking up Confederation.

In the opening sentences of his speech on the Repeal resolutions Adam Bell boldly proclaimed the attitude of himself and his party towards Repeal:

"I have very strong views on the subject, and I entirely and utterly favour the continuance of the political connection with the Dominion of Canada that we now have ... I am perfectly prepared to submit this matter to the decision of the people, believing that they are the proper persons to decide it." 3

He argued that the people wanted to be part of a Dominion which extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He did not agree with his opponents that the material welfare of Nova Scotia was injured by being a part of Canada.

"I believe ... that the greatest calamity which could befall this province would be to sever its connection with Canada. That connection severed we would be left here on the verge of the Atlantic with a waste of waters before us and a hostile territory behind us - a veritable Mother Carey's chicken indeed." 4

1. Debates, 1886, P 468 et seq.
2. Ibid. P 470.
3. Debates, 1886, P 472 - 474.
4. Ibid. P 473.

The Repeal Resolution was adopted by a party vote, fifteen voting for it and six against. The Liberals, with the exception of William Pipes (L, Cumberland), who opposed Repeal because he thought it would eventually mean annexation with the United States, voted for the Repeal Resolution. The Conservatives accepted their leader's stand and all voted against Repeal. ¹

The Repeal question was now launched by the House into the country for a decision at the polls. ²

1. For the Repeal Resolution:

Fielding (L), White (L), Church (L) Johnson (L), Gayton (L), Mack (L), LeBlanc (L), Fraser (L), Weeks (L), McCoy (L) McCurdy (L), Cook (L), Haley (L), Dodge (L), Power (L) - 15.
 Against: Bell (C), Corning (C), Whidden (C), McDonald (C), McRae (C), Pipes (L) - 6.

Hocking (C) paired with Ross (L), Longley (L) with Blair (C), and Mack (L) with Campbell (C). Therefore Hockin, Longley, and Mack were unable to vote although Longley and Mack supported the Resolution and Hockin opposed it. W. Harrington (C) had his name added "to the loyal minority on the division list."
 Debates, 1886, P 501.

2. A bill to give a pension of five hundred dollars a year to the widow of Joseph Howe was accepted by all as eminently fitting, and passed the Legislature with perfect unanimity.

In 1886 the Board of Public Charities was abolished because there had been so many complaints about the administration by the Board. Its powers were vested in the Government through the Department of Works and Mines. The control and support of the Provincial and City Hospital, and the Poor House at Halifax, were transferred to the City of Halifax. Later the Province resumed sole control of the Hospital.
 Debates, 1886, P 214, 255.

CHAPTER II

SECTION III

Relations with Ottawa,

1882 - 1886.

In these early years of the Liberal administration the discussions and correspondence between the men in power at Ottawa and at Halifax did not reveal the cordiality or co-operation which had characterized the Holmes-Thompson rule. This was partly caused by the fact that a Conservative government was in power in the Dominion, and a Liberal government ruled Nova Scotia; and it has long been an axiom that good relations between the Dominion and the Provinces have always been more difficult to achieve when one party is in power at Ottawa and another in the Province. There were many negotiations and disputes between the Federal authorities and the government of Nova Scotia over Railways, the payment to Baring Brothers, and Better Financial Terms. The failure of the Dominion to grant a larger subsidy to Nova Scotia provided the motive which caused the development of the demand for Better Terms into a demand for Repeal from the Dominion of Canada.

The various negotiations over the Eastern Extension Railway caused serious dissension between the Dominion and the Province. The Provincial Government had decided that it was bound by the terms of the Syndicate agreement to acquire possession of the Eastern Extension and to control it until the Company was ready to manage the railway itself. Accordingly, the Nova Scotian government refused to sign the documents which would give the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company complete control of the Eastern Extension and permit them to receive the Pictou Branch from the Dominion government. The Dominion Minister of Public Works had been appointed arbitrator and he was notified that the

Nova Scotian government intended to exercise its power to buy the Eastern Extension.

A delegation consisting of Premier Pipes and Attorney-General White proceeded to Ottawa on business in connection with the arbitration. They failed in their attempt to have the Dominion pay for the Eastern Railways in Nova Scotia, and to operate them until the Nova Scotia Railway Company was ready to assume their management. The Federal government had also refused to build railways in Cape Breton, and to operate the Eastern Railways as part of the Intercolonial,¹ so the Government of Nova Scotia was forced to pass legislation in 1883 to take possession of the Eastern Railways and to manage them itself, and made arrangements to borrow the money to pay the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company.

The Dominion government gave no assistance to Premier Pipes in his difficulties over Railways, and this naturally exasperated the local government. The Premier wrote to Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Railways, asking for the Dominion's guarantee on the large provincial loan in order to effect a saving in interest. The Secretary replied that the Dominion government "was unable to recommend the acceptance of the proposal", on the plea that such a responsibility would reduce the value of its own stock in London.²

1. See JOURNAL OF NOVA SCOTIA ASSEMBLY, 1883, App. No. 12, for the history of the Eastern Extension and delegations to Ottawa.
2. JOURNAL, 1884, App. No. 11.

The Dominion also curtly refused to let the Nova Scotian government use the rolling stock of the Pictou Branch.

In May, 1883, Attorney-General A. J. White and W. S. Fielding went to Ottawa about the Pictou Branch. Sir Charles Tupper gave the delegates satisfactory assurances that the Pictou Branch would be delivered to the Government of Nova Scotia as soon as they should be ready to receive it.

The local government accordingly made their arrangements, and informed the federal Department of Railways that they should be prepared to take delivery of the Pictou Branch on October first. Great consternation was caused by the announcement on October first by the Dominion government that it was beyond their power to transfer the Pictou to the government of Nova Scotia.

Premier Pipes and W. S. Fielding were immediately dispatched to Ottawa where they were informed of the conditions upon which they could receive the Pictou Branch. In their report of the discussions the delegates frequently referred to the manifest unwillingness of the Dominion Government to transfer the Pictou Branch. Mr. Pipes and Mr. Fielding decided that the Pictou Branch could only be obtained by Nova Scotia on terms that would make the roads a burden on the Provincial Treasury. They deemed it expedient to continue the negotiations for the disposal of the railroads.

We felt that if we could obtain such an arrangement as would leave the Province free from loss on account of the policy of acquisition, a transfer of the roads to the Dominion would effect a very desirable and substantial improvement in the railway situation, as compared with what it would have been if the line had been left in the possession of the Company. ¹

1. JOURNAL, 1884, App. No. 11, Part 2, P 3.

Finally it was agreed that the Dominion should purchase the Eastern Extension from Nova Scotia for the sum of \$1,200,000. This amount would repay Nova Scotia exactly what it had paid to the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company, but made no allowance for the provincial railway subsidies expended on the line.

This meant the end of the plan for consolidating all the railroads in Nova Scotia under one company. The transfer of the Eastern Extension began the policy of placing Nova Scotian Railways, which were largely built by provincial funds, under the control of the Dominion.

There was a general feeling that the Dominion had acted unfairly to the Province, and that it had forced Nova Scotia to hand over its railways without adequate compensation. This contributed to the ill-feeling between the Dominion and the Province, and was increased by the difficulties over the payment of the \$1,200,000.

Correspondence between the Dominion and Nova Scotia over the payment for the Eastern Extension continued throughout 1884 and until February 25th, 1885.¹ There was considerable delay before the Dominion made its initial payment to Nova Scotia because the Railway Department failed to instruct the Finance Department to pay the amount. The Provincial government had borrowed the money to pay the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and they had to have the amount from the Dominion to repay the Bank of Montreal. This explained their frantic appeals for payment, and their insistence that interest be paid by the Dominion on the period of delay. When the

1. JOURNAL, 1885, App. No. 14.

Dominion made payment in May, Nova Scotia still claimed \$35,813.00. Mr. Church and Mr. Fielding made frequent requests for this sum. Finally, in September, the Finance Department placed \$33,414.00 to Nova Scotia's credit. Mr. Fielding immediately demanded the payment of the balance as it represented interest from May to September. He also pointed out that the Dominion had deducted \$464 for old rails - a debt which the Province had refused to accept - when the Dominion had already paid themselves by deducting it from the subsidy, and had paid themselves a second time!

Final payment was made in February, 1885, after Mr. Fielding had appealed to Sir John A. Macdonald to give his personal consideration to the just claims of Nova Scotia, when the province accepted \$2,513.00. In this matter Premier Fielding had displayed much skill and persistence in his efforts to obtain Nova Scotia's rights.

When the Nova Scotian Government began to plan for the consolidation and completion of the Western Railways from Halifax to Yarmouth satisfactory arrangements with the Dominion Government became of the utmost importance because the Dominion possessed the Windsor Branch and the Intercolonial.¹

In December, 1885, Premier W. S. Fielding and Mr. J. W. Longley went to Ottawa to discuss with the Dominion the Provincial debt account, the transfer of the Windsor Branch, the Dominion railway subsidy, and running powers over the Intercolonial railway from Windsor Junction to Halifax. After submitting a Memorial, and having interviews with various ministers, the delegates left Ottawa

1. Debates of N.S. Assembly, 1886, P 393, G to J.
JOURNAL, 1886, App. No. 14.

without obtaining a reply owing to the fact that the Christmas holidays were at hand. In January they were informed that the Dominion government had refused all Nova Scotia's requests. However, Premier Fielding continued to urge this matter. On February 22nd he sent letters to Ottawa asking for the co-operation of the Dominion, and emphasizing that without this co-operation Nova Scotia would be unable to consolidate her western railways. He failed to receive an answer for six weeks although he had stressed the urgency of the question.

On March 31st, 1886, the Dominion government informed Mr. Fielding that they would transfer the Windsor Branch to the government of Nova Scotia on the acquisition of the Windsor and Annapolis railway, and that an agreement would be made for running rights over the Intercolonial, and that a subsidy of \$64,000 would be granted to a company acceptable to both the Dominion and the Province.

On the basis of this reply Nova Scotia completed negotiations with the Joint Stock Association for the consolidation of the Western Railways. Premier Fielding emphasized in his speeches in the Assembly that this plan for consolidation would fail if the Dominion did not fulfill every part of its agreement.

The payment of Baring Brothers' Claim became a matter which influenced the relations between Canada and Nova Scotia. The deposit of £52,000 had been placed in Nova Scotia's debit account at Ottawa where it received five per cent. interest. The Deputy Minister of Finance had assured Nova Scotia that the sum would be

paid to Barings as soon as the proper application was made, and this was done on June 19, 1884.¹ Nevertheless, the Dominion Government raised objections to the payment of the money, and referred the matter to the Department of Justice. When Mr. Fielding became Provincial Secretary he found that Barings' had not received the money, and that the province's credit in London was suffering. He was forced to appeal to Sir John A. Macdonald to obtain any action, and was informed that withdrawals could be made from the Debt Account only for "local improvements." It was suggested that Nova Scotia apply for the sum for "local improvements" and then forward the money to Barings'. Mr. Fielding declined this suggestion because the money was needed to repay Barings', not for "local improvements", and he insisted that the Dominion could co-operate and return the deposit.

Mr. Fielding decided to borrow \$300,000 from the Public Works fund to repay Baring Brothers, and to replace this by a further loan, and the application to Ottawa was cancelled. After all arrangements were made the Minister of Finance, S. Tilley, wired Mr. Fielding that the Dominion government now agreed to return the deposit to Baring Brothers because the original advance was for local improvements! Premier Fielding adhered to his new arrangements, and in his reply he directed the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the application for payment was made seven months ago, and that the importance of having an early settlement had been urged repeatedly.

1. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1884, App. No. 12, and JOURNAL, 1885, Appendix No. 13; see also Chapter II, P 76.

Finance, and particularly the demand for Better Terms, was of the utmost importance in influencing relations with Ottawa. Each government since Confederation had been harassed by a lack of funds. Financial discontent had been steadily increasing, and with it a feeling that the financial arrangements of Confederation should be altered to give Nova Scotia a larger subsidy.

In the session of 1884 the Legislative Council and House of Assembly passed a joint Address asking for increased allowances from the Federal Treasury. The Address mentioned that Nova Scotia had a lower revenue per head than the other provinces, and demanded

That an additional revenue has become an absolute necessity to this Province, and the only available means of securing it is through the Federal Government, as our people will not submit to direct taxation for local purposes, while they believe that, if justice were done, Nova Scotia would have ample means to provide for her local wants.

That we submit, as the taxation of this country has been increased since the Union at least fifty per cent., the same ratio should be added to the Provincial subsidy given to this Province in 1867. ¹

Although this Address was forwarded on April 18, 1884, no reply had been received by January 10th, 1885, when Mr. Church, Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, and Thomas Morrison, M.L.C., were appointed delegates to Ottawa to press the financial claims of the province. The delegation returned with the assurance that the claims submitted should receive full and due consideration at an early date.

The Liberal government of Nova Scotia was using every constitutional means to obtain a larger subsidy from the Federal government because there was a strong demand for Better Terms in the province, and a growing resentment at the Dominion's delay in replying to the Address of 1884.

1. JOURNAL, 1886, App. No. 12, P 5.

Yet, as late as July 3, 1885, W. S. Fielding, now Premier of Nova Scotia, sent a letter to Sir John A. Macdonald to remind him that his government had not answered the Address of 1884. Mr. Fielding told Sir John that "failure to obtain the desired relief (of financial conditions) led to the opening up of the question of repeal of the British North America Act," and he quoted the Repeal resolutions introduced into the Assembly by James Fraser in 1884 and 1885. The Premier explained that the policy of his government was to wait to give the Government of Canada every reasonable opportunity to come to a decision. Then he quoted in full the government's amendment which resolved:

That if the Government and Parliament of Canada fail to make provision, during the present session of said Parliament, to place the Province of Nova Scotia in a better financial position in the Union, this House affirms that it will be necessary to consider the advisability of taking steps to secure a severance of the political connection between the Province and the Dominion of Canada.

This threat of the revival of the Repeal agitation in Nova Scotia brought a prompt reply from Sir John. The Dominion Government refused any increased allowance to Nova Scotia. They accepted only one claim advanced by the Province, the loss of five thousand dollars caused by a clerical error. The reason advanced for this decision was that Nova Scotia had possessed an excellent financial position, and had a suitable revenue for revenue purposes until she had withdrawn large sums from the debt account at Ottawa. They insisted that the Dominion had made a final settlement of Nova Scotia's financial objections to the Union in 1869, and that the province did not pay an unfair share of the Customs duties.

This refusal aroused a storm of protest in the Legislature and among the people. Discontent and irritation increased. This failure to obtain Better Terms by constitutional means contributed to the force of the desire for Repeal from Canada so that Nova Scotia could have complete control of all revenue raised in Nova Scotia, and be an independent colony under Queen Victoria's rule.

In 1886 the Legislature adopted a Memorial which refuted the Dominion's arguments against granting a larger subsidy. The Memorialists reiterated their previous claims, and submitted a new demand - for the refund of the subsidy paid by Nova Scotia to the Eastern Extension Railway, which was now owned and operated by the Dominion government.

Most Nova Scotians believed that this Memorial would exert no influence whatever upon the federal authorities to make them grant a larger subsidy. Thus they were willing to support the Repeal Resolutions submitted by Mr. Fielding - either as a further step to coerce the Dominion to improve Nova Scotia's financial position or because they wanted Repeal.

All the constitutional efforts to obtain Better Terms had received the unanimous support of both parties. However, the Conservatives disapproved of the revival of the Repeal agitation, and they opposed the Repeal Resolutions.

By 1886 the demand for Better Terms had developed into the Repeal movement, and relations between the Dominion and Nova Scotia were at their worst since the years immediately following Confederation. The question of Repeal - of Nova Scotia's separation from the Dominion of Canada - was to be settled by the people at the general election of 1886.

CHAPTER III

SECTION I

The Repeal Elections.

The Nova Scotian Election, June 15th, 1886.

The Canadian Election, February 22nd, 1887.

1.

Contrary to the practice of 1878 and 1882, the Dominion and Provincial elections were not held on the same day in 1886. In May, 1886, Premier W. S. Fielding had moved a series of resolutions condemning Confederation, and urged that the people vote for the separation of Nova Scotia from the Dominion of Canada. Accordingly, Repeal was the dominant issue of the campaign, with some consideration being given to the examination of the record of the Liberal government, and to Finance, Railways, and Corruption.

The campaign was extremely short. On May 21st, the MORNING CHRONICLE announced that the Legislature had been dissolved and the writs issued for an election on June 15th. This date "must be thoroughly satisfactory to their opponents, who profess the belief that the people are panting for an opportunity to hurl the government from power." 1

However, the Conservatives objected to the shortness of the campaign and were furious at this "flagrant and scandalous attempt to prevent anything like a full discussion of the issue raised by the secession resolutions of the government." 2

The publication in the Liberal newspapers on May 26 of the Hon. W. S. Fielding's election manifesto entitled "THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT - FOUR YEARS OF LIBERAL RULE" became the signal for both parties to exert themselves to the utmost.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, May 21, 1886.

2. MORNING HERALD, May 22, 1886.

The Premier's manifesto formed the basis of the Liberal policy in the ensuing election. Mr. Fielding did not neglect to stress the accomplishments of the Liberal government in Education, Railways, the protection of the forests, administration of justice, Agriculture, Road and Bridge Service, and to enumerate the reforms inaugurated by it, and he exulted in the financial record of the government because in spite of the difficulty of a limited revenue the public business had been carried on in a most economical manner, and the various services liberally maintained. Yet he emphasized that Repeal was the question of paramount importance in the campaign. He declared that no man in Nova Scotia was satisfied with Confederation, and that "in the opinion of the government the time has come when the people of Nova Scotia should once more make an effort to obtain a release from a union into which they were forced, and which has been productive of little good and much evil." ¹

The severity of the depression, the hatred of the high tariff of the National Policy, the refusal of the Dominion to grant Better Terms to Nova Scotia, and acute dissatisfaction with the Dominion policy of public works, railways, and reciprocity with the United States had all contributed to the strength of the demand for Repeal.

Mr. Fielding asked what was to be done in view of the discontent with the financial situation in Nova Scotia:

1. CHRONICLE, May 26, 1886.

Submit in silence? Some would do so. If the people of Nova Scotia are satisfied with the fruits of Confederation, they will have the opportunity of recording the fact by depositing their ballots on the 15th of June. But if, as we believe, they are deeply dissatisfied with their position in the union and determined to bring about a better state of affairs, they will doubtless feel that they can best advance the true interests of this Province by sustaining the Repeal Policy which the local government submit for their approval.¹

Much of the disaffection in Nova Scotia in 1886 was caused by disapproval of the financial arrangements of the Union and by the feeling that the province contributed far more to the finances of the Dominion than she received in return. The expenses and expenditure in connection with the Dominion had increased much more rapidly than had been contemplated by the Fathers of Confederation. Nova Scotians had to bear their share of this increasing debt which was expended largely in development of Railways, and the Premier claimed that all Nova Scotia had to show for this vast increase of Dominion indebtedness was a few miles of the Intercolonial Railway.

The Liberals felt that since the "Tories" did not refute their arguments about the financial condition of Nova Scotia the Conservatives should support them in the logical step towards Repeal. Many

Tories are willing to give up the contest because we have been refused. Not so the Liberal party ... We do not believe in submitting, at least until it has been demonstrated that the clear, emphatic and indignant voice of the whole people of Nova Scotia can accomplish nothing in the struggle to secure for this Province fair consideration ... Until the people have had an opportunity to make that protest and have refused to take advantage of it, we shall not believe that they are so wanting in spirit as to accept without resentment the injury and insult put upon them.²

1. CHRONICLE, May 26, 1886.
2. CHRONICLE, May 15, 1886.

The Nova Scotian Liberal party possessed a tradition of Repeal. Ever since Charles Tupper had "tricked" Nova Scotia into Confederation, the members of the Liberal party had defended the interests of Nova Scotia against the Dominion. They scorned all doubts that they could not obtain Repeal.

We are asked, will we get Repeal? We answer that if we secure the co-operation of the other Maritime Provinces we will get Repeal very quickly, and that even if we fail to secure their co-operation, the occurrences in the Mother Country today should encourage us to believe that a people resolved to be free will accomplish their purpose.¹

But if there were smaller hopes of Repeal than there are, it would nevertheless be the duty of the people of Nova Scotia to declare their wishes. It was only the improvement on the original confederation scheme secured by the anti-confederate and repeal parties that enabled the Province to exist in the Union. Already the Repeal movement has accomplished enough to justify it and to show the people that it is a power for good.²

The Conservatives admitted that there was dissatisfaction in Nova Scotia over financial conditions, but they wished to reach a satisfactory solution within the Union. They were utterly opposed to Repeal.

Adam Bell, the leader of the Conservative party, had boldly proclaimed the attitude of his party towards Repeal, and he rejoiced that the people would have the opportunity to settle the question. "I entirely and utterly favour the continuance of the political connection with the Dominion of Canada that we now have."³

He argued that the people had been influenced by the sentiment of forming part of a great country and a Dominion which extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and that they wanted to

1. W. E. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill for Ireland. See CHRONICLE, May 26, 1886, for a copy of cablegram sent by the Nova Scotian government expressing sympathy with efforts of Her Majesty's government to give self government to Ireland.
2. Fielding's manifesto, 1886.
3. Debates of N. S. Assembly, 1886, P 472.

remain part of Canada. He did not agree with his opponents that the material welfare of Nova Scotia was injured by being part of Canada.

There was a universal feeling among Nova Scotians in 1886 that the interests of the various provinces of the Dominion were entirely different - so dissimilar that fusion into one nationality was impossible. "The attempt to build up a Canadian nationality has been the most complete miscarriage that can be pointed to in the history of civilized communities ... It has been a waste of substance and resources, and Nova Scotia has suffered the most of all."¹

The Liberals in Nova Scotia claimed that the tariff was regulated for the benefit of Ontario, and that they were forced to buy from Ontario when their natural markets were in the United States

Since 1879 the Dominion government has levied one million dollars duty on imported flour ... since 1879 the Dominion government has levied one million dollars' duties on wheat.

These imported necessaries are mainly consumed in the Maritime Provinces, which, as consumers, have paid these unjust taxes on the means of existence.²

They also objected to the enormous debt of two hundred and eighty million dollars which the Dominion had contracted. Their objections were directed towards the fact that Nova Scotia did not receive her fair share of the money spent on public works.

By the increase of our tariff, we (Nova Scotia) are now contributing to the revenue, on our present consumption, \$4,000,000.00 annually ... That, for this enormous debt and annual contribution to the Dominion treasury, we have never received adequate expenditures or compensation.³

They asserted that the government at Ottawa had expended millions on the C. P. R., on a line to Maine, and on a drydock in

1. CHRONICLE, May 10, 1886.
2. CHRONICLE, June 4, 1886.
3. CHRONICLE, May 29, 1886, "Electors of N. S."

British Columbia, while Nova Scotia received nothing, - her own railways remained unbuilt, and her sons and daughters emigrated to the United States. Many Nova Scotians, and certainly all who wanted Repeal, felt that the taxes contributed by Nova Scotians should be spent in Nova Scotia.

The amount of actual taxation taken directly out of our pockets by customs and excise duties, has increased since the Tories assumed the reins of power by nearly \$10,000,000. Nova Scotia's portion of this gain is certainly not less than \$1,000,000. Will anyone be kind enough to inform the public of Nova Scotia in what respect they are today in the slightest degree the better off for this enormous addition to their yearly burdens? ¹

The CHRONICLE stated that this money had been spent on the Pacific Railway, on subsidies for newspapers, for paying the sons-in-law, partners, and friends of ministerial supporters in Parliament - not on public works in Nova Scotia. One election slogan was "Millions for Corruption, not a cent for Nova Scotia!"

The advocates of Repeal expressed disapproval of the Dominion policy of public works, railways, fisheries, reciprocity with the United States, and the regulation of the tariff. They desired Repeal so that Nova Scotia could again control these matters herself, and not have her interests overshadowed or neglected for the benefit of Canada as a whole. Another important demand was for Nova Scotia to have full control of her revenues. It was galling for the Province to be in financial difficulties while millions poured from Nova Scotia into the Dominion treasury.

If we had continued since 1867, as we did previous to that time, to pay the taxes levied within the province into the Provincial Treasury, every necessary railway in the country would have been constructed by now, and the road and bridge service, and public works would be in a better state. ²

1. CHRONICLE, June 3, 1886.
2. CHRONICLE, May 18, 1886.

The Repealers claimed that if Nova Scotia had been able to expend the taxes raised in the Province among the people of the Province, and if she had been able to regulate her tariff for her own benefit without regard to Ontario, then business would have been booming instead of depressed.

Nova Scotians looked back to the days before Confederation - the Golden Age - and they saw prosperity and low taxes instead of hard times and high taxes. Naturally they desired to return to the Golden Age.

We thrived before we endured the exactions of the Canucks, we shall thrive when we are once again free from these exactions. Give us free control of our revenues, and we can hold our own without difficulty.¹

They insisted that the campaign for Repeal had already achieved some success in that it had forced the Dominion to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Cape Breton.² Repeal would mean that Nova Scotia would leave Confederation, assume a debt of seventeen millions, pay the interest and conduct her services on the present scale, and still have a surplus of half a million dollars at the present rate of taxation. Then Nova Scotia would be free to regulate her tariff, free to obtain reciprocity with the United States, and free at last from the domination of Canada.

The Conservative party in Nova Scotia violently opposed the Liberals' demand for Repeal. Their party, led by Premier Charles Tupper, had been responsible for bringing Nova Scotia into the Union, in spite of the opposition of the Anti-Confederates or Repealers, who later became the Liberal party. The Conservatives

1. CHRONICLE, May 18, 1866.

2. CHRONICLE, May 10, 1866, and Fielding's Manifesto.

agreed with the arguments of the Liberals as to the necessity for Better Terms, while they refused to admit that there was cause for Repeal. They believed that Nova Scotia should remain part of the Dominion of Canada, and that a solution for all problems could be found within the Union. They said that Nova Scotia possessed a constitutional remedy against discontent, for she could always elect twenty-one men to the Dominion Parliament who would be determined to see that Nova Scotia obtained her rights. However, the Liberals thought that Nova Scotia's difficulties could only be settled by Repeal.

Better Terms is not what we are fighting for. We want separation pure and simple. Better Terms simply means a new financial deal all round, and then, as we are the largest consumers, we pay the largest proportion of any readjustment. ¹

At first the Conservatives believed that the Liberals were not serious in their demand for Repeal. This was merely an election cry sponsored by the "Grits" in the vain hope of success. "The Repeal cry was a mockery, delusion, and a great fraud to boot." ² Later they became convinced that the "Grit" leaders wanted Repeal and secession from Canada. Thus all loyal men were urged to vote against the "Repeal and Ruin Army" led by General Fielding and Major-General LeBlanc.

We appeal to all patriotic and Christian men in the ranks of our opponents to ponder well the position they are about to assume. This is no ordinary party contest. This is an attempt to dismember the country ... let no appeals to your party loyalty delude you. Party loyalty to Edward Blake does not require you to support every shyster and traitor who calls himself by your party name. But even if it did, do you not owe something more to your country than to your party? ³

1. CHRONICLE, June 2, 1886.
2. HERALD, May 29, 1886.
3. HERALD, June 3, 1886.

The editor of the MORNING HERALD deplored Secession because it would mean the dismemberment of Nova Scotia, for example Cape Breton would secede from the province. Further, it would mean the closing of all important factories, like the sugar refineries and cotton factories, because of the withdrawal of Canadian capital. Double tariff walls would be erected with the loss of free access to the Canadian markets. After Secession, Saint John would become the great Dominion port, and the terminus of the railway, while Nova Scotia would be forced to make different postal arrangements, and part of her railways would be managed locally, others by the Dominion.¹

As many of the Liberals' arguments for Repeal were based on their hatred of the National Policy of protection by high tariffs, the Conservatives repeated a few arguments similar to those advanced in 1878 and 1882 when they had successfully defended the National Policy, proving that Nova Scotia benefited from the National Policy. "Flour was \$10.00 per barrel in 1866 and only \$5.00 in 1886 - two barrels today for one in 1866. Vote against Repeal, as it will make flour dear."² The journalists who supported the Conservative party devoted much space to statistics which attempted to prove that Nova Scotia had prospered since Confederation.

The main charge levelled against the Secessionists by the Conservatives was that of disloyalty and dismemberment. This was an accusation of disloyalty to Great Britain and the British

1. HERALD, June 10, 1886.

2. HERALD, June 14, 1886.

Empire - not of treason to Canada. Neither party seemed to have felt any loyalty to the Dominion of Canada although a few Conservatives had pointed with pride to the rapid expansion of the Dominion to the Pacific, to the rapid development of the North West, and to the Intercolonial and the Pacific Railways. The people of Nova Scotia reserved their patriotism and deepest loyalty for their own province and for Great Britain.

The Conservatives argued that the Secession of Nova Scotia from Canada would lower the prestige of the Empire, and weaken Great Britain by weakening one of her dependencies. One of their most prominent objections to Repeal was that Secession would mean commercial union with the United States or even annexation!

Repeal, pure and simple, is a square issue that we are content to fight on its own merits; repeal as a preliminary to annexation is a different thing and not to be fought on the same lines at all. It then becomes a question of treason and disloyalty. ¹

The Liberals protested that the local government was not disloyal. "Are the government disloyal to their sovereign because they announce their intention of trying to arrest Nova Scotia in its downward march to desolation?" ² They repeated that Confederation and the National Policy had ruined Nova Scotia's great commerce with the world. Why was it disloyal to endeavour to teach Nova Scotians that there was a better and more profitable system of trade laws? It would be impossible for the Liberals to dismember the Dominion as the "Tories" were doing then because the Dominion was already dismembered, as far as nature, race differences, provincial jealousies, and bad government could dismember it.

1. HERALD, May 19, 1886.

2. CHRONICLE, May 15, 1886.

There can be no dismemberment where there is no unity. It will not in any way injure the Empire by our withdrawing from the Confederation. On the contrary, by giving renewed life and prosperity to the province, Repeal will add to the stability and permanence of the British connection.¹

Some of the members who supported the Liberal party really wanted Repeal, and desired to be freed from the domination of Canada. A few may have wanted annexation with the United States. Others favoured reciprocity with their great neighbour, but were against closer relations. Many Nova Scotians cherished a sentimental desire to return to 1866 - when Nova Scotia was wealthy and powerful - and they had conceived the idea that Repeal would achieve their dream. Other men, Liberals and Conservatives, saw the cry for Repeal only as a weapon to force the Dominion government to grant Nova Scotia better financial terms.

The Conservatives reiterated their arguments that the demand for Repeal might lead to rebellion or to a demand for annexation to the United States, and as such it should be deplored. They opposed Secession because it meant dismemberment both of Canada and Nova Scotia, and ruination to its people, but they failed to counteract Premier Fielding's statement of the Liberal policy by a strong platform of their own. They merely criticized various minor subjects and attacked the Liberal leader, characterizing him as "Incompetent, Negligent, and Corrupt."²

1. CHRONICLE, June 9, 1886.
2. HERALD, May 27, 1886.

On June 16, 1886, the MORNING CHRONICLE announced the victory of the Liberal party in these headlines:

A WATERLOO

The Tory Party Crushed

REPEAL WINS

The Liberal Majority Increased

A Splendid Triumph

All the Liberals rejoiced because the people of Nova Scotia had given overwhelming support to the cause of Repeal and to the government. They had won a triumph greater than any since the clean sweep of 1867. Twenty-nine Liberals, one Independent pledged to support Repeal, and eight Conservatives had been elected. The government majority had been almost doubled. It was a complete and overwhelming defeat for the Conservatives, who were reduced to a veritable "corporal's guard."

The vindication of the local government is as complete and overpowering as could possibly be desired ... There can be no mistake in the voice with which Nova Scotia had declared that she must have justice done to her or be allowed to withdraw from the Confederation. It will be impossible to resist a demand so backed up ... If the Dominion government and Parliament should still persist in turning a deaf ear to our remonstrances we may rest assured that our case will not meet a similar reception by the Imperial House of Commons and the Imperial Government.¹

The Conservatives acknowledged their defeat, but explained their failure as due, first, to the fact that the "Grits"

1. CHRONICLE, June 16, 1886.

possessed an enormous corruption fund; and, second, that the campaign had been too short for an adequate canvass of the constituencies; and, third, the absence of the fishermen caused the loss of a large number of votes for their party.

The Liberals replied that the people had re-endorsed the local government's excellent record of administration, and that the people had given an unqualified verdict for Repeal. They declared that the Liberal party had no corruption fund although everyone knew that the "Tories" had used a large sum for bribery, and that each party had suffered equally from the shortness of the campaign, while the fishing districts had voted solidly for Repeal.

The Liberal party had been returned to power because it possessed a very able and skilful leader in W. S. Fielding. It also had an excellent record of administration, and a united party with a good organization and able members, backed by strong newspaper support. Above all, the people of Nova Scotia wanted Repeal. They had seized on Repeal as the solution for the depression and the financial difficulties of the province, and as a reassertion of their intense love and pride in Nova Scotia as their native land - which would now be free of the domination of Canada.

The Conservatives had suffered defeat because Adam Bell was not as able a leader as the Premier, although he was liked and respected. They possessed no constructive policy, nor could they point with pride to their achievements in the Legislature.

The Conservative candidates seemed to be weaker men in character, influence, and political experience. Many people felt that it would be impossible to form an efficient government from the Conservative party. Lastly, the people wanted Repeal because they had many grievances against the Dominion. The Conservatives opposed Repeal, and were defeated on this issue.

2.

The Hon. Mr. Fielding and other prominent Liberals thought that the Repeal movement would be greatly strengthened if Nova Scotia could elect a majority of Repealers to the House of Commons in the next Dominion election. They claimed that it would be impossible for the government of Nova Scotia to achieve Repeal while a majority of the elected representatives of the Province at Ottawa were ardently opposed to Repeal. In the event of an appeal to England by the local Assembly, Nova Scotia's Dominion representatives would send a counter appeal, claiming that they were as well entitled to speak for the Province as the local members. Accordingly the Liberal leaders in Nova Scotia and the Liberal press of the province exhorted the people to strike for Repeal and to vote for the Liberal party in the Dominion election.¹

Instead of taking definite steps towards Repeal, the Fielding government concentrated their efforts on defeating the Conservatives in the Dominion election which was to be on February 22nd, 1887. Although the rest of Canada was concerned over the North-West Rebellion and Riel, and with the National Policy, in Nova Scotia Repeal alone was important.

Without a decisive and overwhelming vote now for repeal, the great victory of last summer will amount to nothing. Every man who voted for repeal then is bound by every obligation that can have influence upon an intelligent, consistent, and patriotic citizen, to repeat it now, and not only that, but to exercise all legitimate influences to persuade

1. CHRONICLE, June 4, 1886; NOVA SCOTIAN, February 19, 1887, P 1.

his neighbour to do the same ... Let the victory of February 22nd be a perfect Waterloo for Tupper and his fellow conspirators. ¹

Both parties repeated the Repeal arguments of the June election. ² The Conservatives tried to undermine the Liberals by taunts that the Liberals had done nothing to secure "secesh", and by statements that a reaction had taken place in the popular demand for Repeal. They insisted that the voters must defeat the Liberal candidates and destroy Repeal forever.

If this province today elects a majority of members favourable to union, especially if it elects a majority of men pledged to maintain the union, the result can hardly fail to be the quietus of the foolish movement in favour of repeal ... Certainly, all well wishers of this country should unite then, to secure such a result; for no reasonable man can entertain a doubt of the futile and harmful nature of that agitation. ³

The MORNING HERALD printed many statistics to prove that Nova Scotia had prospered under Confederation and reiterated the arguments advanced in June. They declared that Canada's fiscal policy was no concern of the province of Nova Scotia, and that the majority of the Nova Scotian representatives in the federal parliament had always supported the Dominion's policies. They agreed that the province needed more money for roads and bridges, but that this was no reason for Repeal. They said that Nova Scotia was far better off with her share of federal public works and her trade with the other provinces as part of the Dominion of Canada than she would be in isolation, particularly as Repeal might lead to annexation with the United States.

1. NOVA SCOTIAN, February 19, 1887, P 2.
2. HERALD, January 20, 1887; C. H. Cahan's letter; also ACADIAN RECORDER, January 25, 1887.
3. HERALD, February 22, 1887.

The question of the National Policy was still important in the election campaign of 1887, but it was used chiefly to support pro and con arguments on Repeal. The Conservatives repeated many arguments advanced in 1882 to prove that Nova Scotia had thrived under the National Policy, while the Liberals quoted their arguments to the contrary which they had expressed in 1878 and 1882. The Conservatives asked why Nova Scotians should wish to leave Confederation and the blessings of the National Policy. Their opponents tried to show that the National Policy had ruined Nova Scotia, and inferred that all Nova Scotians should support Repeal and escape the curse of National Policy.

The subject of corruption figured largely in the election campaign waged by the Liberals because they feared that bribery and corrupt election promises might cause their defeat. The editor of the ACADIAN RECORDER (J. W. Longley) in particular, made a desperate attempt to convince the electors that the country would be ruined by "Tory" extravagance and corruption. ¹

The Conservative party appealed to the people to vote for them because they opposed Repeal, and because they supported the National Policy which had brought prosperity to the Dominion, and on their record. They stated that the government, of which Sir John A. Macdonald was the honored head, should receive credit from honest and patriotic voters because it had accomplished the consolidation of British North America, the successful completion of the Pacific Railway, the adoption of a national policy for the protection of Canadian industries, the enlargement of canals,

1. RECORDER, January 3, 17, February 8, 1887.

erection of public buildings and lighthouses, the granting of "Better Terms" to the provinces, and the development of the North-West. In regard to the peculiar interests of Nova Scotia the present federal government had not been negligent. It had been responsible for granting the province about four million dollars of Better Terms since 1867, and for constructing the Intercolonial and aiding various short lines in the province, and had provided coast services, public works, and the erection of a grain elevator at Halifax.¹

The Liberals asserted that they intended to carry out the following programme if elected:

To reform the senate; to check the increase of the public debt; to reduce the expenditure; to guard provincial rights; to make an honest effort to secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States; to obtain for Canada the right to negotiate her own treaties; to protect the public domain from plunder; and to give to the public (and not to the boodle supporters of a boodle government, as is the case now) the profit arising from public property; to restore to the provinces the control of the franchise; to frame a land policy in the Northwest favourable to the settler; and to debar ministers of the crown and members of parliament from receiving subsidies and money grants from the government on any pretext or in any shape whatever.²

They warned the people that since there was no longer a large surplus, but a deficit instead, it was clear that a high scale of taxation must be retained, and so manufacturers would not be deprived of any incidental protection provided by a high tariff.

On February 22nd Sir John A. Macdonald won his fifth election as Premier of Canada. In Nova Scotia the Conservatives had fourteen supporters and the Liberals seven, the same as in 1882.

1. HERALD, January 18, 1887.
2. HERALD, February 4, 1887, reprinted from the CHRONICLE; see also RECORDER February 17, 1887, P 2, Col. 5.

3.

The Liberals had won a sweeping victory in June, but were defeated in the Dominion contest in February. Why?

The Conservatives claimed that a reaction had taken place in the people's opinion about Repeal, and that Nova Scotians had decided against Repeal.

Many Liberals, including Premier Fielding, concluded that the people had been eminently satisfied with the good administration of the local Liberal government, and therefore had voted for it. Repeal had only increased the Liberal majority, instead of causing the majority as everyone first believed.

The feeling for Repeal had lost some of its fervour between June and February as there was no official action towards Repeal which would have tended to retain public interest.

The Conservatives won the Dominion election because they were already in power and were superlatively organized, and also were aided by the manufacturers who flourished under the National Policy. The Liberals were over-confident because of the June victory, while the Conservatives exerted themselves to the utmost to avoid a second defeat. Although there was considerable Repeal feeling it did not possess enough influence to offset the weakness of the Liberals, the energy and organization of the Conservative party, the immense patronage wielded by the Dominion Government, and the tremendous personal popularity of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper.

CHAPTER III

SECTION II

Domestic Legislation, 1886 - 1890

In the twenty-ninth Assembly the Liberal government possessed such a large majority that they could enact a large and useful body of legislation with scarcely any opposition. This enabled individual members of the Liberal party to express their personal views, and to vote against the government without fear of causing their party's defeat. As the Conservatives could not offer any effective opposition they usually supported government measures. Very little time was occupied with party disputes. The chief subjects of discussion were Repeal, Quebec Resolutions, Abolition of the Legislative Council, Education, Road Bills, and Finance.

The government had been reconstructed before the June election. The Hon. Alonzo White, Attorney-General, had retired to be appointed Registrar of Deeds in Halifax. Hon. Isidore LeBlanc resigned, later to become a member of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. W. S. Fielding continued to guide the destiny of his native province as Premier and Provincial Secretary; C. E. Church remained as Commissioner of Public Works and Mines; J. W. Longley (Annapolis) was appointed Attorney-General; the members without portfolio were Thomas Morrison (Colchester) M.L.C.; Thomas Johnson (Shelburne); Angus McGillivray (Antigonish) former Speaker of the Assembly; and Daniel McNeil, (Inverness).¹

With the exception of Mr. Morrison's portfolio, vacated by his death, this Executive remained unchanged during the term of the twenty-ninth Assembly. First John D. McLeod, M. L. C.,

1. MORNING HERALD, May 31st, 1886.

replaced Mr. Morrison, but later D. C. Fraser, New Glasgow, who had been appointed to the Legislative Council in 1888, became the government's spokesman in the Council, and the Council's representative in the Cabinet.

The Liberal party possessed an overwhelming majority in the Assembly because there were twenty-nine Liberals, eight Conservatives, and one Independent, Dr. John L. Bethune, from Victoria, pledged to Repeal. The strength of the respective parties remained the same in the various by-elections.¹

The Opposition was extremely weak. Not only were they hopelessly outnumbered by the Liberals, but they had suffered a severe loss in the resignation of their leader, Adam C. Bell, who had been elected to the federal parliament. When the House met on March 10, 1887, the only Conservative with previous experience in the Assembly was Dr. Charles Munro (Pictou) and he admitted that he was no parliamentarian. In the debate on the Speech from the Throne Dr. Munro declared that he felt himself incapable of leading an opposition, and asked that the debate be adjourned to allow the Conservatives to retire to select a foe worthy of government steel. Dr. William McKay (Cape Breton) was duly elected Opposition leader.

This weakness and inexperience of the Conservatives meant that they offered virtually no opposition to the government policy. All the members of the Assembly discussed each question on its own merits, gave their reasons for supporting it, and

1. Jason M. Mack (L, Queens Co.) resigned eventually to go to the Council, and was replaced by A. M. Hemeon (L); Adam C. Bell (C, Pictou) resigned and was succeeded by William Cameron (C); and George A. Ross (L, Lunenburg) was replaced by John Drew Sperry, Liberal.

stated their objections. There were very few divisions. Debates were much shorter than in the previous Assembly. The Conservatives supported government bills such as Miners' Relief Societies, Municipal Assessment, Towns' Incorporation, Imprisonment for Debt, Road Bill of 1889, and the Health Bill. They opposed the Liberal policy on the question of Repeal, the Quebec Resolutions, the Road Bill of 1890, and the restriction of the Education grant. Not until 1890 did the Opposition really fight the government on all its proposals and argue over minor details with considerable bitterness and partizan feeling.

Dr. Bethune used his position as an Independent to criticize government bills though he generally supported Fielding. In the session of 1890 he opposed the government, and became the Conservative candidate for Victoria in the election of that year.

Since Repeal had occupied such a prominent place in the election campaign of 1886 one would expect the subject to be of first importance in the measures promised for discussion in the Speech from the Throne. However, the word Repeal was not mentioned in the Speech and its absence was commented upon.

Although the Legislature met on March 10, 1887, the debate on Repeal did not begin until April 21st. Premier Fielding moved a series of resolutions which reviewed the causes of the Repeal movement and concluded:

That at the said general election for the house of commons in February, 1887, the province of Nova Scotia returned a majority of members opposed to the policy of separation from the Dominion. That in view of such recent action by the people of the province, an application to the imperial government and parliament for the release of Nova Scotia from the Canadian confederation could not be favourably

received by the imperial authorities, and it is at present inexpedient to make such application;

That this house strongly reaffirms the declaration of the last house, that Nova Scotia suffers great disadvantages in the union, and declares its opinion that unless a material change takes place in financial affairs and commercial relations, whereby the position of the province is improved, the discontent in Nova Scotia will continue and increase, and it will be necessary to again submit the question of separation from Canada to the people of this province for their decision. 1

Mr. Fielding related the history of Repeal in Nova Scotia, and analyzed the difference in the results of the June and February elections. "It almost seems as if the people had not clear and definite views in the matter." 2

He explained why the government had not taken definite action to obtain Repeal by sending a delegation to England immediately following the June election, by reminding the members that first the government were to approach the governments of the maritime provinces and endeavour to bring about a Maritime Union. Unofficially he had ascertained that neither the government of Prince Edward Island nor of New Brunswick was favourable to Repeal, and that they would give an emphatic refusal. The Executive of Nova Scotia had decided to wait until the meeting of the Legislatures of those provinces when they hoped that those private members who wanted Repeal could influence the governments of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick to give a favourable response.

The Premier stated that the Nova Scotian government had refrained from sending a delegation to England until the province's representatives at Ottawa were in favour of Repeal, because if they had sent such a delegation the federal members would

1. Debates and Proceedings of the House of Assembly, 1887, P 250.
2. Debates of N. S. Assembly, 1887, P 254.

have sent a counter delegation declaring that the people of Nova Scotia did not want Repeal. In addition, he said that Mr. Gladstone had been replaced by Lord Salisbury, who was known to be hostile to Home Rule in Ireland and to Repeal in Canada; and the Earl of Carnarvon, who had been instrumental in passing the British North America Act, occupied a prominent position in the cabinet. It would have been folly to demand from this Imperial government the right for Nova Scotia to go out of the Union because that request would have been met by a prompt refusal, and it might have been fatal to the cause of Repeal.¹

But it was not this probable hostility of the Imperial government that was most fatal to Repeal at this time, according to Mr. Fielding, because the views of the government and parliament of Great Britain had been known to change from time to time. The people of Nova Scotia themselves had raised an insurmountable obstacle to Repeal in the February elections:

In the face of that fact for this government to send a delegation to England would, in my judgment, be something that would not command the confidence and respect of the people of Nova Scotia.²

The Premier thought that for the present Nova Scotia must remain in Confederation, but he was convinced that the Province was not receiving fair play and that there must be some change.

I have felt, since the February elections, that the hands of the government were tied ... I am persuaded that our true policy is to tell the people of Nova Scotia that they had the matter in their own hands, that they had a glorious opportunity of asserting their desires on this question, and of placing themselves in a fair position to secure the accomplishment of those desires, that they lost that opportunity, and that, until they are prepared to take up the question again

1. Debates, 1887, P 286.
2. Ibid, P 254.

with greater firmness, and repair the damages of the February election, this repeal movement can have no reasonable hope of success. ¹

The debate on Repeal dragged on until April 27th, each member protesting that he had not intended to speak, but since the House considered that the matter should be discussed he would give his opinion. ²

Various Liberals, notably James Fraser (Guysborough), Otto Weeks (Guysborough), William F. MacCoy (Shelburne), George Ross (Lunenburg) and Jeffry McColl (Pictou), expressed their dissatisfaction with the government's resolutions because they wanted to continue the agitation for Repeal. George Ross said: "It seems to me that the government are disposed to let this question die. It is my belief that it is one of the causes that are worthy of being kept alive and bravely fought for." ³

Otto Weeks discussed the resolutions with a deep and sincere feeling of "disappointment that after three years of agitation we seem to be no whit nearer the fruition of our hopes than when that agitation began." ⁴ He criticized the government for not taking definite action to obtain Repeal before the Dominion elections, although he admitted that another provincial election or a delegation to England, or a plebiscite would not obtain Repeal.

In the evening session of April 22nd, Jeffry McColl moved an amendment to the Premier's resolutions which declared for annexation to the United States:

1. Debates, 1887, P 254 - 255.
2. Ibid, P 250 - 352.
3. Ibid, P 257.
4. Ibid, P 352.

That this house, after using all possible efforts to keep the expenditure of this province within the receipts, and failing in that, the whole matter should be submitted to the people with a view to a repeal of the union, and as a first step to asking the government of the United States to admit us as a state of the union, which is no doubt our ultimate commercial destination. ¹

Mr. David Hearn (C, Richmond) seconded this amendment for the purpose of securing a discussion on the matter, although he always hoped to live under the aegis of the British crown. The members refused to discuss Mr. McColl's resolution, and the amendment was defeated without debate by a vote of one to twenty-six.

The Conservatives did not speak on Repeal until the last day of the debate although they were frequently urged to do so by their opponents because they refused to fight the Repeal resolutions seriously, and by doing so lend dignity to a farce. ²

On April 27th, Dr. W. McKay (C, Cape Breton), the Leader of the Opposition reviewed the history of Confederation, and repeated all the previous arguments of the Conservatives which attempted to prove that Nova Scotia had prospered in the Union. He accused the Liberals of fostering the Repeal agitation for the purpose of winning the election. Dr. McKay moved a resolution which declared that the continuance of the Repeal agitation was inexpedient and unwise, and should not be continued; and which affirmed the right of the province to claim amelioration of its financial condition by constitutional means. ³

In seconding Dr. McKay's resolution Frank Andrews (C, Annapolis) admitted that Nova Scotia had not prospered since

1. Debates, 1887, P 257B.
2. Ibid, P 337.
3. Ibid, P 324 - 325.

Confederation, but he stated that Confederation could not be blamed for the changes in the mechanical and industrial world which were adverse to Nova Scotia. He said that the Liberals did not care for the truth that the province had been ruined by the industrial revolution, not by Union, but only wanted to make the people dissatisfied and to vote for them.

Suppose, if instead of all these lamentations they (the Liberals) told the people that we possess a country rich in mineral resources, rich in the wealth of our forests and fisheries, that we enjoy as great an amount of civil, religious, and political liberty as any people under heaven. Let the hon. gentlemen opposite pursue such a course as that and there will be less of an exodus, less dissatisfaction, and the people will be more loyal to the country and more patriotic in every respect. ¹

The vote on the Repeal Resolutions was the first trial of the strength of the respective parties. Dr. McKay's amendment was defeated by the Liberals on a vote of five for and twenty-seven against. Mr. Fielding's resolution was passed by a vote of twenty-four in the affirmative and eight in the negative. All the Liberals, with the exception of T. R. Black (Cumberland) who was a strong advocate of maritime union, voted for the resolutions, and all the Conservatives voted against them. ²

The importance of Repeal had diminished by 1888. It was discussed indirectly in the guise of the Quebec Resolutions and Reciprocity with the United States. All the members tacitly admitted that if the condition of Nova Scotia was improved in the way suggested by the Quebec Resolutions that the Repeal agitation would cease.

The hope of benefits to be derived from the financial readjustment proposed by the Quebec Resolutions, and from reci-

1. Debates, 1887, P 337, also P 250-260, 274-291, 344-370.

2. JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY OF N.S., 1887. P 123-125.

procuity with the United States gradually removed the Repeal agitation.¹ In 1889 the subject of Repeal was superseded by the perennial question of Better Terms. On April 15th, William Roche Jr. (L, Halifax) moved a resolution to obtain an increase in the provincial subsidy. This demand had the concurrence of both parties, but the debate was never concluded on account of the lateness of the session.

The Repeal movement therefore had passed out of practical politics by 1890, and was not an issue in the election of that year. The matter was revived only when the Conservatives taunted Mr. Fielding for his failure to obtain Repeal, and he defended his action, and declared that Repeal was dead. The most ardent Repealers were defeated in 1890.

The Quebec Conference had been held in October, 1887, at the invitation of Premier Mercier to discuss proposed amendments to the British North America Act. Only the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba participated in the Conference.²

The results of this Conference were embodied in a series of resolutions which Mr. Fielding submitted to the Assembly for their approval on March 22, 1888. The most important amend-

1. Debates, 1888, P 381-384.

On April 13th, 1888, the Assembly discussed a proposal for Reciprocal Trade with the United States made by Mr. Longley, and a resolution for Repeal and Reciprocity made by William Roche. The members expressed the feeling that if reciprocity could be achieved between Canada and the United States they would be satisfied to remain a part of the Dominion, because reciprocity would restore Nova Scotia's prosperity. If Canada did not obtain reciprocity, they wished to leave the Union, and obtain reciprocity as a separate colony.

2. The delegates from Nova Scotia were Premier W. S. Fielding, Attorney-General J. W. Longley, and Hon. Angus McGillivray.

ment referred to the financial relations between the Dominion and the Provinces. It provided for an increased allowance to the provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, and for the sum of eighty cents per head to be paid until the population of the province reached 2,500,000, and sixty cents per head for so much of the population as might exceed that number. This arrangement would give Nova Scotia a subsidy of \$542,457.60 - an increase of \$162,457.60 over her present subsidy.

Mr. Fielding asked that an Address be prepared to submit the Quebec resolutions to the Governor-General, and closed with a plea for all to consider the matters in a non-partisan spirit as a means of maintaining and improving the stability and welfare of the Dominion.

No one rose to reply to the Premier's remarks. The House sat in silence. The Quebec resolutions were adopted without debate by a vote of twenty-two to eleven.¹ The Liberals, with the exception of Ross, McColl, and Lawrence, who objected to some minor details, voted for the resolutions. The Conservatives and Dr. Bethune voted against them without discussion. It seems that the Conservatives thought that some of the proposed amendments, such as appointments to the senate by the province, and the use of provincial electoral lists, would limit the power of the federal government, and accordingly opposed it as the Conservative party favoured a strong Dominion government.

1. Debates, 1888, P 209; also P 189 et seq.; and HERALD, March 23, 28, and 30, 1888.

They also opposed increasing the federal taxes so that the Fielding regime would have larger sums to spend, most probably on corruption.

On March 27th, after a short debate, the Legislative Council defeated the Quebec Resolutions by a vote of four to twelve. The members of the Legislative Council, regardless of their party affiliation, objected to the Quebec Resolutions because one amendment proposed to give the Assembly the power of abolishing the Council by an Address to Her Majesty if the Address was concurred in by at least two-thirds of the members of the Assembly. Naturally, the members of the Council refused to assent to giving the Assembly such power.

During his first term of office Premier Fielding had been fortunate in having the co-operation of the Legislative Council. From 1886 to 1890 this harmony was disturbed because he had decided on the abolition of the Council. The Councillors' resentment of this suggestion made them extremely critical of all work of the Assembly. Although they asserted their right of veto in only a few instances, such as the Quebec Resolutions and the legislation re Imprisonment for debt,¹ the bills proposed by the

1. William F. MacCoy (L, Shelburne) had introduced a bill in 1883 and in successive sessions to remedy the evils of Nova Scotia's debt law which permitted any creditor to have a debtor arrested. He aroused sufficient interest in the subject to have the government introduce a bill to abolish Imprisonment for Debt as a government measure in 1888. This bill afforded ample protection for creditors to collect their debts, and received unanimous support from the Assembly. It was defeated by the Council in 1888 because of insufficient statistics, and in 1889 it was laid over by the Council because of the lateness of the session, and finally became law in 1890. Debates, 1888, P 52.

Assembly suffered many amendments. For instance, the Town Corporation Act of 1888 received one hundred and forty-eight amendments in the Council. ¹

On April 28th, 1887, the Premier moved a resolution, which passed unanimously, for a conference with the Legislative Council, to consider its abolition. The Council declined the conference.

The next year the Premier introduced a bill which provided that at the dissolution of the present Assembly, the Legislative Council should be abolished. He expressed his regret that this abolition was necessary because many of its members were his personal and political friends. Although an important saving would thus be made, he was convinced that the people wanted the abolition of the Council. "The country feels today that it does not need a second chamber." ²

Contrary to Mr. Fielding's expectations, a long debate ensued over the subject of abolition. Frank Andrews (C, Annapolis) and David Hearn (C, Richmond) expressed their approval, and Dr. McKay promised that the Opposition would consider it on non-party grounds. The bill passed the Assembly by a vote of thirty-one to four, Otto Weeks, (L, Guysborough), William Roche (L, Halifax),

1. This bill, sponsored by Attorney-General Longley in 1888, provided a uniform machinery by which all towns desiring incorporation could be incorporated without obtaining a special charter from the Legislature, and was unanimously assented to by the Assembly. The Council made many amendments, in particular providing exactly for tax assessment while the Assembly intended the provisions of the Municipal Assessment Act to apply. Many members of the Assembly protested angrily at the Council's action, but at last agreed with Premier Fielding that the bill was too important to be lost, and accepted the amendments.

See Debates, 1888, P 48, 67, 214, 226, 377.

2. Debates, 1888, P 167.

James Fraser (L, Guysborough), and John McNeill (L, Digby) voting against it because they had decided that the Council was a very useful body and there was no burning desire on the part of the people to abolish it. The remaining Liberals and all the Conservatives voted for it. The supporters of its abolition believed that the people wanted the Council abolished, and that both parties were committed to obtain this.

The Legislative Council considered the bill for its abolition on March 28, 1888. Hon. D. C. Fraser made a vigorous speech in which the arguments of previous debates were repeated. Finally, Mr. Baker moved that the bill be deferred for three months. The measure for the Abolition of the Council was defeated by a vote of eleven to eight and the amendment carried.¹

Late in the session of 1890 Premier Fielding introduced a bill similar to one of 1888 and which provided for the abolition of the Council at the end of the current parliamentary term. The members adopted this bill unanimously without a debate.²

1. CHRONICLE, March 29, 1888.

Vote for Abolition of Council:

Ray (L), LeBlanc (L), Dodge (L), McNeil (L) Fraser (L),

Parker (C), Owen (C), Black (C) - 8

Against - Oakes (L), Baker (L), Locke (C), Whitman (C),

Goudge (L) Butler (L), Creelman (C), McKinnon (C),

Francheville (L), McCurdy (L), Boak (L) - 11

Ray, LeBlanc, Dodge, McNeil, Fraser, Goudge, Owen, Black, Locke, and Whitman were all pledged to vote for abolition.

Creelman and Whitman had previously voted for abolition while the Conservatives were in power, but now felt that the Council was needed to revise bills. Goudge was pledged to abolition, but he thought that an infringement of privilege of the Council had been committed in the manner of bringing the bill before the Council. Butler, Boak, Francheville, McCurdy, Oakes, and Baker had always opposed abolition.

2. CHRONICLE, April 19, 1890, P 4, Col. 1 for Debates of April 11th.

This bill was left on the table in the Council from April 12th till April 14th when a sharp altercation arose among the members as to whether the bill should be sent to the Committee on Privileges for a report. Mr. Fraser, leader of the government in the Council, objected to sending the bill to a Committee because he preferred a debate in the Council to consideration in a Committee which was composed largely of members hostile to abolition. ¹

The Committee not only reported adversely on the bill, advising a three months' hoist, but declared that the introduction of the bill in the Assembly was an invasion of the rights and privileges of the Council, and that such bills should only originate in the Council. This report was adopted by a vote of thirteen to four. The seven Conservative members of the Council, who had all previously voted for its abolition, now voted against it. Only four Liberals - Murray, Mack, McNeill, and Fraser - voted for it. ²

The Conservatives had voted for abolition during the Holmes administration, regardless of their private opinions, to support their party's policy. Now they would not assist the Liberal government in the same policy unless they were convinced of the absolute necessity for abolition. They had decided that the Council was an extremely useful check on legislation, and that no saving would be made by abolishing it. The Liberal members in

1. The Committee on Privileges consisted of Goudge (L), Black (C), Francheville (L), Whitman (C), and McCurdy (L) - only Black had voted for abolition in 1888.
2. CHRONICLE debates, April 29, 1890, and editorial, April 24th.

the Council thought that a majority of the Assembly and the people were against its abolition, and that the Liberal government were making a great mistake. Murray, Mack, McNeill, Fraser, and Ray were willing to vote to abolish the Council in fulfilment of their pledge to do so.

There were no important railway debates, or changes in government policy towards railways from 1887 to 1890. This was a period of the construction of branch lines in various parts of the province, usually with the aid of a combined Dominion and Provincial subsidy. ¹

The great plan of 1886 for Western Railway Consolidation failed. In 1887 Lieutenant-Governor Richey explained that the promoters of the scheme had not succeeded in obtaining the necessary co-operation from the Dominion Government to enable them to carry out their arrangements. Later the Joint Stock Association terminated their contract. The Federal government assisted the Western Counties Railway and prepared to complete the missing link.

The Nova Scotian government made no further plans for the consolidation of the western railroads as they thought it would be inadvisable to use the public money for this purpose when the Dominion might take them over without compensation as

1. Four contracts were entered into under the Act of 1886 - (1) Maccan and Joggin for twelve miles; (2) the Springhill and Oxford line for fourteen miles; (3) the Stewiacke Valley and Lansdowne Railway Company for twenty-four miles; (4) Cornwallis Valley Railway for fourteen miles from Canning to Kentville. In 1890 the Nova Scotia Central Railway (the Nictaux and Atlantic line) was opened from Lunenburg to Middleton. See Debates, 1889, P 306, 341.

railroads for the general benefit of the country. There existed a considerable agitation for the Federal government to complete and consolidate these western lines as they had in the eastern part of the province so that all would enjoy the lower rates of the Intercolonial. ¹

Education continued to be of vital importance. In 1887 the subject under discussion was the curtailment of the Education Grant. The government expenditure on education was not fixed, but instead a certain grant was made to every teacher according to their grade of licence. The grant to teachers of common schools had increased from \$148,173.50 in 1880 - 81 to \$167,184.97 in 1885 - 86.

When Mr. Fielding moved the second reading of the bill which would restrict the education grants, he said that he "believe(d) there is a general agreement on this point, that we shall not go on increasing our educational grants, unless it is shewn that our revenues are to be increased in proportion." ²

The expenditure for common schools was fixed at \$82,000 for the winter term, and \$85,000 for the summer term, approximately the same total grant as in 1886, and the county academy grant at \$14,000 per year. This meant that if the members and teachers increased the amount of the government grant to each would be reduced.

1. Debates of the Council in CHRONICLE, 1890, April 25 and 27, P 1.
2. Debates, 1887, P 73.

Dr. McKay believed that education would be ruined if the grant were reduced and he moved the following resolution:

"Resolved, that it is not expedient that the present grants for common and academic schools be restricted, but that a greater economy be exercised in providing for the other public services of the province." ¹

After a long and vigorous debate, the first in the session of 1887, the government's bill to restrict the Education Grant was passed without a division. The Opposition leader's amendment had been defeated by a vote of eight to twenty-eight, the Conservatives and James A. Fraser (L) voting for it, and the Liberals against it. ²

The Liberals voted to restrict the Education Grant because they believed that this grant could not be permitted to increase as Nova Scotia had had a deficit of \$23,203.00 in 1886. The Education grant was already almost one-third of the total provincial revenue, and any further increase would be at the expense of the road service, which required more money. Premier Fielding had chosen the restriction of the grant to prevent another deficit, and he was loyally supported by his party in this decision. Some of the Liberal members expressed their regret that the grant had to be reduced, but all agreed to the bill, while some hoped that the sections would increase the salaries of the teachers by direct taxation when the government grant was decreased.

The Conservatives opposed the restriction of the Education Grant because they believed it would interfere with the

1. Debates, 1887, P 76.

2. JOURNAL OF N.S. ASSEMBLY, 1887, P 109. Fraser wanted the bill deferred, and he refused to vote for it because there were ten districts in Guysborough without schools.

province's education system. They thought that Nova Scotians should improve the teaching in their schools, and that this act would tend to discourage the teachers from improving their licenses. Frank Andrews (C, Annapolis) and David Hearn (C, Richmond) wanted the government to economize in other departments, and to cut the academy grants rather than the common school. 1

On March 3, 1890, Dr. Bethune (Victoria), who was now regarded as a Conservative by the Liberals, made a motion to repeal this act of 1887. He stated that he had previously assented to the limitation because the road service needed more money. He had discovered that while the teachers' grants had decreased the road grant had also been steadily reduced. He now wished to remove all restrictions on the Education Grant.

The ensuing debate, in which there were charges of extravagance and manoeuvring to catch votes, was not on education but on finance. The Liberals declared that the province did not have enough revenue to increase the Education Grant. There was no division on the motion because it was a money bill which could only be moved with the Crown's consent. Premier Fielding refused to muzzle the debate and permitted a frank discussion of grievances. 2

A grant of eight hundred dollars was made to the School of Art and Design as encouragement to technical education. An experimental farm was purchased in connection with the School of Agriculture at Truro. This school received steady support because it was expected to be of great benefit to farmers and to agriculture in general. 3

1. Debates, 1887, P 73, 91, 130, 381.
2. CHRONICLE, March 4, 6, 1890.
3. Debates, 1888, P 345, 389.

Schools had also been established for coal miners at Sydney Mines, Bridgeport, Springhill, Maccan, Stellarton, and several other places in the province. Seven instructors were employed. In March, 1889, seventy-five pupils were attending to study for the position of underground managers and overmen.¹

In 1890 the Legislature provided for the establishment of night schools. These were intended for mining centres for the benefit of miners who did not have sufficient common school instruction to attend the School for Miners. The bill provided that whenever twenty-five adults petitioned the Governor-in-Council to establish such a school a night school would be established, using the local school facilities.²

In the evening session of April 12, 1889, Premier Fielding introduced an act for Higher Education for the consideration of the country. He was unable to proceed with his proposals because of the financial position of the province. He argued that Nova Scotia should give some aid to college education, and he proposed that the province should award annually eight scholarships of two hundred dollars per annum for four years. The successful candidates would attend any of the provincial universities.³

Finance was of overwhelming importance in the years 1887 to 1890. The Hon. W. S. Fielding, as Provincial Secretary, had complete control of the finances of Nova Scotia. In view

1. CHRONICLE, March 12, 1889, P 4, Col. 2.
2. CHRONICLE, 1890, Editorial March 19, March 20, P 1, Col 3.
3. CHRONICLE, 1889, April 30; Col 4; Debates, 1889, P 423.

of the fact that Mr. Fielding became Finance Minister of the Dominion of Canada particular interest should be attached to his increasing skill at handling figures, his various devices to increase revenue and control expenditure, and to his ability to make a complex matter simple, and a simple matter complex, whichever suited his purpose.

In these years the Premier possessed no financial critic. The members of the Opposition confessed their inability to judge his financial measures, and offered only general criticisms, such as protests against the rapidly increasing debt. No member could begin to approach his knowledge of provincial finance or his command of figures.

In this period the same general tendencies were discernible as in the earlier and later years of the Fielding administration. The period was characterized by freer spending, but not extravagance, by the steady growth of both expenditure and revenue, and by the development of capital account.

Since expenditure tended to triumph over revenue the government continued its efforts to obtain an increased subsidy from the Dominion. The Repeal movement collapsed without the reward of Better Terms, and the Address of 1887 which pressed the resolutions of the Quebec Conference also failed in this aspiration. The Dominion subsidy remained at \$432,800, and as the revenue increased steadily its importance decreased. In 1888 the federal government paid \$71,500 for the province in settlement of the Navigation Securities' claim.

The failure to expand the revenue by a larger Dominion subsidy forced the government to economize and to search for new sources of revenue. The Education grant was limited to avoid deficits. Fortunately, relief came from the coal royalties. The Mines Act of 1885 had resulted in an increased revenue, which continued to increase as coal mining prospered.¹

After 1883 non-recurrent or capital funds were provided by borrowing. Mr. Fielding refused to borrow for ordinary expenditure, but he fostered the rapid expansion of capital expenditure. In his second term of office the Premier continued to borrow money at home, at first at four and a half per cent., and after 1888 at four per cent.² These funds were used for railway subsidies, the construction of bridges, and for a new purpose after 1889 - for road building and repairs. The interest on the road loan of \$600,000, like the bridge loan, was deducted from the annual road grant. The annual cost of interest charges for the debentures steadily increased with the growth of the capital account.

Almost one-third of the recurrent expenditure was for education, and about one-fourth for roads and bridges. Approximately sixteen per cent. of the recurrent expenditure was devoted to Public Charities. The Hospital for the Insane received almost three-quarters of this, although the Victoria General Hospital was beginning to require larger sums for its maintenance.³

1. The coal royalties amounted to \$127,157.00 in 1886, and \$166,670.00 in 1889.
2. There were no withdrawals from the debt account at Ottawa, because the Baring Brothers affair had taught Fielding that money could be borrowed for less than the 5% received on deposit there.
3. In 1887 the name of the Provincial and City Hospital was changed to the Victoria General Hospital in honour of Queen Victoria's jubilee, and \$20,000 borrowed to enlarge the hospital because it was badly overcrowded. See HERALD, 1887, April 6, and Debates, 1887, P 137, 150.

In each of the years 1887, 1889, and 1890, Nova Scotia suffered a deficit which appeared smaller than it was in reality. In the Public Charities Account the total receipts and expenditures were no longer entered in the Financial Returns, but only the net sum voted by the Legislature. Also, Mr. Fielding permitted the Public Charities Board to accumulate a large floating debt at the bank. This was not reported in the Financial Returns and this would have increased the amount of the deficit. Another innovation was that the Premier no longer carried the deficit or surplus of one year over to the next year, and any deficits were charged to capital account. The surplus of 1888 was caused by an unexpected windfall in the payment of \$71,500 from the Federal government for Navigation Securities, and this surplus was expended in 1889 to avoid the evil day when the grants would have to be reduced.

In 1887 the Legislature passed a Bridge Loan Bill which permitted the government to borrow a further sum of \$250,000 for the bridge service. This bill was very similar to the Bridge Act of 1883 which had authorized the government to issue bonds for \$750,000, and to lend each county a certain sum for the construction of permanent bridges, while the interest on the sum borrowed was deducted from the road grant. Mr. Fielding explained that some counties, such as Halifax, Guysborough, Antigonish, and Cape Breton, had spent their portion, and that important bridges must be left unconstructed unless further sums were granted.

This proposal for another expenditure on capital account, which would cause a debt of nearly a million dollars for bridges, received the general approval of the members of the Assembly. Dr. McKay made a very weak protest. Mr. Fielding observed that if this bill were defeated it would be very bad for Cape Breton County. William McCoy (L, Shelburne) and Frank Andrews (C, Annapolis) refused to vote for the bill. Many members would probably have agreed with Leander Rand (L, Kings) who stated that he must vote for the bill because Kings County needed bridges, and he dared not incur the wrath of the people by voting against a popular measure. ¹

For the first time in her history Nova Scotia embarked on the policy of capital expenditure for roads in 1889. ²

After the Holmes-Thompson government had incorporated the municipalities the municipal councils were given the control of the provincial road grant. The system devised by the council was to divide the sum among the councillors, allowing each one to supervise the road repair in his district. Undoubtedly the road grant could have been spent more efficiently and economically by one engineer for the whole county.

By 1889 the roads in Nova Scotia were in a terrible condition; many were badly in need of repair, while new roads were urgently required in some sections. Under Mr. Fielding the roads were slightly improved. However, the road grant was less

1. Debates, 1887, P 260-272.

2. After Confederation the Legislature had made annual grants for the road service. These grants were spent under the supervision of the county members in the Assembly. This practice led to waste and corruption.

than before Confederation, and in her present financial condition the province could not increase the annual grant. Premier Fielding decided to borrow \$300,000 to obtain sufficient funds to grapple with the road problem. His reasons were outlined in the preamble of the bill:

Whereas, the ordinary appropriations for the construction and maintenance of public roads in this province are insufficient for the purpose; and whereas numerous petitions have been presented to the house of assembly praying for special grants for road construction or improvement; and whereas, the construction of new roads in the cases of isolated districts, and the improvement of existing roads, more particularly main post roads, are essential to the growth and progress of the province, and it is expedient to have such construction and improvement made in a more substantial and durable manner than in the past. ¹

The \$300,000 was allotted among the counties according to the old road scale, apparently without discrimination towards the counties represented by political opponents. The interest on the sum was to be deducted from the annual road grant as in the Bridge Loans. The Road Bill was passed with the support of both parties by a vote of twenty-three to one, Frank Andrews (C) dissenting. Some Conservatives thought that the amount to be borrowed was too large while the Liberals contended that \$300,000 was not sufficient to rebuild the main roads. Although Dr. McKay moved an amendment that a smaller sum be voted and the system of road grants be investigated, the others seemed satisfied with the bill. All agreed that the amount of money expended on the public roads must be increased by some method. ²

1. Debates, 1889, P 372. The bill specified that before the money could be expended on a road such a road must be brought under the control of the governor-in-council, and that construction or repair should be under the direction of the provincial engineer or supervisors appointed by the government.
2. CHRONICLE, 1889, April 23, 25.

In 1890 the government introduced a Road Bill which proposed to borrow a further \$300,000 to be expended on roads and bridges. Mr. Fielding declared that the principle of constructing and repairing the roads on capital account had received the approval of the country generally. He stated that

The only questions to be considered now are: Do we need a further sum and is the method of expenditure calculated to give an assurance that the country will get the benefit of it. The government feel satisfied that the expenditure under the act of last session has been wisely made, and that the system will bear a thorough investigation. ¹

The debate over the Road Bill revealed that the money borrowed in 1889 had been largely used for the same type of road work as the annual grants from recurrent revenue. Very little work of a permanent character had been accomplished. Moreover, the Liberal representatives had been very influential in recommending and appointing foremen and inspectors, and in some instances had supervised the road building, although all such powers had been vested in the Governor-in-Council and the Provincial Engineer. This practice made it possible for men to be chosen for their politics instead of their skill at road building.

This Road Bill failed to obtain the support of the Conservative party, partly because in this session the Opposition were vigorously opposing the Liberals, and partly because they objected to the methods of expenditure under this act.

The Conservatives had asked for a detailed report of expenditure under the Road Act of 1889. The Premier had refused

1. Debates, 1890, P 147. Mr. Fielding admitted that some incompetent men had been hired, and that some of the work was badly done. Section 3 of the Act of 1889 was repealed. This section had limited expenditure by bringing the roads under the jurisdiction of the Governor-in-Council.

to print this information on the grounds of expense. Finally, a chest filled with road returns was placed in the Assembly room. The Opposition did not receive this information in time to make any specific charges of corruption, but hints of graft and fraud were rife.

The Conservatives did not oppose the principle of capital borrowing for roads. They did object to voting such a large sum on the eve of an election when it might easily be used for bribery. "It may be taken for granted that these gentlemen (the Liberals) have two roads in view, the roads of the country, and the road to get into parliament."¹ Other reasons which they advanced for their opposition were that very little of the road work had been of a permanent character, and that most of the money had been wasted.

The Liberal members supported the Road Bill because the roads needed more repairs. While the roads had been much improved, a grant of \$140,000 annually was insufficient to keep the roads in condition. The Liberals believed that it would be wise to completely re-construct the roads with borrowed money, and then it would require a smaller road grant to keep them in repair. Needless to say, they did not object to having large sums expended in their constituencies at election time when this would enhance their popularity. The Liberals all agreed with John A. Fraser (L, Victoria) that the money voted by the Road Act of 1889 had been carefully expended. "I contend that the expenditure has been honestly and judiciously made."²

1. Debates, 1890, P 158. Mr. Chisholm (C, Cape Breton)
2. Debates, 1890, P 160.

The debate over the second Road Bill marked the height of party animosity during the Legislature of 1887 - 1890. The Bill was passed by a vote of twenty-seven to six. The Liberals, joined by David Hearn (C, Richmond) and R. L. Black (C, Cumberland) - who wanted the grant for their counties - voted in favour of the bill while Dr. McKay (C), Bill (C), Munro (C), Cameron (C), Chisholm (C), and Andrews (C), refused their assent.

From 1887 to 1890 the Legislature increased the road grant so that the municipalities still had large sums to devote to roads, and did not suffer any diminution on account of interest deducted. Although the whole of the \$600,000 was not expended by 1890 the Road Bill was a bad measure financially because the greater part of the loan went for work which endured only a few years while the interest had to be paid for thirty years.

In this period public interest in politics had been steadily aroused until it rivalled the days of Confederation. The members of the government were considered to be young men of ability and statesmanship. Much legislation had been passed every year and new life and activity had been infused into every branch of public service. The Fielding government had stimulated railway construction by a policy of subsidies; provided the province with substantial and permanent bridges; had awakened interest in mining industries;¹ they had created the Victoria

1. The Miners' Insurance Bill was passed in 1888. Since the occupation of miners was extremely hazardous, and the government derived a large sum from mining royalties, the government had decided to encourage the formation of mutual relief societies for the benefit of the miners and their families. See CHRONICLE, April 3, 6, 18, 1888.

General Hospital, which was a source of pride to every citizen;¹ had given new life to educational work, created mining schools, and provided a model farm and night schools; prepared a Towns' Incorporation Act under which a large number of flourishing towns carried on public improvements; had consolidated the County Courts Acts; had remodelled the municipal assessment act;² abolished imprisonment for debt; enlarged the franchise until every man earning a decent livelihood could vote;³ and had inaugurated a system whereby the great roads and highways could be reconstructed.

1. A public Health Bill had been passed in 1888. It had been drafted by three doctors (one of whom was Dr. William McKay, the Conservative leader) and provided for the appointment of local Boards of Health and public health officers.
2. This bill had received one hundred and forty amendments by the Legislative Council, and the Assembly had been forced to accept these to avoid a deadlock because there was an urgent need for a new assessment law. See Debates, 1887, P 162, 190; 1888, P 17, 25, 254; HERALD, April 17, 1888.
3. The Franchise Act of 1888 was largely a revision and consolidation of the franchise laws. The chief amendment was the extension of the franchise so that all persons earning £300 or over and resident for one year in the district could vote. The Conservatives proposed an amendment for manhood suffrage.
See CHRONICLE, 1888, March 21, March 28, P 4, April 13, P 4.

CHAPTER III

SECTION III

Relations with Ottawa,
1886 - 1890.

Relations between the governments at Ottawa and Halifax were not cordial chiefly because they were not of the same political faith. The Conservatives remained in power in the Dominion, and the Liberals in Nova Scotia. In these years the Nova Scotians continued their struggles to gain better financial terms from the federal government.

Nova Scotia's financial needs had grown rapidly since Confederation with the expansion of population and more demands for government services. By far the larger part of the provincial revenue was derived from the Dominion subsidy, and this source proved both inelastic and insufficient, so naturally the provincial statesmen made every effort to obtain a larger subsidy.

In his previous administration Mr. Fielding had tried various approved methods to gain Better Terms, but all in vain. The Repeal movement, which was partly a financial demand for an increased subsidy, had reached its climax in 1886. It was generally acknowledged that if the Dominion would grant an additional subsidy to the province that the majority of the Repealers would be satisfied. Finally, Repeal collapsed without achieving Better Terms.

Thereafter the demand for Repeal subsided into occasional mutterings and complaints from a few members of the Assembly. Its most ardent advocates were defeated in the election of 1890.

The Inter-provincial Conference held at Quebec in 1887 to consider amendments to the Canadian constitution provided an opportunity for the government of Nova Scotia to return to constitutional methods of winning better financial conditions. The majority of the governments at the Conference were Liberal, so the Conference came to be regarded as a Liberal move to embarrass the Dominion Conservative government. Nova Scotia showed particular interest in the resolutions proposing an increased subsidy to the provinces. The Assembly of Nova Scotia passed an Address praying that the Imperial Parliament enact the suggested amendments to the British North America Act. This agitation did not result in any increased subsidy.¹

After much diligence and voluminous correspondence Nova Scotia succeeded in gaining a minor financial concession from the Dominion when, in 1888, the province received about \$71,500 for her expenditure on piers and breakwaters. Nova Scotia had spent large sums on the construction and repair of piers, breakwaters, and wharves after Confederation. Subsequently the Dominion had extended or repaired some of these, and had decided to maintain others. Then the province advanced the claim that the Dominion should have supported these projects ever since Confederation, and demanded to be reimbursed for all provincial money expended.²

The general feeling became prevalent that an adjustment in favour of the provinces would never be obtained until a Liberal government came into power at Ottawa.

1. N.S. JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY, 1888, App. No. 12, and P 105. Debates, 1888, P 188.
2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1887, App. No. 14. Debates, 1888, P 298.

CHAPTER IV

SECTION I

The Financial Election of 1890.
May 21, 1890.

The Legislature of Nova Scotia was dissolved on April 21st, 1890, and the election was held exactly one month later on May 21st. Presumably, this meant a very short and intensive campaign, but both parties had chosen their candidates and had begun their canvassing long before the writs were issued. The Conservatives had great hopes of victory as the Repeal issue no longer existed to dazzle the people. In the fall of 1889 and in the early months of 1890 the editorials of the MORNING HERALD and the EVENING MAIL, the Conservative papers, had familiarized the people with the topics of the forthcoming election, and the few Conservatives in the Assembly had criticized and opposed the government's bills, and had attempted to form a policy for the inevitable contest.

A feature of this election was that the county organizations of both parties were very active in the campaign, and that the candidates did much personal canvassing. Premier Fielding tirelessly visited various parts of the province to deliver speeches in many constituencies.¹

The chief issue of this election was the record of Mr. Fielding's government, and in particular, its financial record. Repeal was still discussed while the road expenditure was a minor item.

In the election of 1886 Repeal had been vigorously urged by the Liberals, and forcefully contested by the Conservatives. In 1890 the Conservative "organs", the HERALD and the MAIL, made Repeal a prominent part of their campaign, while the CHRONICLE and the ECHO rarely mentioned it. The Conservative

1. It is impossible to estimate the value of such personal contacts.

papers stressed the fact that the Liberal government had failed to obtain Repeal, and claimed that these "Make-Believe Repealers" did not want Repeal, but that they had merely accepted it as an election cry, and had gladly used the results of the election of 1887 as an excuse to drop the question. The editor of the HERALD wanted to know why the Fielding government had allowed the people to continue to suffer under Confederation, and inquired why Nova Scotia was still in "this cursed union" and still under the "iron heel of extortion." 1

The Liberal papers ignored Repeal because their party no longer actively advocated it. They limited themselves to a repetition of the history of Better Terms and Repeal. Mr. Fielding had declared at Springhill that Repeal "is not now a question of practical politics" 2 and this dictum was loyally accepted by his followers. In his election Address and in his speeches he explained the reasons for the collapse of Repeal and emphasized that the election of a majority adverse to Repeal in the federal election of 1887 had made it impossible for the provincial government to appeal to the Imperial Parliament. The Premier also pointed out that the government anticipated that Nova Scotia would receive extra allowances from the federal treasury by a refund of money expended on railways, and by a readjustment of the subsidy, as proposed by the Quebec Conference.3

1. HERALD, January 10, 1890; see also May 7, May 10, 1890.
 2. CHRONICLE, January 13, 1890.
 3. See Address to the Electors, CHRONICLE, April 28, 1890, P 4. A few Nova Scotians severely criticized Mr. Fielding for his failure to obtain Repeal. Most Liberals agreed that Repeal was not a practical issue. See HERALD, April 22, 1890, and ACADIAN RECORDER, May 7, 1890.

In the ADDRESS OF HON. PREMIER FIELDING TO THE ELECTORS OF NOVA SCOTIA the record of the Liberal government was carefully and concisely presented to the people with great skill and clarity. As the election of 1890 approached

The government and their supporters appeal to the people with the fullest confidence that the record they are able to present is one which will command the support, not only of the Liberal party, but of the best element in the Conservative party. ¹

Mr. Fielding reviewed and interpreted the government's policy towards Repeal, Education, Railways, Roads, and Finance. He stated that Repeal was ended, and reminded the people that the government had established night schools and schools for miners, and that although they had been forced to limit the Education Grant the grant was far larger than grants by previous governments. He claimed that the necessity for a vigorous policy in relation to the road and bridge service had been recognized by the government, and that their railway policy should receive the sympathy and support of all. He asserted that the debt was not excessive, and he emphasized the soundness of the provincial credit and the wisdom of the government expenditure on public buildings such as the Province Building, the Insane Asylum, and the Victoria General Hospital. The Premier commented on the progressive legislation initiated by the administration, and he closed with a reference to the extension of the Franchise, and asked the young men who were to vote for the first time to support the government "which has conferred upon them the privilege of

1. CHRONICLE, April 28, 1890, P 4.

voting, and which has given to the country a vigorous and energetic policy which should enlist the sympathies and command the cordial support of the young men of Nova Scotia."

Thus the record and accomplishments of the Liberal party were ably presented before the people. The Premier asked to be judged by his previous acts, and he promised to continue the policy of railway extension, and to carry out further road and bridge construction by borrowing. His financial policy would remain substantially the same.

Dr. William McKay, the Opposition leader, issued an election manifesto in which he attacked and criticized the Liberal Government, and asked the people to support the Liberal-Conservative party. This manifesto was much shorter than Premier Fielding's. It did not have the same clarity, force of expression, or masterly command of language, nor did it present a strong policy or one likely to appeal to the people.¹

The Conservative leader defined his attitude towards various issues such as Repeal and the rapidly increasing debt. He praised the Holmes-Thompson government for its economical administration of provincial finances, its legislation, and its railway policy. He condemned the Liberals because they had destroyed the Railway Syndicate, had given away the Eastern Extension, and had refused manhood suffrage. He objected to the enormous provincial debt of three million dollars and to the large interest charges.

1. Adam Bell, Conservative leader in 1886, had not made a declaration of his policy.

With a revenue largely in excess of that enjoyed by their predecessors, the present government have expended this money - not upon the roads and bridges, education, or agricultural services - but upon minor services of doubtful utility; and having expended their excess of revenue largely in providing patronage for their political supporters, and upon the minor services which permit of the distribution of patronage.¹

Dr. McKay declared that the people should place the Conservatives in command of the finances to prevent the growth of the debt and to avoid direct taxation, and to obtain larger grants for roads, bridges, agriculture and education. He promised further railway subsidies, and he inferred that if the Conservatives were elected they could obtain financial adjustments from Ottawa. He closed by asking the people "to try the local government by their record of maladministration of provincial affairs, and visit upon them the heavy condemnation which they undoubtedly deserve,"² and not to be swayed by promises of borrowed money.

Most of the attention of the campaign was directed towards the Conservatives' attacks on the financial policy of the government, and the defense by the Liberals. The former advocated economy, the restoration of the teachers' grants to the statutory allowance, transferring the expenditure of the road money to the municipal councils, the reduction of the sessional indemnity to \$400, the abolition of the Legislative Council, and an increase of the road grants. Thus the Conservatives attacked the government for extravagance, the reduction of the teachers' grants, for taking the control of the

1. HERALD, April 24, 1890.

2. Ibid.

capital expenditure on roads from the municipality, for failing to abolish the Council, and for not increasing the road grants.

The Liberal press devoted much space to refuting the Opposition's figures and charges about the Public Debt, the Public Credit, the School Grant, the Cost of Departments, the expenditure on the Province House, and the Road Act.

The main contention of the Conservatives was that the Fielding government had possessed a much larger revenue than the Holmes-Thompson government, and yet had plunged the province into debt. Many editorials consisted of statistics which proved that the revenue under Fielding had been larger, but that the grants to agriculture, education, and roads had increased very little, and closed with general hints of government wastefulness and corruption.

Remember that the local government with a revenue of \$130,000 per year in excess of that enjoyed by their predecessors in office, have only increased the grants to the three principal services of the country by about \$4,000 per year. This left a balance of \$126,000 per year, which the members of that government largely used in promoting partisan ends, and the political power of themselves and their friends.¹

The MORNING CHRONICLE challenged the accuracy of the HERALD'S statistics and claimed that all money had been expended carefully in the interest of the country. The discussion of the financial policy degenerated into a squabble over the exact size of the public debt and over the imminence of direct taxation.² The Conservatives objected particularly

1. HERALD, May 9, 1890.
2. HERALD, 1890, May 9, 10, 12, 15, 17.
CHRONICLE, 1890, May 14.

to the steadily increasing sum which had to be paid for interest charges.

The Conservatives stated that they should be elected in order that the public business might be conducted in an economical instead of an extravagant manner, thereby leaving a larger sum available for roads and other important services. They claimed that part of this saving could be used to restore the teachers' grants, and they asked the voters to "Remember that the local government is entirely responsible for the reduction in the salaries of the public school teachers."¹ The Liberals replied that they had merely restricted the grant, not reduced it, and that the education grant was far larger than a Conservative government had ever paid.²

The Opposition condemned the Road Policy of the Liberals. They asserted that the municipal councils should control the expenditure of the road money because the system of entrusting the members of the legislature with road money had proved a failure and because the distribution of the road money under the councils had proved more satisfactory. This would also deprive the Liberal members of a fund which could be used for bribery and corruption. The Conservatives reminded the electors that "the local government has deprived the municipal councils of the expenditures of the road moneys borrowed at the cost of the road grant for use on the roads and bridges."³

1. HERALD, May 9, 1890.

2. CHRONICLE, May 8, 1890.

3. HERALD, May 9, 1890.

At the same time they criticized the Fielding government because they had borrowed sums on capital account for the roads, and stated that its extravagance had made such borrowing necessary. They protested against the method of the road expenditure.

Remember that the lack of proper roads, and the unsatisfactory condition of those which do exist, is directly attributable to the policy of the government, and to their wasteful disposition of the public moneys which should have been used to put these roads in an efficient condition. ¹

They claimed that the sums borrowed for capital expenditure on roads had been wasted in poor repairs, high wages, salaries to useless inspectors, and in corruption. The Road Act was characterized as a "Road Money Grab" to provide the Liberal representatives with funds to buy votes. The Conservative papers publicized letters which described the road expenditure in various counties, and which made charges of incompetence, negligence, and very poor roads in spite of reckless expenditure.

The money, the borrowed money, has been spent in such a way as to do the party in power the most good at election time, and now the road is just as bad as it ever was. ²

The Conservatives also threatened that soon the whole annual road grant would be swallowed by interest charges.

The pledging of the road grant, year after year, for loans to repair the highways, is like mortgaging a house for money to pay the taxes and insurance. The grant and the house will soon be the property of the money lender. There will be no money for the roads, and the householder will be useless. ³

1. HERALD, May 16, 1890.
2. HERALD, 1890, May 10. See also May 6, 12.
3. HERALD, May 16, 1890.

The Liberals met these charges of extravagance and corruption with the calm assertion that the "Tories" were liars. They published letters declaring that the roads were immensely improved, and that the work had been very well done. They reminded the people that the Opposition had voted for the Road Bill, and they declared that the provincial road expenditure had been cheaper and more efficient than it would have been if expended by the municipal councils, and that the extraordinary expenditure on roads and bridges should be under the control of responsible provincial officers. They praised the government for their vigorous, enlightened, and progressive policy towards roads and bridges, and for the excellent condition of the roads.¹

The editor of the CHRONICLE stressed the fact that the Opposition had not made any specific charges of wasteful expenditure so that the people would realize that there was no corruption.

Hon. W. S. Fielding, premier of Nova Scotia, will be found doing business at the old stand after the 21st of May. If a campaign of falsehood, of misrepresentation, distortion and suppression of facts can dislodge him, he will not be there. But such a campaign cannot be successful in Nova Scotia today. The people are too intelligent, and they are not going to overthrow one of the most enterprising, strait-forward and honest governments that the province has ever had, at the bidding of men who are destitute of brains, honesty, and public spirit.²

1. CHRONICLE, May 8, 14, 1890.
2. CHRONICLE, May 14, 1890.

The Liberals were sustained by the vote at the polls. Twenty-eight Liberals were elected, and ten Conservatives, as compared with twenty-nine Liberals, eight Conservatives, and one Independent in the Repeal election of 1886. All the members of the government were returned although with slightly smaller majorities than in the previous election. ¹

Although the Conservatives had gained two representatives they suffered by the defeat of their leader, Dr. William McKay, and others with political experience.² Charles H. Cahan, who was a sub-editor of the MORNING HERALD and who had proved himself an ardent critic of the Fielding government, succeeded in defeating William MacCoy in Shelburne. Both Otto Weeks and James A. Fraser, strong advocates of Repeal, were defeated.

The Conservative party did not have sufficient strength to defeat the Liberal government. Many Conservatives who would have made admirable candidates had refused to serve. A marked apathy existed among the rank and file of the party towards meetings, policy, and candidates, although the Conservatives had organized early and canvassed diligently. The party was torn by inner dissention, and Cahan and the candidates for Halifax were reported to have repudiated both Dr. McKay's leadership and his policy.³ Dr. McKay failed to

1. CHRONICLE, 1890, May 22, 26, P.2. HERALD, 1890, May 22, 23. RECORDER, 1890, May 22, 24, 26.
2. Cape Breton had been strongly Conservative, but it now elected two Liberals because the people were dissatisfied with their representatives, and inclined to look favourably upon the government which had passed legislation for the miners' welfare. The Road Loan money exerted considerable influence for the Liberals.
3. CHRONICLE, May 14, 1890; RECORDER, May 20.

provide shrewd and competent leadership, and he did not command that implicit confidence from his supporters which was so essential to success. Many Conservatives were dissatisfied with their policy and candidates, and had become disgusted with the HERALD'S incessant attacks upon the government, and claimed that the Opposition party was essentially destructive and merely "against the government."

The Conservative pleas for economy, on which they had based most of their campaign, did not appeal to the people who preferred the prospect of lavish government spending, and were satisfied with the expenditure on roads and bridges and other services.

The people have endorsed this wretched policy (of borrowing for current expenses). They feel, as the members of the government do, that it is a comfortable thing to have plenty of money to spend, and are content to let the next generation shoulder the burden ... but there is a day of taxation coming when they will look back with chagrin at the folly of their conduct. We are defeated. The popular verdict is against us.¹

William S. Fielding, the Liberal leader, was an astute politician, a good speaker with eight years' experience in the Assembly, and in addition he possessed an enormous prestige, and was affectionately regarded by the people as an able man who had risen through merit, force of ability, and honesty of purpose. He led a united, confident, and energetic party, which was well organized and strongly supported by the press. The Liberal candidates were usually abler and had more experience in politics than their opponents. Also many young men worked "like heroes" for the Liberal cause.

1. HERALD, May 22, 1890.

Undoubtedly the fact that the Liberal party was spending large sums of the Road Loan in various constituencies did not harm their nominees. Even if none of the money served as a bribery fund, support could be encouraged by employing men favourable to the "Grits".

The Fielding government had appealed to the electors on the basis of its record, which proved very popular. The people were pleased with the encouragement of agriculture, mining, shipping, and the construction of public buildings, and with the fiscal policy as a whole, and particularly the Road Bill.

The people had re-endorsed the Liberal administration and expressed their approval of a moderate public debt for capital expenditure, and had again stated their confidence in Mr. Fielding.

CHAPTER IV

SECTION II

The Reciprocity Election
The Dominion Election, March 5, 1891.

The predominant issue of the federal election campaign of 1891 in Nova Scotia was reciprocity. A strong sentiment favourable to freer trade relations with the United States had existed ever since the abrogation of the Elgin Treaty of 1854. Although the Conservative party had strongly supported the National Policy of tariff protection, the Liberals in Nova Scotia had fought the National Policy because they believed that it ruined the Maritimes' trade with the United States. Again and again in the press and in speeches the Liberals had expressed their desire for closer trade relations with their great neighbour to the south so that the Maritimes might again return to the prosperity of the days of the Reciprocity treaty.

It requires no gift of prophecy to foretell that with trade barriers again removed, with absolute free trade between the two countries, not only in the products of the farm, the mine, the forest and the sea, but in the varied productions of the loom and the workshop, the trade would at once assume the most gigantic proportions, affording profitable employment for all the workers of this broad land, so richly blessed by the beautiful hand of nature and peopled by a race inferior to none in the face of the earth in all the qualities that go to make up robust and wholesome moral, intellectual, and physical manhood.¹

In 1888 the Liberal caucus at Ottawa had adopted a policy which recommended the opening of negotiations for full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade between the United States and Canada, and for the free exchange of all articles produced or manufactured in the two countries. Issue was then joined between the parties over unrestricted reciprocity. The Liberal press at last had a constructive policy to offer in opposition to the National Policy of the Conservatives. This championship

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, Feb. 17, 1891.

of reciprocity became more eloquent and powerful in 1890 - 1891 with the rumours of an impending federal election.

The Liberals wanted reciprocity because the depression and the small increase in population and the slow settlement of the West had discouraged men and made them anxious for a change. Reciprocity offered a tempting solution for all economic difficulties. Added to this, there was in the Liberal party intense bitterness against the methods by which Sir John Macdonald had kept himself in power.

The Conservative papers in Nova Scotia paid very little attention to the subject of Reciprocity until after the dissolution of Parliament in February. The only exception was a series of passages from Erastus Wiman's writings,¹ which purported to prove that the Liberal party desired annexation with the United States and was working towards this end in the guise of commercial union. The HERALD explained the scheme thus;

The grit government is to sever the British connection, and to administer the affairs of this country in the interests of the U. S., preparatory to the political union of the two countries.

The U. S. is to make a tariff for Canada, the same as prevails in the republic. The new tariff is to be levied against Great Britain and the rest of the world while American goods are to be admitted to Canada free of duty. The U.S. is to be given full possession of all Canadian fishing rights and privileges both on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.²

This paper also publicized certain news which presented the United States in its worst light, providing details of lynchings, murders, the treatment of Indians, and unemployment.

1. Wiman was a native of Canada, but had gained his business success in the United States, and was a strong advocate of unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries.
2. HERALD, January 5, 1891.

The Liberals retorted that the HERALD's statements were "disgraceful falsehoods," and declared that this was their policy:

What the Liberals advocate is this - that everything produced or manufactured in the Dominion of Canada shall be admitted free into the United States; that everything produced or manufactured in the United States shall be admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada, AND THAT EACH COUNTRY SHALL REMAIN PERFECTLY AT LIBERTY TO ADOPT SUCH TARIFF AS IT MAY BE PLEASED TO PREFER IN ITS DEALINGS WITH THE REST OF THE WORLD. ¹

The Dominion Government, which was Conservative, while definitely committed to the opposition of the advanced measure of reciprocity proposed by the Liberals, was impressed by the strength of the desire for access to the American market, and was prepared to concede limited reciprocity for that purpose.

On February 3, 1891, Sir John A. Macdonald suddenly dissolved Parliament and set the elections for March 5. In making this decision he was influenced not only by the rising tide of reciprocity sentiment, but also by the fact that the story of the gross mismanagement of the Department of Public Works might soon become widespread and would seriously damage the Conservative prospects. Sir John himself was growing infirm, and as his death would be an irreparable blow to the party he had so long led to victory, it was believed that an early election would be best. ²

At the time of dissolution Sir John Macdonald announced through the Conservative press that the Canadian government had

1. CHRONICLE, February 7, 1891.
2. CANADA AND ITS PROVINCES, Vol. 6 P 108 - 115.
SIR WILFRED LAURIER by Sir John Willison.
CANADIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS, 1875 - 1911, by G. Tansill,
(Ryerson Press), Chapter XIV.

entered into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States at the instance of the Americans, which seemed to indicate that Washington was willing to concede a generous measure of reciprocity.

The MORNING HERALD emphasized that although Sir John was "willing and anxious to extend our trade relations with the United States by the negotiation of a treaty of reciprocity similar to that of 1854, only modified to meet the changed circumstances,"¹ he would "preserve" the British connection, and protect the industrial interests of Canada, and that he would not accept the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity.

The Conservatives expected the people to support these negotiations which provided for extended trade and the amicable settlement of all questions at issue between the two countries. The farmers and fishermen would be delighted at the prospect of a renewal of the Treaty of 1854, while the protected manufacturers were quieted with the assurance that only reciprocity in natural prospects would be sanctioned.

The Conservative leader had made a very audacious move in order to baffle the Opposition and to deprive them of the one issue, reciprocity, on which they had determined to challenge the government.

Naturally there was blank consternation among the Liberals, and profound suspicion of the good faith of the Conservatives. Liberals were warned that the "Tory" desire for reciprocity was insincere, to say the least.

1. HERALD, February 4, 1891. Sir John's formal offer to the U.S. included a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; reciprocity in Fish and the Atlantic fisheries, and coasting and inland water navigation and salvage; protection of fisheries; and arrangements for settling the Alaska boundary.

Amazement existed in the United States as well as in Canada over this announcement by the Canadian government. Congressman Baker, of Rochester, New York, asked Secretary of State Blaine to explain these reports of negotiations for reciprocity between Canada and the United States. In reply, Mr. Blaine authorized him to contradict the rumours of reciprocity. The Secretary for State said in his letter:

There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. ¹

Mr. Blaine's letter was widely publicized in the Liberal press as proof of "Tory" duplicity and falsehood. The truth was that Canada had been forced to intervene to prevent the conclusion of a treaty between Newfoundland and United States, which gravely threatened her fishing interests. Arrangements had been made for unofficial negotiations about reciprocal trade between the American and Canadian governments, but it had been stipulated by Mr. Blaine that all public reference to the matter was to be avoided, and this was accepted by the Canadians. Thus Mr. Blaine was angry at the public announcement that the United States had agreed to an informal discussion of reciprocity, and declared that absolutely no negotiations were afoot. ²

The Conservative politicians and newspapers revealed great exasperation at Mr. Blaine's letter. Subsequently, the Conservative advocacy of reciprocity became very weak because

1. CHRONICLE, February 3, 1891.
2. Tansill - CANADIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS, 1875 - 1911. Chapter XIV, and Willison's LAURIER, Vol. II, Chapter XXII.

the pretence of negotiations for reciprocity in natural products only, could no longer be maintained. During the remainder of the campaign they made their appeal to the protected interests, to the sentiment of attachment to Great Britain, and to prejudice against the United States.

The National Policy was again discussed in this election. The Liberals continued to hammer away against the policy of protection, quoted statistics to show the large sums paid in customs' taxes, and that business was languishing. They blamed the depression on the National Policy, and promised that Maritime industries and factories would flourish under the stimulus of reciprocity with the United States. ¹

The Conservatives emphasized the prosperity which the National Policy had created in Canada, and made every attempt to prove that protection had benefited various Canadian industries. They also repeatedly stressed the contention that unrestricted reciprocity would mean commercial ruin. They asserted that the tariff would be controlled in the interests of the Americans, that Canadians would become merely producers of raw materials, and that all the coal mines, factories, and mills would be closed and their workers forced to emigrate to the States, that the farmers would be subjected to the merciless competition of western farm produce, that the fisheries would be handed over absolutely to the Yankees, and that it would mean a loss of customs revenue and direct taxation for federal purposes to the extent of fifteen millions a year. ²

1. CHRONICLE, January 26, 1891.

2. HERALD, January 29, February 28, 1891.

The Conservative party stood for "Home Rule Not Yankee Rule." Their policy was outlined as:

CANADA FOR THE CANADIANS, AND THE INTEGRITY OF THE
EMPIRE
A FAIR MEASURE OF RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES,
AND
CONTINUED PROGRESS BY PROTECTION TO HOME INDUSTRIES.¹

It was an essential part of the Conservative strategy to stigmatize the Liberals as traitors who would detach Canada from the British Empire and merge its destinies with those of the United States. The campaign was one of shrieking, denunciation, and intemperate utterances by both parties. The Conservatives accused the "Grits" of disloyalty and treason. They attempted to convince the people that the Americans who favoured unrestricted reciprocity did so only because such a trade policy would mean annexation.

The election that will take place today will be the most important ever held in this country ... The destiny of Canada hangs in the balance ... If the Wiman conspirators get control, there is no doubt felt but that they will make Canada a vassal dependency of the United States, and give to New York and Boston the pledged monopoly of our trade ... a gang of base conspirators and traitors (the Liberals) have sought to bribe us into selling our commercial independence for the paltry consideration of a rebate of duty on barley and potatoes.²

The Liberals replied that the disloyalty cry was an absurd trick to draw attention from the real issues of the campaign.

1. HERALD, 1891, February 13, P 3; February 16, P 1.
2. HERALD, March 5, 1891.

The Liberals believe that reciprocity will bring about such an era of prosperity in Canada that perfect contentment will prevail and that there will be no desire in any quarter for annexation or any other radical change in our constitutional system. Prosperity and loyalty go hand in hand. Free trade with our great and populous neighbour is all the connection we want with them, and there is no need of any other beyond friendly feeling and neighbourly intercourse.¹

An unusual development in the campaign was Sir John's attack on Edward Farrer. The proof sheets of Farrer's pamphlet on the fisheries were stolen from a Toronto printing office and were given to Sir John, who affected to see in Farrer's statements proof of treasonable designs on the part of the Liberal leaders. Farrer, a journalist then working for the *GLOBE*, a Liberal paper, was a firm believer in a political union between Canada and the United States, and his article declared that Sir John's disappearance from the political stage would be the "signal for a movement in Canada towards annexation." Edward Farrer accepted sole responsibility for the pamphlet, which had been written privately for a friend.

The Conservative papers exaggerated the meaning of this pamphlet and made a great outcry against the "Grit treason party," and made many charges of plots and conspiracy, and vehement appeals to passion and prejudice.

The Liberal papers ridiculed the veteran Conservative leader for stirring up a "large-sized mare's nest" in an attempt to befog the minds of the electors as to the real issues, and to snatch a verdict on the feigned issue of loyalty. They pointed out that Farrer was a "literary free-lance, ready to advocate any

1. *CHRONICLE*, January 9, 1891.

cause for sufficient pay," and that the Liberal party was not responsible for his "private lucubrations."¹ They declared that the Liberal leaders had rejected the policy of commercial union, and supported only such a measure of reciprocity as would be sanctioned by the Imperial government; and far from being a conspiracy for annexation there was not even an understanding with the American government that the trade policy of the Liberal party would be accepted by the Washington administration.

Undoubtedly, the overwhelming sentiment of the Liberal party was uncompromisingly British. A few Liberals may have been political unionists. However, the vast majority of those who supported reciprocity believed that freer trade relations with the United States would restore Canadian prosperity, and they did not pay any attention to the political implications that might result from closer commercial intercourse.

The Liberals did not emphasize Conservative corruption and bribery as they did in the campaign of 1887, although they made frequent references to misappropriation of public funds, graft, bribery of voters, the non-revision of the franchise lists, and to the fact that the manufacturers and monopolists had been forced to contribute to the "Tory" campaign funds.²

In their turn, the Conservatives accused the Liberal party and its leaders of receiving millions of dollars from Americans for the purpose of bribing the people to vote for the "Grits".

1. CHRONICLE, February 21, 1891.

2. CHRONICLE, January 26, February 5, P 2, Col 5, 1891.

Sir John A. Macdonald's last Address to the electors was very short, with a masterly appeal to prejudice, and a skillful rallying of the Conservative forces. "Canada's Grand Old Man" declared that unrestricted reciprocity implied a common tariff with the United States and ultimately annexation. He clung with renewed faith to the National Policy, and praised the record of the government. Sir John admonished the people to think well before choosing unrestricted reciprocity. He said:

As for myself, my course is clear, a British subject I was born, a British subject I will die. With my utmost effort, with my latest breath, will I oppose the "veiled treason" which attempts by sordid means and mercenary proffers to lure our people from their allegiance. During my long public service of nearly half a century, I have been true to my country and its best interests, and I appeal with equal confidence to the men who trusted me in the past, and to the young hope of the country, with whom rest its destinies for the future, to give me their united and strenuous aid in this my last effort for the unity of the Empire, and the preservation of our commercial and political freedom.¹

This appeal to patriotism and to the people's personal loyalty to Sir John touched the feeling of affection and veneration which many people had for the Canadian premier.

In his speech at the Academy, Toronto, Sir John declared that this election was a great crisis, and that Canadians would show Americans that they could fight to preserve their independence, and that if he thought otherwise,

I would say the sooner the grass was growing over my grave the better; rather than I should see the degradation of the country which I have loved so much and which I have served so long.²

1. HERALD, February 9, 1891.
2. HERALD, February 25, 1891.

For the first time Wilfred Laurier, who had succeeded Edward Blake in 1887, was leading the Liberals in an election campaign. He provided an inspired and confident leadership for the whole Liberal party, and in his eloquent election manifesto he gave a calm, clear, and straightforward definition of the Liberal policy.¹ This Address gave fresh confidence to Liberals throughout Canada, and dispelled the fears of many that the Liberal leaders had some secret understanding with Washington, and were bent upon a quarrel with Great Britain, if that should become necessary to the establishment of unrestricted reciprocity.

However, the Liberal press in Nova Scotia did not stress Mr. Laurier's statements as they had Mr. Blake's in previous elections or as the Conservatives were emphasizing Sir John A. Macdonald's opinions. The people were asked to "Vote for Reciprocity, Reform, and Retrenchment."²

In Nova Scotia Mr. A. Jones, the Liberal member for Halifax, and W. S. Fielding, Premier of Nova Scotia, were the leaders of the Liberals in this federal contest, and both worked valiantly for reciprocity and the Liberal cause. A province-wide Liberal association had been organized for the first time through Mr. Laurier's influence.³

1. CHRONICLE, February 17, 1891.
2. See also CHRONICLE, March 5, 1891.
3. CHRONICLE, January 24, 1891.

The Conservative government was again sustained in power, but by a small majority of less than thirty. In Ontario, a Conservative stronghold, the Liberals won forty-three seats, while Quebec elected thirty Liberals and twenty-five Conservatives. Sir John had won by large majorities in the Maritimes and the West. Seventeen Conservatives and five Liberals were elected in Nova Scotia.

In Nova Scotia there had appeared to be a very strong feeling in favour of reciprocity. The Liberal papers declared that a majority in Nova Scotia had supported reciprocity and the Liberals until February 28th. The cause of this change, they intimated, was the influence and the money provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway when the government had promised to accede to their demands. The Liberals said:

We had the popular feeling, the policy, and in most cases the candidates, and would have won but for the appearance on the field of a new element, which has never been present to the same extent in this province. Bribery more general than has ever been practised here would seem to be the only cause which can account for the change which took place after last Saturday.¹

The Liberals blamed their defeat in Nova Scotia upon "Tory" bribery and "Tory" misrepresentations which had convinced many people that a Liberal victory would mean commercial ruin, particularly as the fisheries and factories would be handed over to the Americans, and that also it would mean certain political annexation to the United States.²

The Conservatives had won because Sir John Macdonald possessed the passionate devotion of his party, the affection of

1. CHRONICLE, March 6, 1891, Editorial
2. CHRONICLE, March 11, 1891.

the whole country, and likewise he had the general support of the bankers and manufacturers and those who distrusted new men and new policies, and who preferred to continue the present regime. Also the Canadian Pacific Railway had exerted great pressure and considerable influence in favour of the Dominion government. Sir Charles Tupper had rallied the Maritimes with consummate skill after long practice in electioneering.

The Conservative press and candidates had made strenuous efforts to put the Liberal leaders under suspicion of intrigue with Washington, and to raise against them the British sentiment of the country. Many of the electors were thoroughly persuaded that the fate of the British connection depended upon the result of the contest, and that the Conservatives must be elected to preserve the British Empire. Likewise, many people were convinced that the establishment of free trade with the United States would ruin business and industries in Canada.

Another event in the election was a letter from Edward Blake to his late constituents of West Durham, where he had declined renomination. This letter, which was published after the election, and which caused a great controversy, was an exhaustive analysis of unrestricted reciprocity, together with a gloomy account of the financial and political position of the country. It condemned the Conservative trade and fiscal policy very severely, but it did not allow the Liberals to go unscathed. The object of

the letter was to show that unrestricted reciprocity led naturally and inevitably to political union with the United States. As Canada was suffering from depression, and as he had decided that the United States would never accept the policy of a revenue tariff with reciprocity; Mr. Blake thought that annexation was inevitable.

There was considerable disagreement as to the true meaning of Mr. Blake's letter. The MORNING CHRONICLE politely disagreed with Mr. Blake's contention that limited reciprocity with the United States would never be obtained, and that unrestricted reciprocity would involve an assimilation of the tariffs of Canada and the United States. The CHRONICLE also pointed out that Mr. Blake had severed his political connections with the Liberals. ¹

The Conservative papers emphasized the dissension existing in the Liberal party, and used Mr. Blake's letter to bolster their charge that the policy of the Liberal party was disloyal and treasonable. This letter proved very useful in the numerous by-elections which changed the small government majority into a decisive one. In return, the Liberals stressed the parts of Mr. Blake's letter in which he gave a telling indictment of the "Tories".

In this midwinter campaign of 1891 Sir John A. Macdonald had overtaxed his strength and had become completely exhausted. In May, while Parliament was sitting, he became ill, and died on June 6, 1891.

1. CHRONICLE, March 10, 1891.

CHAPTER IV

SECTION III

Domestic Legislation, 1891 - 1894.

W. S. Fielding remained Premier of Nova Scotia from 1891 to 1894. The Liberal party had a large majority, and they were united. Under the guidance and example of Charles H. Cahan, editor of the HALIFAX HERALD, the leading Conservative paper in the province, and who had succeeded Dr. William McKay as Conservative leader after his defeat, the Conservatives in the Assembly offered a very spirited opposition in spite of their numerical weakness and their inexperience. Every government bill was forced to a division. Not only did the Conservatives scrutinize every measure and record their objections, but they advocated an alternative policy and procedure.

The policies of the previous administration were further developed. Finance continued to be the outstanding subject. Considerable legislation was passed, e.g., the Bridge Bill, the Road Act, the consolidation of Mines and Minerals' Acts, and the Whitney Legislation which led to the creation of the Dominion Coal Company. Road Expenditure, the Railway Claims, and the Abolition of the Legislative Council were discussed in protracted debates.

The opening of the Provincial Legislature in 1891 had been postponed until April 2 so that the members could devote themselves wholeheartedly to the federal election campaign. The Conservatives chided the members of the Government for neglecting their executive duties to take part in the contest. After the meeting of the Legislature the provincial government was reorganized because two of its members had resigned to take part in the Dominion

election. The Hon. D. C. Fraser, leader of the Legislative Council, had been elected to the House of Commons for Guysboro; the Hon. Angus MacGillivray, M.P.P., though unsuccessful in the federal contest against Sir John Thompson in Antigonish, decided not to re-enter provincial politics. These vacancies were filled by the appointment of George H. Murray, of North Sydney, C.B., to act as government leader in the Council, and Colin McIsaac, M.P.P., Antigonish, to succeed Mr. MacGillivray. George Murray was a young man, who, though he had failed to be elected as candidate in Cape Breton, had done much to build up a strong Liberal party in that county. He had been a Councillor for several years, and had resigned to attempt to wrest Cape Breton from the "Tories." Colin McIsaac was one of the most popular members in the Assembly.

Thus the Executive consisted of W. S. Fielding, Premier and Provincial Secretary; C. E. Church, Commissioner of public works and mines; J. W. Longley, Attorney-General; and Thomas Johnson, Daniel McNeil, George H. Murray, and Colin McIsaac, members without portfolio.¹

There were twenty-eight Liberals and ten Conservatives in this thirtieth Assembly of Nova Scotia. The Liberals possessed a large majority so they were able to carry their legislation without regard to the Opposition. Although the Conservatives were weak numerically, under the valiant leadership of Charles H. Cahan (Shelburne) they provided a brilliant and vigorous opposition and a searching criticism of the government policy. Very few of the members had previous political experience. The only experienced

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, Tri-Weekly Edition April 14, 1891, P 4.

Conservative members were William Cameron (Pictou), and Dr. John Bethune (Victoria), who had now changed from an Independent to active support of the Conservatives, and Thomas Smith (Hants), who had been a Liberal in the Assembly in 1878 - 1882, and had now joined the Conservatives. The Opposition leader, Dr. William McKay, (Cape Breton) had been defeated, and this weakened the prestige of the Conservatives.

Several by-elections took place in 1891. Albert Gayton (L), and experienced and able member, resigned in Yarmouth and was replaced by Forman Hatfield (L). Angus MacGillivray (L), Antigonish; Joseph McPherson (L), Cape Breton, and Allan Haley, (L), Hants, had resigned to take part in the Dominion election. MacGillivray was succeeded by Christopher P. Chisholm (L); Joseph McPherson, having failed as a federal candidate, was re-elected; and Arthur Drysdale (L) replaced Allan Haley, who had been defeated in the Ottawa campaign. ¹ The relative strength of the parties remained unchanged in these by-elections. Michael J. Power (Halifax) was re-elected Speaker.

The subjects which engaged the attention of the Legislature were the Provincial Claims for railway subsidy refund from the federal government; Finance; Mines and Minerals, particularly the Whitney Legislation which consolidated the coal mines in Cape Breton under the Dominion Coal Company; Roads and Bridges; Abolition of the Legislative Council; Railways, Education; and Agriculture.

1. CHRONICLE, April 9, P 4; and N.S. JOURNAL, 1891, App. 13.

The problem of Better Terms, which had concerned every Nova Scotian Legislature since Confederation, continued to occupy the time of this Legislature under the guise of Provincial Claims. In the Speech from the Throne in 1891 the Lieutenant-Governor directed the attention of the members to the claims of the province upon the Dominion Government for a fund of moneys expended by the Provincial Government on railways which had become the property of the Dominion or had been taken under the legislative control of Canada.

On April 21st Premier Fielding moved a resolution that a committee of five members be appointed to prepare an Address to the Governor-General of the Dominion on the claims of the Province for a refund of the Provincial subsidies expended on the Eastern Extension and the Western Counties Railway. The Premier explained how the Eastern Extension had been built with the aid of a provincial subsidy, how the Province had acquired the Railway, and how the hostile policy of the Dominion had forced the Provincial government to transfer the railway to the Dominion for a sum equal to what the local government had paid the Allan Company. The government of Nova Scotia had given the Dominion a clear title to the Eastern Extension, and had no rights by law to ask them to refund this money. However, the Dominion had constructed the Intercolonial railway from Quebec to Sydney, with the exception of the part from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave.

"If the government of the Dominion had built all the rest of the I.C.R., there was no reason why Nova Scotia, with its limited resources, should be expected to contribute so much money to the building of a certain section of it, and the money which had been expended by the province should be refunded by the Dominion government." 1

1. MORNING CHRONICLE (Debates) April 23, 1891, P 1.

As the Dominion had declared the Western Counties Railway to be under the control of the federal government as a railway for the general advantage of Canada, "then Canada should have the glorious privilege of paying for it." ¹

A short and sharp debate followed. Charles Cahan, Conservative leader, asserted that the government should have submitted a formal statement of their claims against the federal treasury. He claimed that the Opposition could not support the government's former policy in regard to the Eastern Extension, and that the claim on the Dominion was very weak - the Premier admitted that it was only moral, not legal. He believed that the government should not try to avoid their responsibility in pressing the claim by forcing the House to demand the railway refund. Mr. Cahan concluded by refusing to serve on the Committee. ²

Mr. Longley (L) regretted that the Leader of the Opposition acted in a partizan spirit.

"There were no responsibilities that the government were not willing to assume to the fullest extent, but when they went to the Dominion government they wished to go supported by the concurrence of this legislature ... If the Dominion government could pay \$47,000,000 for the building of the Intercolonial ... why should the province of Nova Scotia pay hundreds of thousands of dollars for what now constituted a part of the Intercolonial." ³

Neither party had a strong conviction that the claim was a just or legal one. The Liberals were always harassed by lack of revenue, and since the Dominion government was Conservative, they had no scruples about pressing every possible claim of the province against the Dominion. The Conservatives possessed

1. MORNING CHRONICLE (Debates) April 23, 1891, P 1
2. Ibid, April 25
3. Ibid.

The problem of Better Terms, which had concerned every Nova Scotian Legislature since Confederation, continued to occupy the time of this Legislature under the guise of Provincial Claims. In the Speech from the Throne in 1891 the Lieutenant-Governor directed the attention of the members to the claims of the province upon the Dominion Government for a fund of moneys expended by the Provincial Government on railways which had become the property of the Dominion or had been taken under the legislative control of Canada.

On April 21st Premier Fielding moved a resolution that a committee of five members be appointed to prepare an Address to the Governor-General of the Dominion on the claims of the Province for a refund of the Provincial subsidies expended on the Eastern Extension and the Western Counties Railway. The Premier explained how the Eastern Extension had been built with the aid of a provincial subsidy, how the Province had acquired the Railway, and how the hostile policy of the Dominion had forced the Provincial government to transfer the railway to the Dominion for a sum equal to what the local government had paid the Allan Company. The government of Nova Scotia had given the Dominion a clear title to the Eastern Extension, and had no rights by law to ask them to refund this money. However, the Dominion had constructed the Intercolonial railway from Quebec to Sydney, with the exception of the part from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave.

"If the government of the Dominion had built all the rest of the I.C.R., there was no reason why Nova Scotia, with its limited resources, should be expected to contribute so much money to the building of a certain section of it, and the money which had been expended by the province should be refunded by the Dominion government." 1

a certain loyalty to the federal government, and they were convinced that the Liberals were trying to blackmail the Dominion by hidden threats of Repeal,¹ and that these railway claims were fraudulent. They thought that the Liberals had sufficient revenue, and did not desire to increase the money at the disposal of their rivals.

The Railway Refund resolution was passed by a vote of 24 to 9, the Conservatives voting solidly against it. Mr. Webster (C, Kings) declared that his party did not vote against the railway claim for partisan reasons, but because

they had not sufficient information and that the government had not given them sufficient data. He did not say that the province had not claims on the provincial (Dominion) treasury, but the claims were not pressed to a legitimate conclusion or in a legal manner at the time that they should have been pressed.²

The usual delay occurred before receiving a reply from the Dominion. In spite of the fact that the Attorney-General, J. W. Longley, and Hon. Thomas Johnson, were sent to the capital in 1892, as delegates to explain the Provincial Railway claims, no reply was received until October 28, 1893,³ when the Dominion refused the request for more funds.

On January 23rd, 1894, Mr. Fielding moved a resolution that the Dominion's reply be referred to a special committee. Thereupon Mr. Cahan, Leader of the Opposition, made a very long speech against the resolution, and Mr. Fielding followed by another defending the government. Both men were extremely anxious to explain their positions in view of the approaching election.

1. See Cahan's speech on the Speech from the Throne, CHRONICLE, April 7, 1891, P 1.
2. CHRONICLE, April 25, 1891, P 1
3. N. S. JOURNAL, 1893, Appendix No. 14.

The Conservative leader reviewed at great length the history of the Eastern Extension and the Western Counties Railway, and condemned the government's policy. He pointed out that if the Dominion granted Nova Scotia's railway claims, it would be forced to make similar returns to all the provinces, and that this would mean that the other provinces would benefit more, and that Nova Scotia would pay more in additional taxes than she would receive for railway claims. He did not believe that the Dominion should assume forty-four millions of additional debt. The provincial claims were not legal, but were "used as a shield to cover petty partisan aims." He accused the government of being "arrant cowards" in refusing to accept responsibility for their policy, and instead skulking behind a committee of the House. Then he referred to the Repeal cry.

"That cry is dead, but until hon. gentlemen opposite repudiated it, and repudiated the idea that by making use of such a cry they could blackmail the Dominion government, no honest man, no conscientious man in the Conservative party could support them." 1

The Premier displayed considerable sarcasm and animosity in his reply. He made an able defence against Mr. Cahan's charges, and he reiterated his policy that "the Dominion government should in all fairness return the subsidy to Nova Scotia because the Dominion government now owned the road and every other part of it has been paid for out of the Dominion treasury." 2

1. CHRONICLE, January 25, 1894, P 8. Tri-Weekly Edition.
2. Ibid., Jan. 27, P 6, Col. 4.

He declared that since the federal government had taken control of the Western Counties Railway, over the protest of the local legislature, that the Dominion should repay the subsidy. Mr. Fielding condemned the Opposition for their failure to rise above party feeling and to join members of the government in enforcing the claims of the province.

"He believed that if the government had been able to go to the Dominion government with a united legislature at their back great good might have been accomplished."¹

The Premier's resolution was passed twenty-two to ten, the Liberals voting for it and the Conservatives against.

After a lively debate in which both parties repeated their opinions on the subject, the Address was finally accepted by a vote of nineteen to six, the Conservatives expressing their disapproval by voting solidly against it.²

1. CHRONICLE, January 27, P 6, Col. 4.
2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1894, Appendix No. 14.

Finance in this period predominated over all other legislation although there were important consolidations and amendments to existing laws. Premier W. S. Fielding still acted as Provincial Treasurer, and the provincial finances were skilfully and deftly managed by him. In the years 1891 to 1894, for the only time in his provincial career, Fielding was subjected to the comments of an able and discerning financial critic - Charles H. Cahan, Conservative leader.

In 1891 Premier Fielding attempted the reform of the provincial finances. The government had adopted the device of placing in the public accounts the net sum voted for charitable expenditure and had permitted the Public Charities Department to contract a deficit which rose steadily, but which was not shown in the annual financial returns presented by Fielding to the House. The administration was beginning a new term of office, the floating debt had grown large enough to be dangerous; further, Cahan fully realized and took care to expose in detail certain practices which had passed muster in the past. Accordingly, Fielding charged to capital account, preparatory to funding, the deficit of the Public Charities, which now amounted to over two hundred and seventeen thousand dollars; and other debts kept in the background, such as deficits for Works and Mines, the C. C. Gregory account, and seventy thousand dollars which had accumulated through deficits on recurrent account. The existing laws outstanding with respect to the issue of debentures were consolidated, so that the government was authorized to issue \$1,175,000 by debentures.¹

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, May 16, 1891, P 1.

Mr. Cahan thought that "many people ... would be startled to learn how rapidly the debt of the province was increasing." ¹ He regretted that these resolutions should be rushed through so quickly, and explained the extent of the province's liabilities. He moved in amendment that certain debts, such as those for the Gregory account, the Victoria General Hospital, and the Charities account, be not concurred in as these sums represented deficits on current account, and therefore should not be charged to capital account, but liquidated by debentures issued for a limited term of years. This amendment was defeated seven to eighteen, and the resolutions passed by a vote of eighteen Liberals to seven Conservatives.²

The next step was to go back to the former system of placing both gross expenditure and revenue of the Department of Public Charities in the financial returns. A change was introduced in the method of keeping the accounts, due to criticism from the Conservative leader. The power of the departments to issue cheques was taken from them. Instead, they issued certificates which were presented to the provincial cashier, and he then issued warrants for the amounts due. ³

Cahan was one of the first financial critics to notice the way capital account was developing, and to note that items which once would have been charged to current revenue were being charged to it. He insisted that a sinking fund should be

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, May 16, 1891, P 1.

2. N. S. JOURNAL, 1891, P 151-152.

3. MORNING HERALD, 1893, March 24, P 4 (Debates for March 23rd).

attached to all such expenditure.¹ He objected to the way in which the appropriations were frequently exceeded without any reference to the Assembly. Fielding retorted that such was the custom of the province, and he believed that such over-expenditure should be left to the discretion of the Executive.

In 1893 a further step was taken towards reform in financial administration, and it also was hastened, if not caused, by criticism from Cahan. The fiscal year of the province ended on December 31st, yet the Legislature did not usually meet until February or March. During this interim the government was without supplies as far as statutory sanction was concerned.

Mr. Cahan pointed out

"Although the estimates of last year were fully expended by December 31st, we are here on March 4, and the government have been expending money from December 31 to March 4 without any legislative authority. This is a proceeding which is unconstitutional and which should not be permitted."²

The government lacked the authority to exceed the vote for any item. Fielding brought down a measure to remedy this situation.³ The Governor-in-Council was authorized to exceed appropriations, and the Provincial Secretary might, after the close of the fiscal year and before new supplies had been granted, allow the payment of

"all services of the several departments of the government. Provided that in the case of any class of service the sum so paid ... shall not exceed one-third of the sum appropriated for such service in the preceding fiscal year."⁴

1. Estimates, May 11, 1891. CHRONICLE, May 12, P 3.
2. Debates of N.S., 1892, P 9
3. 1893, N.S. Laws, C 4.
4. Ibid. P 27.

The same act dealt with another difficulty. It was impossible to get reports prepared so that they could be placed before the Assembly early in the session when the fiscal year ended on December 31st. The year was made to terminate on September 30th, although the Conservatives favoured June 30th, when the Dominion year ended.

W. S. Fielding was still faced with the problem that every year there was a steadily increasing expenditure from nearly all departments of the public service if they were to be maintained efficiently; and that the revenue, being largely of a fixed character, was unequal to the requirements of the province, and that it must be supplemented from some quarter, either by increase of the provincial subsidy, or by the increase of indirect taxation, or by the imposition of direct taxation.

All attempts to obtain an increased subsidy from the Dominion failed, so this remained at \$432,822, and steadily diminished in importance as the other sources of revenue increased. Direct taxation could be used only as a last resort as it was highly unpopular. Therefore the Provincial Secretary attempted to obtain more revenue by various devices, such as an increase in the coal royalty, and by the imposition of Succession duties, and by continuing his policy of financing the road and bridge service on capital account. \$350,000 was borrowed for this service in 1891.

In 1892 the coal royalty was raised to ten cents per ton.¹ In 1893 the Dominion Coal Company was created and pro-

1. 1892 Debates, P 218.

vided an impetus to coal production by the introduction of American capital, and by the consolidation of a number of small companies. The coal sales had been rising steadily, and the introduction of new capital and new methods and new men had a beneficial effect. The revenue from coal royalties increased substantially, especially as the Company paid a royalty of twelve and a half cents per ton. The revenue from the royalty on coal increased over ninety per cent. from 1892 to 1899, and thirty-six per cent. of the total revenue was contributed from this source in the latter year.

In 1892 Fielding followed the example of Ontario and imposed succession duties. This was the first step towards direct taxation, and it was a very moderate tax. The duties were not to apply to any estate which, after payment of debts and expenses of administration, did not exceed \$5,000; nor to an estate not exceeding \$25,000 if passing to direct heirs, to charitable, religious, or educational bequests; while bequests to any single person which did not exceed two hundred dollars were also exempt.¹ When the property passing to direct heirs exceeded \$25,000, it paid \$2.50 on every hundred dollars of the excess; and when it exceeded \$100,000 it paid \$5.00 on every \$100 of the excess. Where the property exceeded \$5,000 it paid five dollars for every \$100 if it passed to blood relations, or \$10 if it passed to strangers or distant relatives.

1. 1892 N.S. Laws, C 6.

The Premier stated that

"the principle of the resolution was simply a declaration that upon the distribution of a man's estate a certain percentage should go to the community which by its protection and by all that it had done for him in his lifetime had enabled him to accumulate his wealth ... In presenting the public accounts some days ago he had called attention to the need of increase in the public revenue as well as the necessity for economy, and at the same time he had pointed out that the province was incurring large expenditures by reason of the extension of the operations of the government in connection with the system of public charities." ¹

Cahan said that

"even though the tax was sugar-coated by a preamble that the proceeds were to be devoted to charitable purposes, that would not keep from the public view the fact that the real object was to make up the deficit in the revenue of the province."¹

He thought that the government had no right to raise their salaries last year by the plea of adequate revenues if they had to make a demand for new taxation. Before imposing succession duties the salaries of the Legislative Executive should be reduced, and the Council abolished.

The Liberals favoured succession duties because they knew that the public revenue was inadequate, and they considered that the state should share in large fortunes, and that the measure would not prove vexatious.

Both in the Assembly and in the Council the Succession Duty Resolutions were passed unanimously although the Conservatives opposed them in debate. The burdens imposed by the act were so light that it had no real enemies. The Opposition admitted that it was the least obnoxious form of direct taxation.

1. CHRONICLE, April 12, 1892, P 1.

However, the government's expectations for a large revenue from this source were disappointed. The Succession duties brought in an insignificant revenue because of ambiguity in the clauses and the large exemptions.

The Premier also increased the revenue by forcing the various counties to pay the debts which they owed to the Province, incurred largely for maintenance of patients in the Hospital for the Insane. In 1891 a law was passed requiring the municipalities to pay these accounts and their current quarterly instalments, and in case of their failure to do so, the Provincial Secretary was authorized to retain these sums from the road grant. This money was now paid into the capital account instead of the revenue.

Mr. Fielding continued his policy of not making any withdrawals from the debt account at Ottawa, and borrowing for capital expenditure. The rate of interest remained at four per cent. The liabilities of the province had increased to \$3,142,922 by September 30th, 1893, offset by assets of \$1,469,411.

The administration needed more money because there was a floating debt on which six per cent. was paid, and the bridges, roads, and railway subsidies would require more money still. So in 1891 the Premier had introduced a borrowing bill which consolidated the debt.¹ The government thought it would be unwise to attempt to float on the Halifax market such a large sum as three-quarters of a million dollars, especially as the Halifax market was unfavourable, and the municipalities wished to borrow money.

1. 1891 N.S. Debates, P 130-33.

Fielding went to London to negotiate, found the money market unsatisfactory, and got temporary accommodation from the National Provincial Bank of England for \$730,000. In 1892 the Nova Scotian debentures were issued in London.

As Nova Scotia had not issued securities in England since Confederation her credit was an unknown quantity. Other colonial debentures were floated at the same time and received preference. However, Fielding succeeded in issuing 200,000 pounds of 3½ per cent. bonds payable in fifty years, for the minimum price of 91.5. A sinking fund of one-half per cent., which had been unnecessary in previous loans, had to be established for the London loan. Nova Scotia's credit proved excellent, and in a few months her debentures sold at over 99. Fielding had succeeded in establishing Nova Scotia's credit abroad.¹

Both revenue and expenditure continued to mount in this period, while capital account also developed. The tendency for expenditure to increase more rapidly than revenue also continued. In 1893 and 1894 deficits were avoided because in 1893 the accounts were for nine months, and in 1894 only the unexpected receipt of \$81,000 from the Western Counties Railway warded off a large deficit. The fact that the sums of \$74,000 in 1892 and \$81,000 in 1894, received from the Western Counties Railway in settlement of their debt to the government, were used as current revenue meant that the net debt of the province was increased, since these items had been considered as assets. Fielding admitted that his procedure was not strictly proper, but pleaded fiscal necessity.

1. CHRONICLE, 1892, March 29, P 1; HERALD, 1893, March 24, P 4; N. S. JOURNAL, 1893, App. No. 13.

Premier Fielding still continued his practice of mentioning the leading features of the financial position of Nova Scotia when he submitted the Financial Returns and the Estimates. He now carefully distinguished between expenditure chargeable to revenue and expenditure chargeable to capital account. These speeches were usually short, very simple and very clear, and directed the members' attention towards the facts that the Premier wished to stress. Mr. Cahan made this criticism of the Premier's procedure:

"The honorable leader of the government could be very lucid when he desired to be, and could, at other times when he had a different purpose, so mix and muddle the financial returns that it was impossible for his hearers to get exactly the purport of the statements he was making." ¹

The Conservative leader had begun the practice of making a speech on the financial condition of the province, in which he considered the Premier's statement in detail, made various shrewd criticisms and suggestions. On this occasion he commented that "there was a suspicion that the surplus alleged instead of being genuine was a mere matter of bookkeeping. Cahan showed that surpluses on other occasions were really skilfully hidden deficits. Then he revealed in detail how many accounts were not paid until the following year so that the government could show a surplus, and other devices used for this purpose. He also condemned the rising debt and mounting interest charges, and claimed that the funds borrowed had been largely wasted, and that minor government services had increased while education, agriculture, and the road service suffered.

1. HERALD, April 20, 1893, P 5, Col. 1.

The interest displayed in financial matters was greatest during Fielding's Premiership as the Opposition now possessed a leader with sufficient financial ability to oppose and criticize the government's policy. In the previous Assembly the estimates were merely presented and passed without question. Now a lively debate ensued between both parties, led by Fielding and Cahon, over the government's financial policy, and many individual items were questioned in Committee instead of being accepted without debate. The Conservatives had been elected on a platform of opposition to the government's financial policy, and they justified their election by their acts in the Assembly.

The laws concerning Mines and Minerals received the attention of the Legislature because the mining royalties, particularly on coal, were an important source of provincial revenue. Under Fielding's leadership the Liberal party had displayed considerable solicitude for both the mines and the miners and had tried to encourage this industry by legislation.

In 1891 the Legislature passed an important amendment to the law respecting the regulation of the mines, including provisions for better protection of life and property because of the disaster at Springhill. Another bill was passed to provide for the fortnightly payment of wages at the coal mines.

During the session of 1892 the whole question of the mining laws was discussed. Hon. Mr. Church, Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, introduced a bill to amend and consolidate the laws relating to mines and minerals. ¹ This act

1. N.S. Laws, 1892, C. 1

consolidated the various amendments, and made several new provisions which were intended to make the practice of the department legal in regard to applications, surveying, unlawful entry, forfeiture, and arrears of royalties.

The Conservative leader, C. H. Cahan, agreed that the principle of consolidation must receive the approval of members on both sides of the House, so the bill passed its first and second readings without discussion.

In Committee the Conservatives objected to the amendments proposed by Mr. Fielding. They objected to the coal royalty being increased from seven and a half cents to ten cents per ton. Mr. Cahan claimed that the government were violating their contracts entered into with the coal companies when they raised the royalty. Mr. Forrest (C, Cumberland) insisted that those who had invested capital in the coal mines had a right to expect that the existing royalty of seven and a half cents per ton would be the royalty for the next twenty years, when the contracts would be renewed.

The Liberals denied that the government had acted unfairly or broken any pledges. The government should have increased the royalties in 1886, but as the coal industry was not in a position to pay a higher royalty they had refrained, stating that the Legislature had the power to increase the royalty. Mr. Church said:

The Legislature had express authority to enlarge or diminish the royalty as it saw fit. The reason why the increase was made was because the existing revenue was not sufficient to meet the necessities of the province. ¹

The Premier introduced an amendment which acquiesced to the desire of the coal industry for a fixed royalty. This

1. CHRONICLE, 1892, May 2, P 4, Col. 3.

guaranteed that the royalty should not be increased until 1906, and it should not exceed twelve and a half cents per ton until 1926. He also introduced an amendment to encourage persons to go into the coal trade on a larger scale. The Governor-in-Council was authorized to accept the surrender of leases and to issue new ones if any person or company working or proposing to work coal mines was willing to pay a greater royalty than was fixed or would prosecute the coal industry on such an extensive scale that the provincial revenue on royalties would be substantially increased.¹ Although the Conservatives opposed this it passed on division. The bill was passed by a strict party vote of twenty Liberals to eight Conservatives.²

The legislation which created the Dominion Coal Company occupied most of the time of the members in the session of 1893. The Legislature assembled on January 19, 1893, and adjourned February 1st when the mines and minerals bill was settled. The animosity between the parties reached its highest point over this Whitney Legislation. The Conservatives objected very strenuously to this proposed legislation and opposed it very bitterly in a protracted debate.

1. N.S. Laws, 1892, C. 1, Sec. 155-156
2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 158-9.

The government had taken advantage of the Mining Law of 1892 to enter into negotiations with Henry M. Whitney, of Boston, President of the West End Street Railway in that city, and of the Metropolitan Steamship Company, and also a successful financier with a reputation for shrewd judgment and business integrity, with regard to forming a company which would introduce new capital and new methods into coal mining, and consolidate a number of smaller concerns. Whitney purchased a number of coal properties in Cape Breton, and secured a lease from the government. The Legislature was called in January, 1893, for the purpose of ratifying this agreement, which gave the Dominion Coal Company a lease for ninety-nine years. In return, the Company agreed to pay twelve and a half cents a ton royalty, with the further stipulation that it was not to be taxed in any way by the provincial government.¹

Mr. Cahan stated that the measure required cool, calm, and careful consideration, and that the parties did not need to differ if it had been designed to promote the best interests of the province, and that in its financial aspects it must be regarded as of the greatest importance to the province.

Hon. Mr. Fielding expressed his desire to have the mining legislation discussed in a non-partisan manner, and his pleasure that the capital for developing the coal industry had been secured.

1. N. S. Laws, 1893, C. 1.

The Assembly was forced to meet on Saturday, January 21st, contrary to the custom, so that the Premier could introduce the Mines Bill.¹ Mr. Fielding reviewed the history of mining in Nova Scotia, and commented on the expansion of the coal output. He noted that American coal mining expanded much more rapidly than the Nova Scotian. Although the policy of the Democratic party had encouraged the hope that commercial relations between Canada and the United States would be less restricted, Mr. Fielding thought that in order to compete with the Americans Nova Scotia must adopt modern methods in regard to mining, shipment, and handling of coal. The government believed that more capital and skill should be procured for the coal industry. The Premier submitted the correspondence with Mr. Whitney, and then explained the agreement in detail, and answered arguments against it.

Mr. Fielding declared that Mr. Whitney did not want a monopoly, and if he had desired a monopoly he could create one under the existing law by buying up the present coal leases.

"Mr. Whitney does not want monopoly but wants to work the mines vigorously, under conditions more favourable to the public and to himself."²

The Premier explained that as the lease applied only to Cape Breton County there were sufficient other mines to provide competition and avoid any monopoly. Mr. Whitney had asked for a ninety-nine year lease, and for freedom from provincial taxation, and in return had agreed to pay twelve and a half cents per ton royalty. The Premier scorned any idea that the Company would

1. Debates, 1893, P 17.

2. Debates, 1893, P 23.

close the mines. If such a thing did happen, the Legislature could take action. If the mines were closed Mr. Whitney would be forced to pay a royalty on the quantity of coal equal to the total output of 1893 - approximately \$122,799 per annum. Any idea of domination by Americans was sheer nonsense because any person might invest in the enterprise.

"The elements upon which he (Mr. Whitney) relies for success are better facilities for transportation of coal, better means for handling it, so as to avoid loss by breakage under existing methods, cheaper methods of management, and in fact the employment of all those methods which have brought success to coal enterprises in the United States." ¹

Charles Cahan delivered a speech of three hours' duration in which he criticized the Mines Bill, and explained the Conservative party's objections to it. He pointed out that the bill had an important bearing upon the industrial and commercial interests of the province, and affected the vital interests of every inhabitant of Nova Scotia for ninety-nine years - indeed, for three generations yet unborn. The Conservative leader asked the Legislature to refuse statutory ratification of the lease although it was already binding. He expressed his fear that the Whitney Company would become a monopoly, and raise the price of coal, and he also stated that the Company might lock up the coal areas in Nova Scotia without working them. He declared that the government had no way to force Whitney to act according to the law, and that the clause providing for a minimum royalty was ambiguous and could not be enforced.

1. Debates, 1893, P 23.

"I believe after a careful examination of the question, taking into consideration the large powers conferred upon this company, which enable it to monopolize all the coal and iron in this province, that the consequences might be disastrous." 1

The Opposition leader expressed his opinion that the Whitney Company or their successors might enter into a combine with the coal interests in Pennsylvania and either close the Cape Breton mines, or only produce enough for Maritime consumption, raise the price, and thereby make sufficient profit to pay the royalty.

"The result of this measure proposed by the government may be to introduce into this province a combination which instead of placing the people of Nova Scotia in the enjoyment of coal at moderate prices will grind down the people under a coal tax levied by the coal barons. What in comparison with that is two and one-half per cent. additional royalty? What in comparison with the extorting four millions of dollars from the consumers of Nova Scotia is the mere guarantee of \$123,000 a year for royalty? What is the mere rental of thirty dollars a year for a coal area when weighed in the balance with the whole industrial future of these maritime provinces?" 2

A protracted debate followed. The Conservative members - Webster, Oxley, Forrest, W. Cameron, A. F. Cameron, Grant, and Bethune in particular - made vigorous speeches against the Whitney Legislation. Their chief objection was that of monopoly, but they also disliked the long lease, and thought that the necessary capital could have been obtained in Canada. They stated that the bill enabled Whitney and his associates to obtain a ninety-nine years' lease of all the coal areas in the county of Cape Breton. They claimed that this lease had been given for a merely nominal rent for a century, and that Mr. Whitney intended to mortgage it for at least \$6,500,000, and the property might become still more valuable.

1. HERALD, January 26, 1893, P 4.
2. Ibid., P 5.

They insisted that the syndicate would either close the mines, or work them and demand extortionate prices from the people for their coal. Whatever course the syndicate took, the government had no control over it. The passage of the bill would place the province completely at the syndicate's mercy for ninety-nine years.

On January 26th the Mines Bill passed its second reading by a strict party vote of twenty-four Liberals in its favour to nine Conservatives in opposition.

In Committee and on the third reading of the bill Cahan expressed his opinion that the province did not possess the power to give the Company a lease, and questioned the validity of the lease, and declared that Nova Scotia had title to the mines and minerals during the life of the sovereign only. The Attorney-General declared that the Conservative leader's opinion was completely unfounded, and Mr. Fielding said that Mr. Whitney's solicitors had investigated the title and had declared that the mining lease was valid. Thereupon the Assembly ignored Cahan's charges. ¹

The Premier moved an amendment to make absolutely certain that the province would receive a minimum royalty of \$122,500 yearly. The bill passed its third reading on a division of twenty-two Liberals and eight Conservatives.

An attempt was made in the federal parliament by Dr. Weldon to induce the Dominion government to disallow the coal legislation. The Premier, Sir John Thompson, replied that the local legislature had the constitutional power to do wrong as well as

1. HERALD Editorials, January 31 and February 10, 1893; also February 2, P 5.

good, and that he could not advise the disallowance of the local coal acts. ¹

The fears of the Conservatives proved to be completely unfounded. The most sanguine hopes of the Liberals were achieved beyond expectation. The Dominion Coal Company assumed operations immediately. New methods, new capital, and consolidation greatly stimulated the mining industry. Coal sales rapidly increased, and consequently the provincial revenue from royalties. The revenue from the coal royalty increased ninety per cent. from 1892 to 1899, and thirty-six per cent. of the total revenue was derived from this source in the latter year. The coal industry was exceedingly important in Nova Scotia because of the revenue from it, and because it afforded employment to many workmen, and affected business conditions in almost every town in Nova Scotia.

1. HERALD, 1893, February 18, P 4, March 9, P 2 and 4.

The government continued their road and bridge policy in this session. The Legislature still made an annual grant to the road service, which sum was distributed by the municipal councils after the interest charges for the road and bridge loans were deducted. Most of the road and bridge construction was financed by borrowing on capital account.

In 1891 Mr. Fielding introduced a bill to make further provision for the construction of bridges.

"He said that if there had ever been any doubt in the minds of the people of Nova Scotia as to the wisdom of constructing the larger bridges of the province by funds borrowed and charged to capital account, such doubt no longer existed." ¹

The government asked for authority to borrow \$300,000. They already had the power to borrow one million dollars. This sum had been divided among various counties, and some counties, such as Cape Breton, Digby, Hants, and Guysboro, had exhausted their credit. The Premier stated that some bridges were down, and others in a dangerous condition. "It was the duty of the government to make provision for these bridges, even if the tax upon the road grant was severe."

In the short but bitter debate which followed, Charles Cahan objected to the frequent borrowing for bridges as an unsound policy which was plunging the province into debt. The Opposition had consented to an expenditure of the first \$500,000, but they had opposed all other borrowing which would eventually force the province to resort to direct taxation. Cahan moved in amendment that the province should permit the municipalities to borrow such

sums as the provincial engineer approved for permanent repairs and construction of new bridges, such expenditure being secured by a sinking fund.

"Surely the time had come when the province should cease borrowing money for counties that did not need the expenditure so as to give the counties really in need of the expenditure such funds as were necessary. Why should such a county as Yarmouth, which was not in need of expenditure, receive such an appropriation?"¹

Mr. Roche (L) characterized this constructive suggestion as "a farrago of figures and some most deceptive declamation for the purpose of obscuring the question."

Needless to say the Assembly assented to the Bridge loan by a vote of twenty-six Liberals to ten Conservatives, while Cahan's amendment was defeated by a party vote of twenty-four to nine.²

After 1893 the practice was adopted of letting the counties make application for the construction of bridges, and then having the projects certified by the provincial engineer.

Much of the money borrowed on capital account was used for wooden bridges and even on repairs. Once the province built a bridge the municipality refused to repair or paint it.³ The Provincial Engineer was forced to use money from the Bridge loan rather than have the bridge impaired when a small expenditure would restore it. Not until 1904 was the Provincial Engineer given a fund for bridge repairs. The road grant received by the counties steadily diminished as the interest charges increased.

1. CHRONICLE, 1891, May 2, P 2.

2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1891, P 94-95.

3. CHRONICLE, 1892, April 7, P 8, Maintenance Iron Bridges.

In 1892, due to this failure of the municipalities to properly maintain the bridges, and because of the divided control of the road service between the province and the counties, and because of the other difficulties in the present road system which were being revealed by the Committee investigating Road Expenditure, Fielding introduced his bill respecting the Construction and Maintenance of Roads and Bridges.¹ This bill was excellently designed to solve the problem of the road service by setting up a Road Board, but unfortunately it was permissive. The Municipal Councils refused to adopt it without some coercive measure exerted by the government, because the act limited the power of the Councils.

The Premier stressed the importance of the public roads, and he explained the present system for their construction and maintenance was loose, disorganized and unsatisfactory. He proposed to abolish statute labour, and to provide road funds by a poll tax and a tax on income, and real and personal property.

"He feared that at present there was an absence of the unity that was necessary for securing good work, and an absence of the skilled supervision that it was desirable to have, and he thought that in all respects the system would be admitted to be unsatisfactory ... He thought that the most intelligent minds would see that a system that abolished statute labor and substituted a money tax to be imposed upon the people, the proceeds to be faithfully expended under skilled officials, would be a better system than we have to-day."²

The road work and road funds were to be managed in each county by a Road Board of five members, three appointed by the government and two by the Municipal Council. The inspector, appointed by the government and also Secretary of the Road Board, would devote all his time to the work.

1. N.S. Laws, 1892, C 6.

2. CHRONICLE, April 21, P1 & P 4, 1892.

Mr. Fielding "believed that if the bill received the assent of the legislature great good to the province would come out of it"¹ and he hoped that it would be adopted by the municipalities.

The Conservative leader claimed that the "reform which the bill proposed for the existing evils was no remedy at all", as it failed to provide any uniformity. He condemned the government for removing the control of the road expenditure from the municipal councils by the Road Acts of 1889 and 1890. Cahan strongly advocated the system of allowing the councils to distribute the road money and provide for all repairs and construction. After a long debate in which each party criticized the other rather harshly the Permissive Road Bill of 1892 was carried on its second reading by a strict party vote of twenty-five to nine.

In 1894, in addition to an increased road grant, there was a new form of expenditure.² A special grant of \$20,000 was made out of recurrent revenue to be expended under the direction of the Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, although the Conservatives objected to this fund on the ground that it would be used for political corruption. Gradually and inevitably the government was moving towards the assumption and direction of expenditure on roads and bridges.

The road act of 1890 had repealed the section which had limited the government by requiring the Governor-in-Council to bring the road on which the money from capital account was to be spent under the terms of the Act. Unfortunately, most of the

1. CHRONICLE, April 21, P 1 & P 4, 1892.

2. N.S. Debates, 1894, P 164.

\$600,000 voted by the previous Assembly for permanent road construction was used for work which endured for only a few years. Some roads were broadened, a few new ones built, but much of the work consisted merely of repairs.

There was a strong suspicion that the capital expenditure for roads was misused. The Opposition members had made various enquiries during the session of 1891 for information concerning the details of the road expenditure. In 1892, on March 7, four days after the opening of the session, Charles H. Cahan, Conservative leader, moved a series of resolutions asking for an enquiry,¹ before a committee of seven members, whom he named. He charged that work was being done under the direction of members of the House, and not under the direction of the provincial engineer or inspectors appointed by the government, and that fraudulent returns had been made and concealed.

Premier Fielding used all his wiles and skills as a politician and an experienced member of the Assembly, and all his power as the leader of the majority, to circumvent and forestall these resolutions, which could become a powerful tool in Cahan's hands and lead to a vote of censure. He immediately pointed out that Cahan could not name the members of the Committee as the rules required that the Assembly appoint each Committee.

Cahan was forced to admit that Fielding was correct about the Committee, but

"He was able to prove that this administration had not properly conducted the affairs under their control, that they had not adopted proper safeguards in the public interest, and that their action in the expenditure of this money had been utterly shameful and scandalous." ²

1. N. S. Debates, 1892, P 18.
2. CHRONICLE, 1892, P 4, Col. 2.

Fielding and his supporters indulged in considerable quibbling in the debate over the road expenditures. He admitted that the county representatives had suggested the names of the men to be appointed to the government, but there was nothing wrong in this as "the government of Nova Scotia did not claim to be familiar with every man in Nova Scotia."¹ He insisted that the government knew of only one false and fraudulent return, and that the guilty party had been punished. The government frankly admitted the right of Cahan to bring his charges if he believed that he had sufficient evidence to back them up, but demanded that the charges must be made specific, and that the parties charged with wrong-doing must be named, as had been done at Ottawa in the Tarte - McGreery - Langevin case. Whenever that was done, Premier Fielding and Attorney-General Longley stated that the committee would be promptly granted and that the fullest scope for investigation would be afforded.

The Conservatives naturally regarded the Premier's insistence on specific charges as unfair. They had suspicions and some proof of the wrong use of the road money, but they were not in a position to know all the cases of wrongdoing or to get any evidence of this because it would be in the government's hands. They wanted a general investigation to disclose if the road expenditure had been misappropriated. Their leader said

"The general allegations in the resolution were necessary, so that the scope of the inquiry might not be restricted ... If the government voted them (the resolutions) down they would have to take the responsibility of doing so. He did not intend to withdraw the resolutions."²

1. CHRONICLE, 1892, P 4, Col 2.
2. Ibid, March 9, P 8.

The amendment moved by Tupper (L, Digby) to the effect that the House would investigate the charges when they were made specific was passed by a vote of twenty-one to eleven. Mr. Lawrence (L, Colchester) voted with the Opposition because he believed the charges should be fully investigated. ¹

Since Cahan refused to make the charges specific, Fielding moved a vote of censure upon him which also ordered the member from Shelburne to make the charges specific, or to lay his evidence on the table. ² The Premier explained the system of road expenditure, and admitted that some mistakes might have been made.

"Of course it was not absolutely certain that under any system no wrong could be done. The number of inspectors was over a dozen and there were hundreds of foremen and thousands of workmen, and it was impossible for the government to say that every one of these thousands of men acted honestly and faithfully, but the government were bound to believe in their honesty in the absence of any information to the contrary." ³

The Liberals believed that it was their duty to see that Cahan's charges were investigated, and the members cleared of all implications of corruption, and many thought that Cahan had not been sincere in his desire for an investigation, but merely wanted to cause a sensation. As Mr. Fielding said:

"He thought that the house and the public opinion of the country would say that it would be monstrous to let any member who brought forward a series of charges drop the charges without following them up with some specific statement." ⁴

In the long and lively debate which followed, both parties took a very active part. These debates did not exhibit the

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 14.
2. N.S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 33.
3. CHRONICLE, 1892, March 18.
4. Ibid.

bitter party feelings and the insulting language of the Railway debates and other discussions in the session from 1882 to 1886. Cahan made moderate and dignified denunciations and criticisms. He repeated that the government had not taken the proper safeguards to protect the road expenditure, and he defended his action in requesting a general investigation by appeals to British precedent. He declared that the government had introduced a resolution which had burked the whole enquiry and he closed by moving an amendment which stated that the House did not have the power or the authority to order him to make specific charges. ¹

"The member for Shelburne did not recognize any right on the part of the leader of the government or of any member supporting him to declare at this time what the duty of the member for Shelburne in the premises was." ²

Mr. Webster (C) supported his leader, and he wanted to know why,

"If the matters were not worthy of inquiry, as hon. members opposite contended, what was the necessity for the hon. leader of the government introducing the resolution now before the house." ³

Although the Opposition fought a valiant but losing battle, Fielding's vote of censure passed by a strict party vote of twenty-six Liberals to ten Conservatives. ⁴

On March 23rd Cahan brought definite accusations against three members of the Assembly: Joseph MacPherson (L) and Angus MacDonald (L), Cape Breton, and John A. Fraser (L), Victoria, and asked for a special committee of inquiry. ⁵

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 34.
2. CHRONICLE, 1892, March 18, P 4.
3. Ibid, March 19, P 4.
4. N.S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 39.
5. N.S. Debates, 1892, P 92.

Fielding used every trick of parliamentary procedure to delay these resolutions. Then he decided that the Standing Committee of Rules and Privileges could handle the investigation. Cahan made furious objections to this Committee because it consisted of Attorney-General Longley and McIsaac, who were members of the government and might be involved and certainly would try to prevent anything being revealed that reflected discredit on the administration, and Laurence (L) and Webster (C) and Cahan (C) himself. Also the government attempted to frustrate the enquiry by passing an amendment restricting the investigation to one class of charges only, the making of false and fraudulent statutory declarations as to the accuracy of paysheets returned to the department of public works. ¹

The Committee did not probe the matter very deeply, and no startling disclosures were made. Many witnesses were examined. Hon. Mr. Church, Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, had refused to supply the Committee with all the documents they wanted from his department. The Committee found irregularities but no fraud or graft. ²

The Liberal members on the Committee submitted a majority report, while the Conservatives disagreed, and made a separate minority report. ³ Mr. Longley stated in introducing the majority report that

"Irregularities had been developed in regard to the county of Victoria, and irregularities ... were developed in regard to the county of Cape Breton. He was happy to say that these

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 53-55.
2. Debates, 1892, P 201; JOURNAL, 1892, App. No. 23.
3. CHRONICLE, 1892, April 25, P 1, April 29, P 1.

irregularities had not resulted in loss of revenue to the province to the extent of a single cent. In Cape Breton ... he could say that while the members did interfere with the expenditure of the money more than the law contemplated, and while paysheets were made up in a form that it would have been desirable to avoid, by combining in one paysheet paysheets which should have been signed separately, no misappropriation of money was shown. ¹

Webster declared that

The evidence showed that the money had been expended in a loose manner; it showed that the statute had been violated in every word and section ... The object of the appointment of the inspectors was that the members should have nothing to do with the expenditure, but that everything was to be done through the inspector who alone was to be accountable. The evidence showed that the members took charge of the expenditure of the money, appointed foremen, prepared paysheets, and paid men for work done as sub-foremen, which could not be sworn to by those who attested to the paysheets ... There was evidence that the members had paid money, and there was also evidence of delay in payments ... Declarations were made by men as to the correctness of expenditures who did not see a cent of the money expended. ²

The majority report was adopted by a strict party vote of eighteen Liberals and eight Conservatives. ³

It had been proved that in the County of Cape Breton the Commissioner of Public Works did not issue commissions until September 1, 1890, although the work on the roads was performed during July and August and early September. The members of the Assembly had authorized certain foremen to expend small amounts of road money, and in September these foremen received commissions authorizing them to spend larger amounts. The paysheets had been approved in blank by the government inspector. The members' clerks had filled in these paysheets, and sometimes the amount entered was larger than the sum really expended. False and fraudulent declarations had been attached to such sheets. The money represented

1. CHRONICLE, 1892, May 3, P 4, Col. 3.
2. CHRONICLE, 1892, May 4, P 2.
3. N. S. JOURNAL, 1892, P 162.

by the paysheets had been drawn from the provincial treasury, and large amounts were placed by the government inspector in the hands of the members. In Victoria County some paysheets had been altered after they had been attested before a magistrate.

Although no misappropriation or fraud had been proved and the three members were exonerated from the charges against them, the sums borrowed for the roads had been disbursed illegally, the members had doled out funds as they desired, and the money had been ill spent.

Both parties had made declarations in favour of the Abolition of the Legislative Council. This question had remained in abeyance until 1894 although occasionally the Conservatives suggested that the government could economize by abolishing the Council instead of borrowing such huge sums.

In the session of 1894 an unusual interest was aroused in regard to the Abolition of the Council by the action of the Council itself. It was a well understood fact that gentlemen appointed to the Council by the Fielding administration had been appointed with the clear understanding that they were in full accord with the policy of the government in regard to the Abolition of the Council, and that they were required to state in writing that they would support a measure providing for such a change.

When Daniel McDonald, Albert P. Welton (King's) and William B. Smith, of Cope Island, Shelburne County, and ex-warden of the municipality of Harrington, the latter two to replace Hon. T. L. Dodge and Hon. Samuel Locke, both deceased, were introduced to the Council the point was raised in the Council by Dr. Parker (C) that it was unconstitutional for appointees to accept seats in the Council while trammelled by pledges of that kind. The Council took the point seriously and the swearing-in of the new members was postponed until the next day.¹

The Council procured opinions from Dean Weldon, of Dalhousie College, Benjamin Russell, and Robert Borden, eminent constitutional lawyers, which decided that such pledges were not only unconstitutional but not binding. A vigorous debate resulted

1. CHRONICLE, 1894, January 30, P 6, and Feb. 1, P 6.

over the adoption of the report of the Committee on Rules and Privileges on this opinion. This report was designed by the anti-abolition leaders in the Council to afford an excuse for some members for repudiating the voluntary pledges they gave the government to vote for abolition, and it declared that the Council should entertain no measure looking to abolition of that body until the government had given a declaration that they released all members from their pledge. George Murray, government leader, opposed the adoption of this report. H. H. Fuller withdrew his name from the report because he had discovered that if the report were adopted it would prevent the government from introducing their bill. The report was adopted by a vote of sixteen to five. The five who voted against it, and presumably in favour of abolition were Fuller, Welton, Smith, Murray, and McDonald.¹

Immediately after the report was submitted, Murray introduced a bill for the Abolition of the Council. After a prolonged debate Dr. Parker's (C) amendment giving the bill a three months' hoist was carried by a majority of nine. The men who redeemed their pledges were Murray, McDonald, Fuller, Robicheau, Drummond, and Welton, all Liberals.²

Only four Conservatives remained in the Council - Dr. Parker, Black, Owen, and Whitman. These men had at different times voted for the Abolition of the Council, but now they refused to do so because they did not want to assist the policy of a Liberal government. Robicheau, Smith, Mack, Ray, Welton, Goudge, Cummings, Drummond, McDonald, LeBlanc, McNeil, and Murray had given their

1. CHRONICLE, 1894, January 30, P 6; February 1, P 6.

2. Ibid, February 10, P 7; February 13, P 6.

pledge to vote for abolition, and Fuller had promised to resign if he could not do so.

Those who voted against the Abolition thought that the Legislative Council was a useful and necessary part of the Legislative machinery, and that it had done much good work. However, the Liberals, as well as the Conservatives, expressed their scorn of the men who had repudiated their pledges. If the Councillors could not redeem their pledges they should resign. The majority of the people of both parties had decided in favour of the Abolition of the Council because they felt that the retention of the Council was something the province could no longer afford, and that the money saved could be devoted to the maintenance of important public services. They believed that the members of the Council should respect this public opinion and yield to the wishes of the people as expressed in the Assembly and at the polls.

In the meantime interest in the subject had been aroused in the Assembly. William Cameron (C, Pictou) had requested the government for copies of all correspondence and documents in relation to appointments in the Council.¹ The government gladly acquiesced, and this information was also widely published in the newspapers.

Mr. Cahan declared that the Conservative party supported the policy of the Council's abolition, and he also stated that if the Councillors who were pledged to vote for Abolition did not do so they should be dismissed as they only held office during the

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1894, App. No. 17.

pleasure of the Crown. He asserted that the government did not really desire abolition.

Mr. Fielding naturally resented that the Opposition leader had questioned the sincerity of the government on this question. He trusted that the people had sufficient confidence in the government to believe in its sincerity.

On February 7 Premier Fielding introduced a motion that a committee of three be appointed to prepare an address to be presented to Her Majesty respecting the abolition of the Legislative Council. This Memorial, which prayed that the imperial parliament amend the B. N. A. Act to enable Her Majesty to abolish the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia by proclamation, was unanimously adopted by the Assembly on February 9th.

Mr. Cahan suggested several minor amendments which were adopted. He said that while he differed from the government as to the most expeditious method of accomplishing the Abolition, he was anxious that there should be no division in the Assembly regarding abolition, and therefore he readily agreed that the memorial should pass unanimously.

Chisholm (L) said that if Cahan's plan of dismissing recalcitrant councillors were carried into effect it would not abolish the Council but merely abolish Councillors. Bills had to receive the assent of the Council to become law.

Longley said that the adoption of the government's course did not preclude them from following Cahan's plan at a later date by cancelling the commissions of those Councillors who had broken their pledges, provided that it was competent and constitutional for the government to adopt such a course.

George Murray made a motion similar to Mr. Fielding's to the Council on February 9th. However, an amendment was adopted by a vote of thirteen to two, Murray and McDonald alone opposing it, that the Council appoint a committee of three to prepare a Memorial Against the Abolition of the Council.¹

Although a line had now been constructed from Halifax to Yarmouth, operations were still carried on by several different companies, the Western Counties Railway, and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, which controlled the Windsor Branch. The province still had to pay \$13,400 interest yearly on a loan of £50,000 made to the Western Counties Railway in 1879. In 1882 the Western Counties Railway had informed the government that it could not operate its line between Yarmouth and Digby. Faced with the prospect of complete stoppage, the administration had granted a \$50,000 loan and had received in return the pledge of the postal subsidies, amounting to about \$3,400 yearly, paid the Company by the Dominion. Receipts from this source covered interest and slowly reduced the principal of the loan.

In 1892 prospects for a settlement brightened when a new firm, the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, was formed, which finally united the Windsor and Annapolis and the Western Counties Railways in 1894. The Dominion Atlantic Railway could at last offer the people of the Western Counties an efficient, uninterrupted service throughout the length of the province,

1. CHRONICLE, 1894, February 17, P 1, 6, 8; February 20, P 8; P 7 - The Memorial Against Abolition.

with steamer connections at Halifax, Yarmouth, Digby, Annapolis, and Kingsport. The fertile districts of the Valley now had a complete system of transportation and could further develop the agricultural and other resources.

The Dominion Atlantic Railway proceeded to make terms with the government and at once made a payment of \$74,400 for part settlement of the arrears of the Western Counties Railway.¹ This still left at the end of 1892 an indebtedness of \$163,000 on the 1879 loan and \$31,700 on the 1882 loan which had been gradually reduced by the postal subsidies. This made a total of \$194,700. However, the government, in 1881, had received \$40,000 from the seizure and sale of rolling stock which the Western Counties Railway had been using on the Windsor Branch, and this sum with interest compounded amounted to \$63,100 was deducted from this figure, leaving a liability of \$131,600. If payment was made within the year, four percent. discount was granted. A short extension of time had to be allowed, but in 1894 the government received \$131,000 from the railway in final settlement. \$81,000 was used at once to meet ordinary expenses, while the rest went to reduce provincial indebtedness. In this way the province received the payment of a railway asset, which had been regarded as of doubtful value, and the consolidation of the Western Railways was accomplished.

1. N.S. Debates, 1893, P 93, P 253 et seq.

In this period the policies inaugurated in the previous Fielding administrations were further developed. Finance continued to be pre-eminent. Roads and Bridges were still constructed from capital account, as was the Victoria General Hospital and the Nurses' Home. The Public Charities' Account was re-organized and its finances placed on a sound basis. Capital account expanded rapidly. Nova Scotia's first loan abroad since Confederation was a marked success. New sources of revenue were discovered in the Succession Duties and by the increase in coal royalties. The Mines and Mineral Acts underwent a very important consolidation. The development of the coal industry by the influx of foreign capital, made possible by the government's action, was of incalculable benefit to the province. Agriculture and Education were encouraged by the government. Many useful private and local bills were passed. Although there were not as many outstanding government measures as in previous years the government grappled vigorously and intelligently with the difficulties which confronted it and achieved splendid results.

CHAPTER IV

SECTION IV

Relations with Ottawa, 1891 - 1894.

The relations between the government of Nova Scotia and the government of the Dominion of Canada were as cordial as possible under the circumstances of governments composed of parties of different political faiths.

Premier Fielding, Attorney-General Longley, and various other members of the Liberal party in the local House, took a very active part in the Dominion election of 1891, and opposed the federal government. Also, Premier Fielding was very prominent in the National Liberal Convention at Ottawa in 1893, and assisted in forming the Liberal platform. This participation in federal politics did not make the Conservative party more pleasantly disposed towards the Liberals in the provincial legislature.

Since the provincial government still did not have sufficient revenue to cope with the rapidly growing expenditure it was necessary for them to make every effort to obtain more funds, so the Fielding government appealed to the Dominion government for a refund of the provincial subsidy spent on the Eastern Extension Railway and the Western Counties Railway.

In 1886 Fielding had put forward a demand that the subsidy of \$611,800, which had been advanced to aid the construction of the Eastern Extension, should be repaid to Nova Scotia by the Dominion. This had seemed to be a clear manifestation of the provincial discontent which had culminated in the Repeal demand. Nonetheless, when the province had sold the Eastern Extension to the Dominion they had accepted the payment made as a settlement in full and had signed away all rights to the railway. This claim was revived in 1891.

The Nova Scotian Legislature passed an Address on the Railway Claims in the session of 1891.¹ The Conservatives had voted against the Address, and had refused to serve on the Committee which prepared it. In the Address the Legislature requested that the subsidy of \$671,836 granted and paid by the government of Nova Scotia in aid of the Eastern Extension should be recouped to the province because the Dominion now possessed this line as part of the Intercolonial. As the rest of the Intercolonial had been wholly built out of the federal treasury, it was not fair that the section from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave should have been constructed out of the limited provincial resources. The memorialists stated that notwithstanding the disposal of the property to the Dominion, the Province had an equitable right to be refunded its expenditure on what had become part of the Intercolonial Railway. They also demanded the return of a subsidy of \$679,197.00 granted and paid to the Western Counties Railway because this railway had been declared to be a work "for the general advantage of Canada" by the Dominion, and thus the Parliament of Canada had admitted that public aid for constructing this railway should have been given by the Dominion Treasury.

Although this Address was duly forwarded and acknowledged no reply was received from Ottawa. In October, 1892, Attorney-General Longley and the Hon. Thomas Johnson were sent as delegates to the federal capital to urge the Provincial Railway claims personally. The delegates interviewed the Minister of Justice and Hon. Mr. Haggart, the Minister of the Department of Railways and

1. N. S. JOURNAL, 1891, App. No. 22.

Canals, and stated their case before the Privy Council. No decision was given, although Sir John Thompson promised that the matter would be fully considered at an early date. Finding it impracticable to obtain any definite decision before leaving, the delegates returned to Nova Scotia leaving a letter with Mr. Haggard which fully explained their claim.¹

The Dominion Government failed to give any decision until October, 1893. The Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, refused the province's claim. The Dominion government decided the fact that the province did not obtain the full amount they desired when they sold the Eastern Extension to the Dominion did not constitute any grievance. Any attempt to re-open the terms of the transaction and the question of the price would be "contrary to justice and reason."² The expenditure of the federal money for the missing link had made the Western Counties Railway far more valuable to the people it served and to the government of Nova Scotia. Also, as the province's lien and rights to the Western Counties Railway had not been disturbed by Dominion Legislation the Dominion government saw no reason to reimburse the province.³

The provincial government betrayed considerable exasperation over this decision and over the long delay in receiving a reply. The Assembly appointed a Committee in 1894 to draft an answer to the Dominion's adverse judgment. This was opposed by the Conservative party as they refused to support the Liberals

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1893, App. No. 14.
2. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1894, Tri Weekly Edition, January 23, P 3, Col. 3
3. Ibid.

in their demands for increased federal subsidies, and as they considered the railway claim unjust.

The Committee, composed entirely of Liberals, reiterated Nova Scotia's demand for the railway refund and attempted to refute various points in the Privy Council's memorandum. They advised that no advantage would arise from another application at present to the Ottawa authorities.¹ Thus the matter was dropped.

This railway claim was finally met in 1897, when Murray and Longley revived it. Fielding was then Finance Minister of the Dominion; a Liberal regime ruled in Ottawa. The Federal government agreed to arbitrate the claim. On March 8, 1901, the arbitrators gave Nova Scotia, by a credit to its capital account at Ottawa, the sum of \$671,800.

1. N.S. JOURNAL, 1894, App. No. 14.

CHAPTER V

SECTION I

The Provincial Election, March 15, 1894.

Another Financial Campaign

In the last decade of Queen Victoria's reign the people of Nova Scotia displayed far more interest in the Dominion elections than in the provincial contests, partly because the federal issues were more momentous and exciting than local affairs. Provincial politics were static. The Nova Scotian election of 1894 was very dull compared to the famous Repeal Election or even the Financial Election of 1890.

The 1894 campaign was very short and consisted largely of a repetition of the financial issues of the previous election. On February 15th the Legislature was dissolved and the writs were issued for one month later.

Although both parties had been preparing for the inevitable contest in a desultory manner, the Conservatives had not expected the election until April or May, and they accused the Liberals of holding the election in March so that the old lists, which favoured the party in power, would be used.

The Liberal-Conservative members had offered a steady and vigorous opposition to the government for four years under the leadership of Charles Cahan, and they had been ably supported by the HALIFAX HERALD so that the people were familiar with the issues between the parties, and with the Conservatives' objection to the Whitney Legislation and to the method of abolishing the Legislative Council. However, the Conservative county organizations seemed much slower to function and less efficient than the Liberal organizations. Some of the Conservative nominations were long delayed. For instance, the candidates for Hants were

not chosen until March 5th. Thus, the personal canvassing by the candidates was not as vigorous as in the preceding election. This was due to the season and the shortness of the campaign.

Premier Fielding's ADDRESS to the people formed the basis of the Liberal appeal to the electorate. The Liberals were secure in their tenure of office and in their confidence in the inability of the Conservatives to oust them. Thus the government did not fight a very vigorous campaign, but relied on their record and their able party organizations.

Much of this Address was a repetition of the topics of the previous election manifestoes as Mr. Fielding considered the work of the whole twelve years, not merely the preceding four. This enhanced the government's record although very little had been accomplished in the last term of office. As usual, the Premier paid attention to Education, Agriculture, Roads and Bridges, and Railways. He reviewed government successes which were already familiar to the people. The government leader stressed the fact that the sum for teachers' grants had been increased \$15,000, and that they had spent \$222,000 per annum on education, as compared to \$185,000 by the Holmes-Thompson government. He also noted that roads and bridges had received particular attention, and that railways would be constructed in Shelburne, Queens, and Inverness. He blamed the Conservatives' opposition to the railway claims for the province's failure to obtain the railway refund.

The Premier briefly and clearly explained the amount of the public debt and the interest charges. He stated that the debt was less per head than in other provinces and that

the debt had been incurred chiefly for railways, bridges, roads, schools, and hospitals. All these works were necessary to enable Nova Scotia to keep pace with the times. ¹

Mr. Fielding carefully reiterated that Cahan's charges of corruption in connection with the road moneys had been thoroughly investigated and the charges exploded. "While there had been much looseness and irregularity in making up the returns ... not a single dollar was shown to have been misappropriated." ²

He praised the government's policy of protecting the mining interests and for the Whitney Coal Legislation. As a result of this "the coal trade everywhere has improved, and the government are receiving much higher rates of royalty that (than) were formerly obtained." ³ He summed up the results of the Liberal rule thus:

The province has had twelve years of energetic administration. The government have not hesitated to raise the money to carry on the public works of the province. Railways have been aided, bridges have been built, roads have been constructed, a great hospital has been created. Everything has been done that could reasonably be asked in the way of public improvement. What has been the result from a financial point of view? The public credit has been established at home and abroad... The province has obtained increased revenue which more than meets the interest charges. The government consequently are able to pay the interest and have more money left for other services than was available when they came into power. It would be strange, indeed, if such a policy and such results failed to receive the endorsement of the electors of Nova Scotia. ⁴

1. See Premier Fielding's Address. MORNING CHRONICLE, February 20, 1894, P 6. Tri-weekly Edition. Nova Scotia paid \$72,130.54 per year as interest on debentures.
2. Ibid, Fielding's Address.
3. Ibid, February 20, 1894, P 6.
4. Fielding's Address.

Premier Fielding's Address was clear, condensed, and powerful. It provided an excellent outline of the government's career and achievements, but it had no proposals for new policies. The people were asked to re-elect the government solely on its record, and because of the prestige and past ability of the Liberal government.

The Opposition campaign was based on questions raised by Charles Cahan in his Address. These issues were the financial policy of the government, including the size of the public debt and the road frauds; the abolition of the Legislative Council; provincial legislation; the Railway Refund Claims, and criticism of the Whitney Legislation.

This Address was much longer than Mr. Fielding's and in it Mr. Cahan made a financial analysis for the people and a careful explanation and criticism of the Premier's financial methods. This was the first time that an Opposition leader had made such an attempt, and he expressed himself so clearly that the electors could understand. The Conservative leader attacked the Fielding administration for the Repeal agitation, for bribery, the road and bridge service, the accumulation of a large debt, the Whitney Legislation, and for the Railway Refund Claims. With the exception of the promise to abolish the Legislative Council and the proposal to give the municipalities further control of roads and to increase the road grant, the Conservative policy was purely destructive, and without constructive suggestions. As

Mr. Cahan said,

The local opposition have performed their duty in pointing out the facts; it remains for the electors to decide whether they will longer tolerate the present condition of affairs. ¹

The Conservatives condemned the Fielding government because they had failed to manage the public works and finances with skill, care, and honesty, and had also failed to initiate and promote enlightened and useful laws. They protested violently against the enormous increase in the public debt which they claimed was due to government extravagance and said that the members of the government were "utterly reckless in dealing with public trust moneys, and utterly lacking in political honesty." ²

The public debt was \$3,041,141.00, as compared with \$371,579.00 when Fielding had become Premier.³ The Conservatives claimed that the road and bridge expenditures represented about \$1,800,000 of it, and this money had been largely wasted on corruption. The Victoria General Hospital and the Nurses' Home need not have cost \$95,000, stated Cahan, but "a large portion of the work was performed without bona fide tender and contract; and the excessive cost was due to partisan favouritism in the construction of these buildings." ⁴

Many columns in the papers were occupied in a battle of statistics. Premier Fielding declared that the public debt

1. Cahan's Address To the Electors, HALIFAX HERALD, February 17, 1894, P 5.
2. Ibid, February 22, 1894, P 4.
3. Ibid, March 12, 1894; CHRONICLE, March 13, 1894, P 4.
4. HERALD, February 17, 1894, P 5.

was moderate, well spent on necessary construction, and much smaller than other provincial debts. The Conservatives challenged the veracity of the Premier's figures. The Liberals ridiculed the HERALD's financial articles as having been written by the "horse editor" and being "always calculated to deceive those who might read in a trustful spirit." ¹

The Conservatives repeated their financial criticisms of the previous election. They argued that although the revenue had increased forty-five per cent. since 1882, the expenditure on the major government services had increased very little, and that the increase had been squandered on public works, salaries, and interest! They asserted that the government had "rolled up an interest bill of \$129,000 a year to eat up our current revenues and starve the needful services of the province." ² They also reiterated their attacks on the "Grits" for increasing ministerial salaries and the sessional indemnities, and for reducing the Teachers' Grant. They threatened that Liberal rule led to direct taxation, and that if Fielding were returned to office it would mean a business tax and a tax on transfers of real estate. ³

The Opposition objected to the Succession Duties, and they stated

The local government struck the well to do classes with a succession tax. And they struck the whole people with a coal tax. And still they have the sublime impudence to ask for another lease of power in which to impose more taxes and incur more debt! Turn the rascals out! ⁴

1. CHRONICLE, March 7, 1894, P 2, and HERALD, February 15, 1894.
2. HERALD, March 10, 1894, P 4; also February 15, P 4, Feb. 27, P 2.
3. HERALD, 1894, Feb. 15, P 4, Col. 3; Feb. 22, P 4; March 7th, P 4; CHRONICLE, March 6, P 2 & 4, and March 8, P 4.
4. HERALD, March 14, 1894, P 2.

The Road and Bridge Policy of the Liberal government was opposed and condemned by the Opposition. In 1890 the Conservatives had objected to the policy of constructing roads and bridges by borrowing. In this election they objected to specific incidents in the administration of this policy, particularly to the charges of road frauds.

Charles Cahan claimed that a large portion of the money borrowed for roads and bridges had been expended in the most insidious forms of political corruption.

They (the moneys borrowed) influenced many votes in the local and federal elections, but they conferred no permanent benefit upon the roads of the province. ¹

He protested against the excessive cost of \$1,287,000 for one hundred and forty-seven permanent bridges and he proposed to renew the wooden bridges, thus giving employment to Nova Scotians, not to American iron works. He also attacked the patronage in bridge building.

In inviting tenders for the construction of these bridges the government provided no safeguards against collusion and fraud ... The lowest tenderers were frequently allowed to withdraw their tenders without loss; and the final award was as frequently made by the government in favour of the higher tender.

Then, again, low tenders from competent contractors were often rejected, and the bridges constructed by days' work for the purpose of distributing political patronage.²

These charges were well substantiated by facts and figures.

The Liberal press hotly denied these insinuations of corruption which the Conservatives had never presented in the Assembly. They declared that the government could not prevent men from withdrawing low tenders, and insisted that no tender was ever disregarded

1. HERALD, February 17, 1894, P 4, 5.

2. Cahan's Address, and HERALD, February 27, 1894, P 4.

except for "good and sufficient reasons", given by the Provincial Engineer. They ridiculed any idea of favouritism in awarding contracts, and stated that without the energetic policy of the government "half the roads and bridges of the country would have been rendered impassable." 1

The road frauds in Cape Breton and Victoria were emphasized by the Conservatives. The Opposition reminded the people that the government had promised to spend the "\$600,000 of Road Boodle" on permanent work under the supervision of the provincial engineer, and had failed to do so.

The provincial engineer was simply ignored; the lawful appointment of supervisors was wilfully neglected; and the expenditure of these hundreds of thousands of dollars of borrowed money was dumped into the hands of the grit members and henchmen of the several counties, without any formal appointment, without any reasonable safeguards against improper expenditure, without any lawful authority whatever! 2

The Road Investigations of 1891 were reviewed, with the explanation that the investigation had been restricted as much as possible, but in spite of that, it had been revealed that

in Victoria County not a single commission authorizing the expenditure of a single dollar of money was ever issued to a single foreman during the year 1890. The government violated the law, broke down every safeguard established by the legislature, and paid out thousands of dollars from the provincial treasury, knowing that no commission had ever been issued authorizing these alleged expenditures. The paysheets now on file in the office of the provincial secretary are fraudulent. 3

The Liberals stressed the fact that a thorough investigation of any road fraud was made by a parliamentary committee, and that no graft or corruption was discovered, only "great looseness in making returns."

1. CHRONICLE, February 27, 1894, P 4; March 1, P 2.
2. HERALD, February 20, 1894, P 4.
3. Cahan's Address.

As a reform of the system of corruption in connection with roads and bridges, the Conservatives intended to give the municipalities complete control of the roads and bridges and to increase the annual road grants to the municipal councils. They opposed the remedy proposed by the Road Act of 1892 - the creation of a road board with powers of direct taxation for maintenance - because this would limit the power of the municipality and lend itself to fraud.¹

Both parties favoured the abolition of the Legislative Council. Nonetheless this subject was widely discussed as the Liberals reviewed their attempts to abolish it and the Conservatives criticized their methods. Cahan insisted that all Councillors who violated their pledges should be dismissed by the Crown, and men of honour be appointed, who were prepared to vote for abolition. The Liberals retorted that Cahan's proposal was unconstitutional.²

The Conservatives devoted considerable attention to the Railway Refund Claims although they had opposed them, and had ably defended the refusal of the Dominion government. They asserted that if the Canadian Government was forced to make similar refunds to all the provinces this would be unfortunate for Nova Scotia because she had expended less in proportion on local railway lines than other provinces. The Liberals seldom mentioned the Railway Claims because they had failed to obtain their demands from the Federal government, and they blamed the Conservatives in Nova Scotia for their failure. Also, since the increase

1. Cahan's Address, and HERALD, February 23, 1894, P 2.

2. HERALD, February 17, 1894, P 5. CHRONICLE, 1894, February 20 and 22nd, P 2, Col 1 & 2.

in coal royalties the province was not suffering from a lack of revenue.¹

The Opposition assailed the mining legislation of the Fielding administration. They regarded the Mines Act of 1892 as a breach of faith with the coal lessees, and as an attempt, pure and simple, to increase the revenue by higher coal royalties. They argued that this action of the government merited the severe condemnation of the electorate. Charles Cahan repeated his objections against the Whitney Syndicate Legislation² but he admitted that the Dominion Coal Company had become a vested interest which could not be disturbed. The Conservatives claimed that the Whitney Syndicate had raised the price of coal:

Mr. Fielding, in his manifesto, rejoices that the province is receiving 2-1/2 cents extra royalty on the coal produced at the syndicate mines; but he does not mention that the people are paying from 20 cents to 50 cents a ton more for their coal, according to the quality and the amount purchased! ³

The Liberal press praised their party for increasing the coal royalties, and stressed the fact that Dr. William McKay (former Conservative leader) who was again a candidate in Cape Breton, dared not oppose the Whitney Syndicate Legislation. They also publicized a letter from David McKeen, Cape Breton manager of the Dominion Coal Company, which described the scope of the Company's undertakings. This was considered to be a very effective reply to the vindictive attacks made by the "Tory" press on the operations of the Whitney Syndicate.⁴

1. HERALD, Feb. 17, 1894, March 5, 1894, P 5. CHRONICLE, March 8, 1894, P 2, for railway construction under Fielding.
2. Because it created a monopoly, gave a long lease, placed workmen and coal output of Nova Scotia under control of one company.
3. HERALD, 1894, Feb. 20, P 4, Col 3.
4. CHRONICLE, March 3, 1894, P 2 & 6.

The Liberals proclaimed that:

Neither the mining lessees of the province nor the coal miners can afford to give any countenance or support to the leader and the party followers who sought to wreck the Whitney syndicate enterprise and paralyze every mining industry.¹

Although the Whitney Legislation may have had a profound influence on the election, it had been fully argued in 1893, and it was not discussed very much during this short campaign.

Both parties gave evidence of hatred and contempt of the other's leader. The Conservatives scorned Premier Fielding because of his alleged corruption, negligence, and intermeddling with federal affairs. They objected very decidedly to his participation in federal campaigns, to his espousal of the cause of commercial union, and because he had become Chairman of the National Liberal party's platform committee.

It was he (Fielding) who has sought by fair means and foul to destroy the national policy of the country, and who has used his personal influence and the patronage at his disposal to create opposition to the federal government.²

The Liberals called the Conservatives "Cahanites" and ridiculed the "Cahanite" policy as a frantic anxiety to get into power, jealousy of Fielding, determination to wreck the mining industry rather than see the Whitney legislation successful, and a disposition to decry and injure provincial credit.³

The Liberal government of W. S. Fielding again received the support of the people on election day, March 15, 1894. The

1. CHRONICLE, February 22, P 4, Col 3.
2. HERALD, February 17, 1894.
3. CHRONICLE, 1894, February 27, P 4, Col 2.

victory was first announced as twenty-six Liberals to twelve Conservatives, but later altered to twenty-five Liberals to thirteen Conservatives, a gain of three for the Opposition. The Liberal majorities were considerably reduced and several good men were defeated. However, the Liberals rejoiced because Webster "went down" in Kings, and Cahan had been "snowed under" in Shelburne.

The Conservatives minimized the blow caused by the defeat of their leader. They stated that Cahan had lost by only sixty-four votes, and that Shelburne had been "flooded" with rum and money to accomplish this. Many Conservatives had expressed their doubts of the wisdom of allowing Cahan to reoffer in Shelburne, but had decided that he dared not show signs of weakness by running elsewhere. Shelburne was strongly Liberal, and accordingly the Hon. Thomas Johnson was certain of re-election. The other Liberal candidate, Thomas Robertson, had organized a railway company which had received a large provincial subsidy. The prospect of a railway had appealed to the people of Shelburne, who had long desired one.¹

The Opposition stressed the fact that Speaker Power had been defeated in Halifax, and Premier Fielding's majority greatly reduced. They gloried in the success of six Conservatives in Cape Breton (one of whom was Dr. William McKay) and interpreted this to mean the unpopularity of the mining legislation. The Conservatives attributed their defeat to "Grit" unscrupulousness, the manipulation of the election lists, and to the shortness of the campaign and to bribery by the government.²

1. HERALD, 1894, March 10, March 15, P 2.

2. Ibid, March 16, 17.

The Liberals made counter charges of bribery and use of liquor by the Conservatives. They declared that Speaker M. J. Power's defeat had been caused by ill health which had prevented him from making an active campaign. They also referred to the sectarian feeling which had been aroused in Halifax by a disagreement between Archbishop O'Brien and the School Board over the Russell Street School, and which had influenced the campaign so that the capital was without a Catholic representative for the first time since Confederation.¹

The Liberals owed their success partly to the fact that they were the reigning party, and partly to the leadership, consummate skill, and prestige of Premier Fielding. The Premier was regarded as a man of tact, ability, and unswerving integrity; and he enjoyed the unwavering confidence, not only of the entire Liberal party, but of many Conservatives also. Above all, the people did not desire a change. The Liberals possessed a strong party organization, experienced and able men, and their record and achievements were widely known.

The Conservatives had suffered in prestige and political experience from their twelve years of Opposition. Some people believed that their policy was one of vicious obstruction, slander, and personal abuse, and that the Conservative leaders would be incapable of ruling the country. The Opposition were handicapped

1. CHRONICLE, March 20, 1894, P 2. The Fielding government had given formal approval to the proposals of the School Board. The Conservatives denounced Premier Fielding as being hostile to the Catholics. Both parties tried to arouse the ultra-Protestants, and incidentally prevented them from voting for the Catholics - Walsh and Power, e.g., Conservatives urged Protestant Liberals to vote for William Black (C) instead of Power, who was a Catholic.

by the shortness of the campaign, as they did not have the strength or the time to arouse the people against the government.

Although Charles Cahan had steadily gained political skill, and had led a valiant Opposition in the Assembly, and had offered a searching criticism of Fielding's financial legislation and had formulated a platform, he could not overcome the Premier's political record or the enormous popularity and prestige of Liberalism in Nova Scotia.

The opposition leader was defeated, and never again occupied a seat in the Nova Scotian legislature. Charles Cahan was the ablest Conservative leader of the late nineteenth century, and the only opponent who proved worthy to cross swords with W. S. Fielding. In this election the Conservative party offered the most effective opposition that Fielding received in the political arena.¹

1. Charles Cahan unsuccessfully contested Shelburne-Queens in 1896 and Cumberland in 1900 for the Dominion. From 1886 to 1890 he was editor of the MORNING HERALD. In 1927 he became Secretary of State for Canada in R. B. Bennett's Cabinet.

CHAPTER V

SECTION II

The Dominion Election of 1896.
June 23, 1896.

The chief issues before the people of Canada in the Dominion election of 1896 were the Manitoba School Question and tariff reform. Both of these problems had been fully discussed in Parliament.

After a brief interval Sir John Abbott, a distinguished Montreal advocate and leader of the Senate, had succeeded Sir John A. Macdonald as Premier. In December, 1892, Sir John Thompson, the leader of the House of Commons, replaced Abbott. The sudden death of Sir John Thompson at Windsor Castle in December, 1894, was a severe blow to the Conservative party, especially as it required the services of its greatest constitutional lawyer in the Manitoba School Question. His successor was Sir Mackenzie Bowell, leader of the government of the Senate and a prominent Orangeman.

The Dominion government now undertook the task of the restoration of Separate Schools in Manitoba, and acted on the judgment of the Privy Council in issuing a Remedial Order which ordered Manitoba to restore the separate school system. Manitoba refused, so the Ottawa government was forced to deal with the problem in the Parliament of 1896.

The government was further weakened by the sudden and unexplained resignation of seven cabinet ministers. The "Bolt" gave the Conservative party a stunning blow and shook the confidence of the people. An attempt at recovery was made by reconstructing the government under the veteran Sir Charles Tupper, who had left his post as High Commissioner at London.

Throughout the early period of this controversy, Wilfred Laurier, Leader of the Opposition, had maintained a discreet and judicial attitude. He did not believe that a policy of coercion could succeed, and he was convinced that only by the free action of the provincial legislature could the Catholic people receive effective redress of their grievances. When the Remedial Bill came up for its second reading, Mr. Laurier declared the Liberal policy by moving six months' hoist. He stated that although Parliament had the power to interfere it was the first duty of the Government to investigate, and that only methods of conciliation and of persuasion could provide an effective settlement.

As Parliament was to expire soon through the effluxion of time the obstructive tactics of the Liberals succeeded against the Remedial Bill. Parliament prorogued April 23rd without forcing Manitoba to accept a Separate School System.

The Nova Scotian press devoted considerable space to the Manitoba School Question. The HALIFAX HERALD and the MORNING CHRONICLE had been expanded to eight pages in the early 1890's, and this enabled them to carry more Canadian and World news. The progress of the Remedial Bill had been reported on the first page and also subjected to editorial comment. The HERALD had published the full report of the Winnipeg Conference in a special supplementary. This paper defended the Dominion government, and attacked the Manitoba government and the federal Liberal party. The CHRONICLE supported the action of the Manitoba government and criticized the Conservatives at Ottaws. For example, the HERALD

claimed that the Remedial Bill was satisfactory to the minority, and it condemned Manitoba because it refused the federal offer at Winnipeg, as this would have established the Nova Scotian school system in Manitoba. The CHRONICLE was furious because the Dominion had refused Manitoba's compromise offer, and attacked Sir Charles Tupper for forcing the bill through Parliament while the Conference was taking place.¹

Thus the people of Nova Scotia were familiar with all aspects of the Manitoba School Question before the dissolution of Parliament and before the election campaign began.

The Liberals tended to emphasize the School Question far more than their opponents. The Conservatives stressed other issues, particularly the tariff, and minimized the School Question until they were forced to defend themselves against the "slanders" of the "Grits". They had hoped to have the troublesome matter settled before the election, and then they could have demanded praise for giving justice to the minority. Having failed, the School Question was a source of great weakness to them.

Sir Charles Tupper, in his election manifesto, dealt very briefly with the Manitoba School Question and declared that the government had done its duty and would adhere to its policy.

The fact is recognized that the government has taken a clear and definite stand on the constitutional aspect of the matter (Manitoba School Question). We have simply done what we believed to be right in taking up the duty laid at our door by the judgment of the highest courts of the realm, and in endeavouring to redress the grievances of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba by restoring the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by the constitution;.... we now appeal for vindication to the sober sense of justice of the Canadian people.

1. HERALD, 1896, April 17, P 2; CHRONICLE, April 3, P 1 & 4.
2. Sir Charles Tupper's Electoral Manifesto, HERALD, May 6, 1896.

The Conservative press in Nova Scotia reiterated that it was the bounden duty of Parliament to pass such legislation as the people of Canada could not disregard the order of the Privy Council.

The breaking of the "parliamentary compact of 1870", no matter under what circumstances or for what reasons, deprived the Roman Catholics of Manitoba of rights and privileges, and therefore made it incumbent on the federal government and parliament to intervene.¹

The Liberals carefully reviewed the history of the School Question for the benefit of the people. They angrily refuted the "Tory" contention that the Privy Council had ordered the government to apply remedial legislation. They argued at great length to prove that this was no pre-union compact requiring the maintenance of separate schools in Manitoba, and that the federal government was under no compulsion to pass remedial legislation:

The last deliverance of the British privy council was not a judgment at all in the strict sense of the term; it was merely a judicial expression of opinion that the Manitoba minority had the right of appeal to the governor-in-council - that and nothing more.²

They also repeated Mr. Laurier's policy that any educational disabilities must be removed by Manitoba, not by federal coercion. They promised that if Wilfred Laurier were elected he could settle the matter to the satisfaction of all:

The people of Canada must see the necessity of giving Wilfred Laurier and the Liberal party a mandate not merely to deal with but to settle the question on lines which will conserve the constitutional rights of Manitoba and at the same time deal out to the Roman Catholic minority every right and privilege claimed and exercised by their Protestant fellow citizens ... Mr. Laurier can settle the question on those lines.

1. HERALD, 1896, May 27, P 2; also April 18, P 4.
2. CHRONICLE, 1896, April 18, P 4; also June 5, P 4, June 10, P 4; June 11, P 4.
3. CHRONICLE, 1896, June 5, P 4.

The CHRONICLE condemned the Conservative party for supporting Sir Charles in his attempt to coerce Manitoba, and they protested that this policy was fraught with danger to the free government and the representative institutions of the country.

The ablest and most comprehensive speech delivered in Nova Scotia on the Manitoba School Question was given by Premier W. S. Fielding at Windsor on March 5th, 1896. This was reprinted just before the election in a special supplement by the ACADIAN RECORDER, entitled Coercion or Conciliation ?

Mr. Fielding expressed his regret that the Manitoba School Question had intruded into politics. He stated that there was "an amazing lack of information on the subject",¹ and proceeded to give a summary of the question and a very careful explanation. He attacked the policy of the Dominion government and in particular Sir Charles Tupper for "devoting the evening of his life to the work of destroying the free school system of Manitoba and forcing upon that province a system which he would not dare to attempt to force upon the province of Nova Scotia."¹ The Premier made an eloquent plea for the Liberal policy of a full and deliberate investigation and for conciliation.

1. ACADIAN RECORDER Supplement, June 18, 1896.

Mr. Fielding also commented on Wilfred Laurier's courage in resisting pressure from the Roman Catholic hierarchy to get him to assent to the Remedial Bill, and declared that Mr. Laurier "stand(s) forth before the people of Canada as the champion of civil and religious liberty."

The question of the tariff was more important in Nova Scotia than the Manitoba School Question. The Conservatives maintained their strong support of the National Policy Protection, and declared that the real issue of the campaign was whether the National Policy would be sustained.

The grievance of a very small Catholic minority in the far away province of Manitoba can be made very picturesque and is so being treated by liberals, but the practical question is one of dollars and cents for the merchants and manufacturers, of bread and butter for the artisan and farmer, and on this an overwhelming victory may be looked for on the side of the national policy.¹

They reminded the people that the National Policy was the source of their blessings. This National Policy had increased the free list, had reduced the duties on the necessities of life, and at the same time it had been responsible for the marked increase in the number of factories and businesses, in the amount of capital employed, the amount of wages paid, the value of industrial products, and for the great expansion of Canadian trade. Long lists of statistics were quoted in the HALIFAX HERALD to show the benefits of the protective tariff.²

The Conservatives said the expansion of the coal industry, which was particularly important to Nova Scotia, had been due to the great growth of manufacturing and coal using industries in Eastern Canada under the National Policy. They threatened that if the "Grits" regained power they would remove the duties on coal and iron, and that Nova Scotia's market in Upper Canada would be completely lost in competition with cheaper American coal.

The Liberals repeated the arguments which they had advanced against the National Policy in previous elections. They

1. HERALD, June 18, 1896. P 4.

not only attacked the "Diabolical Tariff", but at the same time pointed out the remedy for its evils - the Liberal tariff policy.

The Opposition insisted that the necessities of life were highly taxed and refuted the Conservative claim that all such necessities were free. They protested against the National Policy which enriched the "sugar barons" and the "cotton lords" while their workmen lived on starvation wages, and prices were raised.

The national policy gives the cotton lords enormous profits, the people dear cottons and the cotton mill operatives unsteady work and starvation wages. Can such a system be a good thing for the masses of the people of this country? Emphatically no." ¹

Both parties wrangled endlessly over such questions as the deficit, the amount of debt and taxation. The Liberals stated that the interest on the debt required one-third of the revenue from the customs and excise to pay it, that much of the debt represented funds which had been wasted, stolen, or misappropriated by the "Tories", and that the government had manipulated the tariff to put more money into the pockets of protected combines.²

The Conservatives retorted that the debt had been created because of the construction of public works, and that "Grit" governments were far more extravagant and wasteful; for example, Ontario and Nova Scotia.

1. CHRONICLE, 1896, May 4, P 4, also April 23, P 4, and May 19, P 4, Col 2.
2. CHRONICLE, May 22, 1896. The Liberals quoted Edward Blake's scathing denunciation of the National Policy.

The Liberal trade policy had been decided by a convention which had met at Ottawa in 1893. This National Liberal Convention had been largely attended by Liberals active in provincial and federal politics. The Hon. W. S. Fielding, Premier of Nova Scotia, had been appointed the Chairman of the Committee which drafted the platform. The Liberal platform had declared squarely against protection, and in favour of a free trade policy like Great Britain; that is, a tariff for revenue; and also in favour of reciprocity with the United States.

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries ...

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of her majesty's government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.¹

The Liberal party intended to remove all barriers to commerce as far as the requirements of honest and economical government permitted, and to show the Americans that Canada was willing to trade with them on fair terms. They promised that if the shackles were removed from agriculture and manufactures, trade and commerce; and if immigration were encouraged; and if Canada received pure, honest, and economical government, namely Laurier and Mowat, then Canada would have world markets, a large and rapidly increasing population, and abounding prosperity.²

1. CHRONICLE, May 22, 1896, P 3, Liberal Platform.

2. CHRONICLE, 1896, June 12, P 4.

Wilfred Laurier reassured the manufacturers that they need not fear reciprocity, and declared that they had nothing to suffer and much to gain from the substitution of a revenue tariff for the existing system. The Liberal press carefully emphasized that leading manufacturers such as George Betram, of Toronto, and William Paterson, of Brantford, were not afraid of tariff reform, and thought that it would enable them to compete more successfully in home and foreign markets.

A large number of self reliant and enterprising manufacturers ... are supporting the Liberal policy and the Liberal candidates ... they know that the Liberal policy of freer trade and reduced taxation will be a good thing for them as well as for the masses of the people. ¹

Sir Oliver Mowat, who possessed great influence in Ontario and among Liberals generally, asserted that any tariff legislation would be gradual and cautious. The changes must

be a relief to our farmers and at the same time will not injuriously affect but rather benefit manufacturers and their workmen. A government owes a duty to all classes of the people. ²

The Conservatives recognized the popular appeal of the Liberal tariff policy, and made more strenuous efforts to defend their National Policy. At the same time they repeated their arguments of the 1891 election against reciprocity. They insisted that the Liberal policy meant unrestricted reciprocity which would benefit the United States to the detriment of Canada, and that the awful years of the Mackenzie regime would be repeated if the National Policy was removed. Another argument was that

1. CHRONICLE, 1896, May 22, P 4 Col 2, also May 14, P 4, and May 18, P 4.
2. CHRONICLE, 1896, May 12, P 1.

the Liberals would establish a revenue tariff which would mean large taxes on tea, coffee, tobacco, beer and spirits, with absolutely no protection for manufactured goods, and intimated that this would be the end of all Canadian prosperity. ¹

The government press also revived the cries of a "Yankee Reciprocity Fad", disloyalty, and annexation. The Conservatives stated that Reciprocity meant union with the United States, and referred to Edward Blake's letter for proof that the Liberal trade policy would result in political union with the United States. They publicized comments from American papers which claimed that under Liberal rule Canada would soon join the United States.

The liberal politicians and newspapers have no aspirations in the direction of closer union with Great Britain. They want to tie up Canada's destinies with those of the United States. They would first make the two countries one commercially, and then it would become one politically.²

The Conservatives made charges of disloyalty against Wilfred Laurier. They declared that Laurier still wanted unrestricted reciprocity, which would injure Great Britain, and that in this election he was even less careful "to keep the anti-British character of his proposal under the mask." ³

Because Wilfred Laurier was a French-Canadian, and therefore supposedly hostile to Great Britain, the presence of half a dozen American flags at one of his political meetings in Montreal was interpreted to mean that the Liberal leader wanted

1. HERALD, 1896, April 23, P 4; May 22, P 2; May 30, P 2; June 8, P 2, June 9, P 6, Col 2.
2. HERALD, 1896, June 1, P 4; also May 6, P 4; June 1, P 4; June 9, P 4.
3. HERALD, June 9, 1896, P 4, Col 2.

annexation to the United States, and that he hated Great Britain. ¹

The Liberals attempted to counteract such charges by explaining clearly the nature of their reciprocity proposals, and by making statements of their loyalty to Great Britain, and by furious denials of the Conservative claims. They concluded that this was merely an effort by the "Tories" to humbug the people and to divert attention from their own disgraceful record by cries of disloyalty and veiled treason. ²

In opposition to the Liberal reciprocity policy the Conservatives advocated preferential trade within the Empire. This would mean a reduction in the colonial duties. The Liberals replied that "Tupper's preferential humbug" would not be acceptable to Great Britain's free trade policy and that the Mother Country would refuse to impose a duty upon food and raw materials from foreign countries. ³

The topic of corruption did not figure as prominently in this election as it did in 1887 or 1891 although the Liberals made frequent references to "Tory" bribery and corruption and political villainy. The Liberals stated that although the people could not wipe out the years of "Canada's shame", they could drive from power "the corrupt and incompetent men who have for years past been masquerading as statesmen at Ottawa", and they

1. HERALD, 1896, May 6, P 4.

2. CHRONICLE, 1896, April 21, P 4; May 20, P 4.

3. See Tupper's speech in HERALD, June 6, P11, and CHRONICLE, May 14, 1896, P 4.

urged the people to elect Wilfred Laurier and his lieutenants, who could "be depended upon to be true to the principles of pure, honest, and just administration, something Canada has not enjoyed since 1878." ¹

The Opposition press in Nova Scotia stressed Sir Charles Tupper's bad reputation and all scandals in which he had been involved in his long political career. The Premier was accused of feathering his own nest by acquiring the treasures of this world, chiefly in the shape of public moneys, for the use and benefit of himself and his offspring, and that he became wealthy by public funds. The Liberals asked, "How long can Canada stand the drain on her treasury which will be involved in the payment of Sir Charles Tupper's election promises?" ²

The Conservatives retorted by criticisms of the Liberal provincial governments, not by contradicting the Liberal charges. They praised Sir Charles Tupper, and reported in detail the story of the "Old Warhorse in the North-West", and the "Triumphal Tour of Cape Breton", and the "Royal Welcome to the Great Chieftain" in Halifax. They stressed Sir Charles' "prominence as a statesman and leader ... the public service which he has rendered throughout the history of the Dominion", his experience, prestige, and popularity, and "he still possesses his old-time power as a leader both in the house and out of it." ³

1. CHRONICLE, May 7, 1896, P 4.
2. HERALD, 1896, May 18, P 4; May 25, P 4.
3. Ibid, 1896, May 2, P 4.

Wilfred Laurier, leader of the Opposition, and destined to be the first French-Canadian Premier of Canada, had truly become the leader of the Liberal party. In this election he was closely identified with the Liberal party, and he was regarded as its spokesman, in Nova Scotia as well as in Quebec, and as a great statesman and an honest man. In 1891 he had seemed to be merely a leader from Quebec, while men in Nova Scotia would act for her interests.¹

The MORNING CHRONICLE reported Laurier's speeches briefly, and his campaign triumphs in Quebec and Ontario. This paper also published his picture with the caption: FOR PREMIER - WILFRED LAURIER, and various articles in his tribute.²

The Conservatives expressed profound contempt for Wilfred Laurier and said he was "too cowardly to avow any principles or declare any policy."³ They stated that he was almost entirely without experience in the administration of public affairs, capable of delivering flowery and meaningless speeches, but wanting in principle and executive power. The Liberal leader was also criticized for his anti-British and anti-Canadian spirit.⁴

1. During the few years preceding the election of 1896 Laurier had visited every province in Canada. Everywhere a new national spirit was born into the Liberal party, and a genuine enthusiasm for the leader developed.

2. CHRONICLE, 1896, May 8, P 1; June 9, P 1; June 15, P 6

3. HERALD, 1896, June 16, P 4.

4. Ibid, June 5, P 4; June 20, P 1.

Conservatives also said that Quebec did not want a French Premier because Laurier would be compelled to sacrifice her interests to maintain union in the cabinet.

The Conservative party asked the electors of Nova Scotia to

VOTE FOR THE GOVERNMENT

and

The National Policy.
 Preferential Trade within the bounds of the Empire.
 Fast Atlantic Service, with
 Winter Terminus at Halifax.
 Pacific Cable
 Justice to Minorities.
 Development of Agriculture.
 Encouragement of Immigration.
 Admission of Newfoundland to Confederation.
 Maintenance of Canadian Industry

If you vote for the Opposition, what Policy are you voting for? You don't know; you're taking a leap in the dark. ¹

For the first time the Liberal party had a definite programme which had been formulated by various representatives of the party. This Liberal platform was clear and concise, and it was frequently reprinted in the Liberal papers during the election campaign. The Liberal Platform denounced protection, and favoured a lower tariff and a reciprocity treaty with the United States; and declared in favour of purity of administration; economy with decreased expenditure; senate reform; a Dominion plebiscite on prohibition; a land policy which would provide land for the settler; not for the speculator; for the repeal of the Dominion Franchise Act, and the return of the Provincial Franchise; and against the Gerrymander, and in favour of preserving county lines in the formation of electoral divisions; and in favour of reduced taxation. ²

1. HERALD, June 23, 1896, P 8.
2. CHRONICLE, May 22, 1896, P 3.

On June 24th, 1896, the MORNING CHRONICLE announced in headlines:

LIBERALS SWEEP THE DOMINION.

A MAGNIFICENT TRIUMPH FOR THE LAURIER HOSTS THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE COUNTRY.

After eighteen years in the wilderness of political exile, the cocks could crow again for the victory of the Liberal party.

The result of the polling was a decisive victory for the Liberals. In Ontario the Liberals carried forty-four out of ninety-two seats, while three were carried by Patrons of Industry who supported the Liberals. Nova Scotia elected eleven Liberals and nine Conservatives; New Brunswick five Liberals and eight Conservatives and one Independent; and in Prince Edward Island three out of five seats were carried by Liberal candidates. Manitoba returned a Conservative majority, while British Columbia and the Territories gave seven out of ten seats to the Liberals. It was in Quebec that the Liberals won their support when they carried forty-eight seats out of sixty-five! ¹

1. Hon. A. R. Dickey, Minister of Justice, was defeated in Cumberland, and two prominent Liberals, Attorney-General J. W. Longley and J. D. Sperry, were also defeated. In Halifax B. Russell, Q.C., (L) and Robert L. Borden (C), both lawyers and both Protestants, were elected. Both parties regretted that one Catholic had not been elected. The Liberals were disappointed that Thomas Kenny (C), the former member, had not been chosen instead of R. L. Borden. Although R. L. Borden was "an amiable gentleman and a good lawyer", and "held in high esteem by the bar of Halifax ... he has no aptitude for political affairs" and he would not stand by Halifax's interests. The Liberals failed to perceive the qualities which were to make R. L. Borden the leader of the Conservative party and the next Prime Minister of Canada. See HERALD, May 5, 1896, P 4, and CHRONICLE, 1896, May 1, P 4.

The Conservatives were defeated because of the rapid changes in leadership; and because the "Bolt" and the subsequent resignation of Sir Mackenzie Bowell had given the party an irreparable blow on the eve of the election. The government had lost not only Sir John Macdonald, but his successors, Abbott and Sir John Thompson. Sir Charles Tupper had considerable personal appeal to the electors and he made a gallant fight, with dash and courage, to save the government. He bravely opened his campaign at Winnipeg, and maintained the expedience and justice of the remedial policy, and he made a tour of all Canada, acting with vigour and phenomenal endurance. Although Sir Charles achieved great success in uniting the Conservative party, he was handicapped by a weak Cabinet which had no men of commanding influence or skill in political organization, and by the fact that he was not in command long enough to re-organize and rally his party. There was also a powerful feeling in favour of clean government, and that the Conservatives were corrupt and therefore should be removed. ¹

In Ontario the Orange body, which had previously supported the Conservatives, was either hostile or very lukewarm. Other Protestants objected to the Remedial Bill and accordingly refused to vote for the government. In Quebec Sir Charles was unable to counteract Wilfred Laurier's influence. He relied on the strong support of the Catholic hierarchy for the Remedial Bill as the Quebec leaders of the Conservative party were weak.

1. CHRONICLE, 1896, April 29, P 4; May 18, P 4, Col 3; June 23, P 4.

In the Maritime Provinces a new generation had arisen which knew not Sir Charles, as he had been absent from Canada since 1884, except for short intervals, acting as High Commissioner in London. Therefore he could not exert a personal influence or knowledge on local organizations. Also the country was still in the throes of a depression. This made the people more inclined to favour a reciprocity treaty and a change of government since the National Policy was failing to give prosperity. ¹

The Conservative press attributed their defeat to the fact that the people had "declared for the Abolition of the National Policy and Against Justice to the Catholic Minority in Manitoba." ² They claimed that the Liberals had used the Manitoba School Question to create discord and that their trick had succeeded as the ultra Protestants had voted against the government because they were opposed to Roman Catholic separate schools. On the other hand, French racial prejudice had been aroused, and the French had gone against the government in favour of a French-Canadian Premier.

The Liberal party was victorious because their leader, Wilfred Laurier, possessed remarkable popularity and strength and an irreproachable reputation in contrast to the weak and changing leadership of the government. Laurier was now the unrivalled "favourite son" of Quebec in spite of his opposition to Remedial Legislation. The French Canadians were proud of their fellow countryman, and they wanted a French Canadian to be Premier, so they gave him overwhelming support.

1. CHRONICLE, May 18, 1896, P 4, Col 3.
2. HERALD, June 24, 1896, P 1.

The Liberals had a very strong platform, and their free trade policy was very popular with the people because it promised prosperity.

Many people were convinced that the Conservatives had failed in their Remedial Legislation, and they believed that Wilfred Laurier would be able to settle the Manitoba School Question without fuss, to the satisfaction of all. The School Question did not exert undue influence in the election, for Manitoba supported the Conservatives, although its people were opposed to Remedial Legislation, and Quebec, which should have supported separate schools, gave an overwhelming Liberal majority.

The Conservative government suffered from all the evils and weaknesses of a party which had remained in power too long. Many people wanted a change of rulers. The Liberal party had able leaders - not only Cartwright, Mills, Charlton, Mulock, and Davies in Parliament - but such eminent and experienced and well-known provincial premiers as Mowat in Ontario, Fielding in Nova Scotia, and Blair in New Brunswick.

The Liberal party in Nova Scotia had steadily grown in power and supporters and influence under W. S. Fielding, who was largely responsible for the Liberal majority in this election. Mr. Fielding was to become Finance Minister in Wilfred Laurier's cabinet.

The weakness of the Conservatives and the strength of the Liberals had combined to result in a substantial Liberal majority, and to make Wilfred Laurier the Premier of Canada.

Sir Charles Tupper has met his Waterloo ... His government has been struck down by the hand of an aroused people, who wanted relief from the exactions of the national policy, who had grown tired of boodle government, and who for years have been longing for the inauguration of a regime of clean government to which for eighteen years they have been strangers. Let us hope that yesterday's Liberal victory marks the dawn of a brighter and better day for Canada and for all classes of the Canadian people.¹

1. CHRONICLE, June 24, 1896, P 4, Editorial.

CHAPTER V
SECTION III

Domestic Legislation,
1895 to 1897

In the election of 1894 twenty-five Liberals had been elected and thirteen Conservatives - a majority of twelve for Premier Fielding. However, John Morrison (C) was unseated, and in December, 1894, John Matheson (L) was returned as the member for Richmond. So when the Legislature met on January 31, 1895, there were twenty-six Liberals, and twelve Conservatives.

The Executive Council remained the same with W. S. Fielding as Premier, Charles E. Church as Commissioner of Public Works and Mines; J. W. Longley, Attorney-General, and Colin McIsaac, Thomas Johnson, and George Murray ministers without portfolio.

The Hon. Colin McIsaac was elected to the Dominion Parliament for Antigonish County on the death of Sir John Thompson, Premier of Canada. Hon. Angus MacGillivray (L) again became the member for Antigonish in 1895. In the by-election in Digby County Angus M. Gidney (L) replaced E. A. Tupper (L) deceased.¹ These elections left the relative strength of the parties unchanged.

The federal election of 1896 caused a considerable change in the personnel of the Nova Scotian government and Assembly. Hon. J. W. Longley, (L), John Drew Sperry (L), and Wilbert D. Dimock (C) resigned to take part in the Dominion contest.

The Attorney General suffered defeat in the federal election, and was consequently re-elected by acclamation to

1. See Appendix No. 17, N. S. JOURNAL, 1896.

his seat in the local house. Firman McClure (L) replaced W. Dimock (C) as the member for Colchester, while Allan R. Moreash (L) succeeded J. D. Sperry (L) and Edward Farrell (L) was chosen to represent Queens County on the death of Albert M. Hemeon (L).¹ The Liberal party now had twenty-seven representatives and the Conservatives eleven.

The success of the Liberals at Ottawa had a profound influence on the affairs of the party in Nova Scotia because, in July, Wilfred Laurier had selected Premier William S. Fielding as Finance Minister of the Dominion of Canada. Nova Scotia rejoiced at this compliment to one of the province's native sons, and wished their Premier a long, successful, useful, and honorable career in Canadian politics.

The name of Canada's new finance minister is a household word in the maritime provinces, and the reputation he has won for himself as premier and finance minister of Nova Scotia, combined with the ability he has displayed as an able all round public man, has undoubtedly led to his being called to the important portfolio of finance in the Laurier cabinet ... The people of Nova Scotia will watch his career in the larger field of federal politics with increasing interest.²

The Liberal papers reviewed Mr. Fielding's political achievements and praised him for his bold, progressive, and energetic policy, and for his honesty and skill in handling the provincial finances.

The fact, however, remains that Mr. Fielding's administration of public affairs has been singularly able, honest, successful, and entirely free from scandal at a time when federal politics, because of their rottenness, had made Canada a byword among the nations; and to Mr. Fielding's able and clean administration of our provincial finances, to

1. Appendix No. 12, N. S. JOURNAL, 1897.
2. NOVA SCOTIAN, July 18, 1896, P 3.

the ability he has displayed in the provincial political arena, and to his well-known honesty and integrity of purpose, is due the fact that he has been called by the Liberal leader, with the hearty endorsement of the Liberals of all the provinces, to the responsible and important post of finance minister of Canada.¹

In August, 1896, after the resignation of Mr. F. G. Forbes (L), W. S. Fielding was elected by acclamation to the Dominion Parliament for the constituency of Queens-Shelburne.²

Although Attorney-General Longley had been taking a steadily increasing part in the Assembly, Mr. Fielding recommended that George Murray be sent for to form the Cabinet. This choice occasioned some surprise for the moment, on account of the prominence of Mr. Longley.

The Hon. George H. Murray had been a member of the Legislative Council since 1889, and had become a member of the Executive in 1891, when he was only thirty years old. In 1896 he was the leader of the government in the Legislative Council. He had been a candidate in several elections in Cape Breton County and had always been defeated. In the by-election in 1896 he had opposed Sir Charles Tupper, who had returned from England, where he had been High Commissioner for Canada. Murray fought a memorable fight which attracted attention all over the country although Sir Charles won. He was recognized as the leader of the Liberal party throughout Cape Breton Island, and he enjoyed the reputation of a sane and far-seeing public man.³

1. NOVA SCOTIAN, July 25, P 4, Col 1.
2. Ibid, August 8, P 1.
3. Hon E. M. MacDonald - RECOLLECTIONS POLITICAL AND PERSONAL, P 555 - 559.

George Murray succeeded W. S. Fielding as Premier in July, 1896. He proved himself to be a wise and prudent administrator, and continued to follow Mr. Fielding's policies. He retained the confidence of the whole Province in a marvelous degree until he retired in 1923, having been re-elected at all the intervening elections and holding office for twenty-seven years continuously. Mr. Murray was a man of ability, an impressive public speaker, and a splendid administrator, who possessed great tact and wisdom which made him extremely popular with the people.

In August, 1896, Premier George Murray (L) was elected by acclamation for Victoria County, after the resignation of Dr. John Bethune (C); and William B. Wallace (L), an important Halifax lawyer who had been active in Halifax politics since 1884, was returned to Mr. Fielding's seat in Halifax by acclamation. This gave the Liberal party twenty-eight members in the Assembly and the Conservatives ten.¹

The Executive Council consisted of the following members during 1896 and 1897: G. H. Murray, Premier and Provincial Secretary; Charles E. Church, Commissioner of Public Works and Mines; J. W. Longley, Attorney-General; and Thomas Johnson, A. Comeau, Angus MacGillivray, William Roche, and T. R. Black, ministers without portfolio.²

The Liberal party possessed able leaders with political experience and also a large majority. F. A. Laurence (L) Colchester, was elected as Speaker of the House. From 1895 to 1897

1. Appendix No. 12, N. S. JOURNAL, 1897.
2. Belcher's Farm Almanack, 1897, P 29.

the relations between the Liberals and the Conservatives were extremely cordial, in contrast to the ill-feeling and bitterness prevalent in the previous Assembly.

Since Charles H. Cahan had been defeated, Dr. William McKay, of Cape Breton, who had formerly been the Conservative leader from 1886 to 1890, again assumed the guidance of the Opposition.

The Conservative party was too weak both in numbers and political experience to offer effective opposition. They resorted to the expedient of allowing the government's policies and measures to be adopted with a very mild criticism and without division. Very few subjects were vigorously debated, and these were usually of a non-partisan nature.

In 1895 and 1896 the attention of the newspapers, members, and the people was focused upon the affairs of the Dominion of Canada. The Conservative party had disintegrated rapidly since the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, so the approaching federal contest was awaited with hope and anxious trepidation. The questions discussed in the local Assembly seemed of little importance compared to the Bolt, the shift in Premiers from Sir Mackenzie Bowell to Sir Charles Tupper, the Manitoba School Legislation, and the impending election. In Nova Scotia both parties desired a short business session of the Assembly with little debate so that they could concentrate on the Dominion election. There were few evidences of party differences or ill-will, even though the Liberal leader of the Legislative

Council, George Murray, had resigned from the Executive to campaign against Sir Charles Tupper in the Cape Breton election.

More interest in Nova Scotian politics was evident in 1897. The future of the Dominion had been settled until the next election, and as there was a new Premier and a new provincial government, attention centered on local politics. Premier Murray and Dr. McKay were on friendly terms so both parties continued to co-operate in the Assembly, and there were no re-priminations. In this session both Liberals and Conservatives were preparing for the impending provincial election. There was a long debate over the Address in which the Conservatives criticized the government's policy, while Premier Murray defended the Liberal measures, and made clear that he intended to follow Mr. Fielding's policies and procedure.

From 1895 to 1897 Finance remained of the utmost importance. Yet financial matters were not discussed as much in the Legislature as in previous Assemblies because the financial policies which had been established under Premier Fielding's guidance were continued without hesitation. The various tendencies which had emerged during the last decade became more obvious.

In 1895 and 1896 W. S. Fielding still acted as Provincial Secretary and Provincial Treasurer. He retained his ability to understand questions of financial import and also his skill in juggling figures. Long experience with Nova Scotia's finances had given Premier Fielding an appearance of effortless ease and a ready comprehension of all the province's financial problems.

Mr. Fielding was still troubled by the difficulty that expenditure tended to increase much more rapidly than revenue. He continued to spend more freely than his predecessors, but he was careful not to burden the province with an excessive debt. Capital account continued to develop while the debt mounted steadily. Conditions had eased somewhat by 1895, and the revenue now exceeded \$800,000. There was a surplus for the years of 1894 and 1895, and a deficit for 1896 and 1897.

In these years there was no acute financial critic like Charles Cahan in 1890 - 1894, and thus the financial discussions were less interesting and less illuminating. Dr. William McKay, Conservative leader, made no attempt at searching financial criticism. As Charles Tanner, Conservative member from Pictou, gained political experience he offered criticism of the various financial policies of the Liberals.

In the summer of 1896 George H. Murray became the Provincial Secretary and Treasurer of Nova Scotia. He made no innovations in financial affairs. It soon became clear that Premier Murray would follow W. S. Fielding's financial practices, and make changes slowly.

Mr. Murray continued Mr. Fielding's tradition of making a speech on the Financial Returns and a budget speech on Estimates. However, Premier Murray's speeches were much shorter than his predecessors. He did not possess the same grasp of figures as Fielding, nor could he direct his audience's attention so skilfully to

certain points, nor did he have Fielding's ability to impart brilliance and interest to a recital of facts.

Nova Scotia still suffered from insufficient income, and every attempt had to be made to increase revenue and to restrict expenditure to absolute necessities. The history of the period was epitomized by surpluses and deficits incurred by the government on recurrent account. By 1895 all attempts to obtain an increased grant from Ottawa having met with a determined rebuff, all appeals to the Federal government were abandoned until a more favourable opportunity. The subsidy remained fixed at \$432,800, and it steadily declined in importance as the province grew in wealth and population. Public Domain became a much more fruitful source of revenue because of the prosperity of the coal mining industry. In 1896 the Province received \$275,000 from coal royalties.¹ In addition, Succession duties had been imposed, and in 1896 these yielded \$18,253.00. In that year there was an unexpected windfall of \$18,000 from the sale to collectors of the Nova Scotian postage stamps used previous to Confederation.

Capital account was largely developed. Twenty-one per cent. of the total expenditure from 1883 to 1899 was on capital account. The items which absorbed most of this were Roads and Bridges, Railways, the Victoria General Hospital and the Nurses' Home. Capital account by the end of 1896 totalled \$3,443,769.17.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1897, February 4, P 7 and Feb. 25, P 3.

The amount required for interest increased steadily, although the rate decreased. The interest paid on the English loan was 3-1/2%, while temporary loans were made for 4%.

Expenditure for Administration, Charity, Education, and Public Domain increased only in proportion to the general increase in expenditure. The outlay on Roads and Bridges was small because the government continued their policy of financing the bulk of the expenditure on roads by borrowing.

There were few financial debates in the Assembly from 1895 to 1897. However, the Succession Duty Act had failed miserably to provide the expected revenue because of ambiguity in the act and the large exemptions. In 1895 the whole measure was restated and altered.¹ It proposed that estates over \$25,000 pay when passing to direct heirs, \$2.50 for every \$100 of value, and not merely on the excess, and estates of over \$100,000 pay \$5.00 on every \$100 of value. Exemptions to religious, charitable, and educational bequests were dropped.

A very vigorous debate took place in committee and on the third reading of this bill.² The Conservative party did not favour succession duties. There was a long discussion which was adverse to the government's policy of capital expenditure. The "Tories" felt that capital expenditure, while in some respects it might confer a benefit on the country, was a mistaken policy as it burdened the revenues with a permanent charge of interest and would bring about the much dreaded direct taxation.

1. 1895, N.S. LAWS, C 8.

2. MORNING HERALD, 1895, March 7, P 3, 4, 5; March 8, P 3.

Charles Wilcox (C, Hants), seconded by Dimock (C, Colchester), moved a three months' hoist. He admitted that the succession duties were popular, but he insisted that this was because a line was drawn at \$25,000, setting a numerous class against a small class. There was no need for direct taxation with a surplus of \$25,000.¹

Alex. Campbell, (C, Inverness) felt that Nova Scotia should add to her resources, and that if a man had such a large estate he should give a share to the community.

Premier Fielding replied that the people were satisfied with the policy of capital expenditure, and that they should not oppose direct taxation if necessary. He pointed out that the Conservatives never objected to specific expenditures and that "the policy of succession duties had received the unanimous support of the previous House of Assembly."

T. R. Black (L) objected to the form of the bill, and did not see why a man's estate should be taxed, while Attorney-General Longley stressed the fact that if this bill were defeated it would leave the Succession Duties Act in its ambiguous condition, and succession duties would be collected under it.

Charles Tanner (C, Pictou) proved himself an able critic for the Conservatives, and he stated that the "proposed legislation was an attempt to bring out of the graveyard an act that had been practically declared dead by the courts."

The amendment was defeated by a non-party vote of 10 to 24. Four Liberals voted against the Succession duties, while

1. MORNING HERALD, 1895, March 7, P 3.

seven Conservatives voted for them. The Conservatives had failed to oppose solidly the government's policy of Succession duties.

The Financial Returns and the Estimates were accepted and passed without debate. Dr. McKay did not continue Charles Cahan's practice of making a reply to Premier Fielding's budget speech, in which the Opposition leader commented upon the Provincial Finances and subjected the details in the financial statements to a searching criticism.

In 1897, after Premier Murray's presentation of the Estimates, Charles Tanner (C) made a very long speech in general criticism of Liberal policy since 1867 and denounced the government for their extravagances. He closed by moving a series of resolutions for retrenchment and for the government to provide yearly road grants out of revenue, sufficient to enable the municipalities to keep the highways in repair. A lengthy and lively debate ensued in which government acts were examined and each party clarified its policies in preparation for the approaching election. Finally the amendment was defeated by a vote of nine to twenty-three, the Conservatives voting solidly for the resolutions, and the Liberals united against.¹

The long talked of problem - the Abolition of the Legislative Council - attained considerable prominence in the session

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1897, February 27, P 8, March 2, March 4. Tri Weekly Edition.

of 1897. This question had been under discussion for over twenty years. Both political parties had placed themselves on record as favouring the desirability of dispensing with the Legislative Council. The Assembly had always failed to surmount the Council's objection to being abolished.

The majority of the people of Nova Scotia wanted the Council abolished because they thought they were over-governed since the Dominion now administered many former functions of the Province, and because they wanted economy, and because British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island had abolished their Councils, and did not suffer from hasty legislation.

In 1896 Premier Fielding had informed the Assembly that Her Majesty's government had received their petition for the Abolition of the Council, and that as the province had the power to alter its constitution "a resort to imperial legislation would be inexpedient except in circumstances of urgent necessity." ¹

In the debate on the Speech from the Throne in 1897 the Opposition leader, Dr. McKay, expressed his strong disapproval of the government's policy about the Legislative Council. He criticized the government for not accomplishing its Abolition, and also blamed the government for neglect, injustice, and a want of confidence in the Council because the Cabinet had no representative from the Council.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, February 20, 1896, P .1.

Two weeks later Alexander Campbell (C, Inverness) introduced a resolution ¹ that during the session the House pass an act to abolish the Legislative Council and give its retiring members a small allowance equal to three years' sessional indemnity. Mr. Campbell insisted that this was a non-party question and he reviewed the reasons for the Abolition of the Council. He asked if the Council had been approached properly and then suggested the retiring allowance.

Premier Murray replied that he must oppose this resolution as this would not be acceptable to the Councillors, and it was not practical. The Premier believed that the pressure of public opinion would yet force the Councillors to recognize their pledges and vote for abolition.

Attorney-General Longley reasserted his belief that the Council should be abolished, but he had to vote against the principle of abolition by giving a pension as he did not feel the people wanted it.

Campbell's measure was defeated by a strict party vote of ten Conservatives for and twenty-three Liberals against.²

Several days later Charles Tanner (C, Pictou) revived the question. He moved that the government introduce a bill in the present session to provide for the taking of a plebiscite on the subject of the Abolition of the Council at the next general election. He hoped that the results of this plebiscite would convince the members of the Council that the people wanted it abolished. This resolution was deferred at the request of the leader of the government.³

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1897, February 11, P 6.

2. Ibid., February 11, P 5.

3. CHRONICLE. Tri-Weekly Edition, February 13, P 6.

On February 18th Premier Murray introduced a bill for the Abolition of the Legislative Council similar to Mr. Tanner's resolution. Mr. Murray's government had adopted the policy of the abolition of the Council.¹ The bill, which was in two parts, declared that if the general results of the election showed that the larger number of voters had voted in favour of abolishing the Council, then the Lieutenant-Governor could issue a proclamation declaring that the Legislative Council was abolished and all power now held jointly would pass to the Legislative Assembly alone.

The Premier expressed his desire to have the bill passed quickly through all its stages because the session would soon end. The next day it was debated. Charles Tanner had great pleasure in agreeing to the proposal made by the Premier. Then he criticized the former policy of the Liberals in regard to the Council, and expressed his doubt as to whether the Liberals really wanted the abolition of the Council. The debate degenerated into mere bickering over past records of the two parties, and over certain statements made by the members, and over the sincerity of the two parties in desiring the abolition. The Conservatives prided themselves on the present resolution as Charles Tanner was responsible for it. The Liberals were furious at this attempt of the "Tories" to make political capital out of the fact that the government's bill was similar to Tanner's.

The bill was carried on its second reading without a division.

1. MORNING CHRONICLE, Tri Weekly Edition, February 20, P 8, P 5.

Very little railway construction was undertaken in this period. The government entered into contracts for a railway from Bridgeport to Louisburg by the Dominion Coal Company, and the Cape Breton railway from Port Hawkesbury to St. Peter's, and the Coast railway from Yarmouth to Lockeport.¹

Mr. Fielding stated clearly that although there was a general impression that every railway company that organized could get a government subsidy, actually the government used their power with discretion. If an area had railways already the government refused subsidies. By 1895 the government insisted that the subsidy was not paid until the road was completed.²

In the session of 1895 an act was passed to amend the Railway's Aid and Consolidation Act of 1886. It was provided that whenever any Company was entitled to receive a subsidy in money under the provision of the act of 1886, the Governor-in-Council might convert the subsidy into half-yearly payments, payable to the holders of bonds or debentures of the Company. Thus the government guaranteed interest alone on the bonds for a certain period.

Both parties agreed to this bill without a division because both felt that it would facilitate the floating of bonds and the construction of railways.

1. HERALD, February 9, 1895, P 2.
2. Ibid, Feb. 25, P 2, Col 2.

There were no momentous debates with far-reaching consequences in the years 1895 to 1897. The attention and the time of the members of the Legislature were occupied with routine reports, private and local bills, and various minor changes in laws. The Nova Scotia Judicature act was amended; a bill passed to provide for a Provincial Farmers' Association; the Coroners' Act amended; the acts relating to the Probate Court consolidated so as to reduce the cost of administering estates; a new system established for the registration of land titles and easy transfer of land; a Cold Storage system for fruit and fish established; road machinery purchased, and an Address passed to Queen Victoria on the occasion of her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee.

The years 1895 to 1897 witnessed the close of W. S. Fielding's participation in Nova Scotian politics and the descent of his mantle to another Liberal, George Murray. Although there were important changes in the men in the Legislature, there were no new policies initiated, and no momentous laws passed. It was a period of transition from the control of one Liberal leader to the rule of another.

CHAPTER V

SECTION IV

Relations with Ottawa,
1895 to 1897.

The years 1895 to 1897 were uneventful in the development of relations between the Dominion government and the provincial government of Nova Scotia.

One startling example of the lingering of old resentments was the debate over Tanner's bill to declare Dominion Day a holiday in Nova Scotia.

Charles Tanner (C, Pictou) said that "he thought it was in the public interest, so far at least as the public schools and public offices were concerned, that we should observe that day as a public holiday." ¹

July 1st had been declared a holiday by Dominion statute. There was a growing sentiment in the province in favour of having a national holiday on that day. Mr. Tanner wanted the young people to have one day to think about their country, and to realize that Canada was worthy of their admiration.

T. R. Black (L, Cumberland) insisted that the parents did not want an increase in the number of school holidays, and furthermore, whenever any section desired to make a public holiday they could do so. He thought that if any attempt were made to enforce the observance of the day it would revive past differences. Accordingly, he moved a three months' hoist.

William Roche (L, Halifax) declared that the Provincial government should not force this holiday upon the people - it would be better to leave the celebration of Dominion Day to the free action of the people. He remarked that Confederation was

1. HALIFAX CHRONICLE, Vol. 1, February 17, 1896, P 2.

brought about by one of the blackest acts of treachery and outrage which were ever committed by representatives of a free people,¹

and that the day was not one of rejoicing and bonfires but the anniversary of a day of shame and humiliation.

Mr. Black's amendment was carried on division by a vote of twenty-one to eleven. The Liberals voted solidly for a three months' hoist, while all the Conservatives voted against it.

Federal elections had considerable influence on the Nova Scotian Assembly because many members of the local Assembly were interested in Federal politics. In the winter of 1896 George Murray, a member of the Nova Scotian Liberal government, opposed Sir Charles Tupper, Prime Minister of Canada, in a by-election in Cape Breton. This did not arouse as much resentment in relations with Ottawa as might have been expected. The Conservatives did make some mild protests about a member of the Nova Scotian government taking part in a Dominion by-election when it was not clear whether he had resigned or not. However, Mr. Murray was defeated and continued as a member of the local government.

The Dominion election of 1896 was very important in the relations between Ottawa and Halifax. The Nova Scotian government, and the Assembly, led by Premier W. S. Fielding, took a very active part in the federal campaign, and some members were candidates for the House of Commons. This activity by the local

1. N.S. Debates, 1896, P 126.

Liberal government did not encourage cordial relations with the Conservative Dominion government.

Many changes occurred in the personnel of the Nova Scotian Assembly as former members passed to Ottawa. Also, with the Liberal party in power at last in the Dominion, the governments at Ottawa and at Halifax were again in harmony, and good feeling reigned between the two. Premier W. S. Fielding became Finance Minister in the Laurier government, and while this was a severe loss to Nova Scotia, and necessitated a new leader and a new government, at the same time it assured the province of an able, powerful, skilful, and sympathetic advocate in the federal cabinet.

Thus, though various events prepared the way for pleasanter and more understanding relations between Canada and Nova Scotia, there were no outward signs of it from 1895 to 1897.

The first results of this cordiality came in 1898 when Premier George Murray and J. W. Longley journeyed to Ottawa as a delegation to obtain the refund of provincial money expended on the Eastern Extension railway from Finance Minister Fielding. The first overtures in this matter were made during the summer of 1897, although it was several years before Nova Scotia's claim was accepted.

APPENDIX I

Members of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, 1879.

Annapolis County	-	William B. Troop	C
		Caleb W. Shafner	C
Antigonish Co.	-	John S. D. Thompson	C
		Angus McGillivray	R
Cape Breton Co.	-	E. Tilton Mosely	C
		Hector F. McDougall	C
Colchester Co.	-	William A. Patterson	C
		William Blair	C
Cumberland Co.	-	Charles T. Townshend	C
		Edward Vickery	C
Digby Co.	-	Benjamin Van Blarcom	C
		Henry M. Robichau	R
Guysborough Co.	-	J. W. Hadley	C
		A. N. McDonald	C
Halifax Co.	-	Charles J. Macdonald	C
		William D. Harrington	C
		John Pugh	C
Hants Co.	-	Nathaniel Spence	C
		Thomas B. Smith	R
Inverness Co.	-	Duncan J. Campbell	R
		Alexander Campbell	C
Kings Co.	-	W. C. Bill	C
		James S. McDonald	C
Lunenburg Co.	-	Charles A. Smith	C
		Edward James	C
Pictou Co.	-	Simon H. Holmes	C
		Alexander McKay	C
		Adam C. Bell	C
Queens Co.	-	L. S. Ford	C
		James C. Bartling	C
Richmond Co.	-	Isidore LeBlanc	R
		Alexander McCuish	C

Shelburne Co.	-	N. W. White	C
		Behemiah McGray	C
Victoria Co.	-	William F. McCurdy	R
		John Morrison	C
Yarmouth Co.	-	Albert Gayton	R
		Joseph R. Kinney	I

Conservatives, 30; Reformers, 7; Independent, 1.

Members of Nova Scotia Assembly, 1883.

Annapolis County	-	J. Wilberforce Longley	L
		Henry Munro	L
Antigonish Co.	-	John S. D. Thompson	C
		Angus McGillivray	L
Cape Breton Co.	-	Alonzo J. White	L
		William Buchanan	L
Colchester Co.	-	William A. Blair	C
		William A. Patterson	C
Cumberland Co.	-	William T. Pipes	L
		Charles J. Townshend	C
Digby Co.	-	Henry M. Robicheau	L
		John S. McNeill	L
Guysborough Co.	-	Otto S. Weeks	L
		James A. Fraser	L
Halifax Co.	-	William D. Harrington	C
		Michael J. Power	L
		William S. Fielding	L
Hants Co.	-	Allan Haley	L
		Nathaniel Spence	C
Inverness Co.	-	Alexander Campbell	C
		Duncan J. Campbell	L
Kings Co.	-	Thomas L. Dodge	L
		Thomas R. Harris	C
Lunenburg Co.	-	Charles E. Church	L
		George A. Ross	L
Pictou Co.	-	Robert Hockin	C
		Charles A. Munro	C
		Adam C. Bell	C
Queens Co.	-	Jason M. Mack	L
		Joseph A. Cook	L
Richmond	-	Isidore LeBlanc	L
		Murdoch McRae	C

Shelburne Co.	-	Thomas Johnson	L
		William F. McCoy	L
Victoria Co.	-	John A. McDonald	C
		William F. McCurdy	L
Yarmouth Co.	-	Albert Gayton	L
		Thomas E. Corning	I

Liberals, 24; Conservatives, 13; Independent, 1.

Members of Nova Scotia Assembly. 1887.

Annapolis County	-	Hon. J. W. Longley	L
		Frank Andrews	C
Antigonish Co.	-	Hon. Angus McGillivray	L
		Colin F. McIsaac	L
Cape Breton Co.	-	William McKay	C
		Colin Chisholm	C
Colchester Co.	-	George Clark	L
		Fred A. Lawrence	L
Cumberland Co.	-	Thomas R. Black	L
		Richard L. Black	C
Digby Co.	-	Henry M. Robicheau	L
		John S. McNeill	L
Guysborough Co.	-	Otto S. Weeks	L
		James A. Fraser	L
Halifax Co.	-	Hon. Wm. S. Fielding	L
		Michael J. Power	L
		William Roche, Jr.	L
Hants Co.	-	Allan Haley	L
		Archibald Frame	L
Inverness Co.	-	Hon. Daniel McNeill	L
		John McKinnon	L
Kings Co.	-	Leander Rand	L
		William C. Bill	C
Lunenburg Co.	-	Hon. Charles E. Church	L
		George A. Ross	L
Pictou Co.	-	Adam C. Bell	C
		Jeffry McColl	L
		Charles H. Munro	C
Queens Co.	-	Jason M. Mack	L
		Joseph H. Cook	L
Richmond Co.	-	Joseph Matheson	L
		David A. Hearn	C
Shelburne Co.	-	Hon. Thomas Johnson	L
		William F. McCoy	L

Victoria Co.	-	John A. Fraser	L
		John L. Bethune	I
Yarmouth Co.	-	Albert Gayton	L
		William Law	L

Liberals, 29; Conservatives, 8; Independent, 1, with
 Repeal leanings.

Members of the Nova Scotia Assembly, 1891.

Annapolis County	-	Hon. J. Wilberforce Longley H. Harding Chute	L L
Antigonish Co.	-	Hon. Angus MacGillivray Colin F. McIsaac	L L
Cape Breton Co.	-	Angus J. McDonald Joseph McPherson	L L
Colchester Co.	-	George Clark Frederick A. Laurence	L L
Cumberland Co.	-	George W. Forrest William Oxley	C C
Digby Co.	-	Ambrose H. Comeau Eliakim E. Tupper	L L
Guysborough Co.	-	Alexander F. Cameron Hamilton Morrow	C C
Halifax Co.	-	Hon. W. S. Fielding Michael J. Power William Roche	L L L
Hants Co.	-	Allan Haley Thomas B. Smith	L C
Inverness Co.	-	Hon. Daniel McNeil John McKinnon	L L
Kings Co.	-	Barclay Webster Alfred P. Welton	C L
Lunenburg Co.	-	Hon. Charles E. Church John Drew Sperry	L L
Pictou Co.	-	William Cameron Alexander Grant James D. McGregor	C C L
Queens Co.	-	Albert M. Hemeon Richard Hunt	L L
Richmond Co.	-	Joseph Matheson Abraham LeBlanc	L L
Shelburne Co.	-	Hon. Thomas Johnson Charles H. Cahan	L C

Victoria Co. - John A. Fraser L
John L. Bethune C

Yarmouth Co. - Albert Gayton L
William Law L

Liberals, 28; Conservatives, 10.

Colchester Co. - Frederick A. Lawrence
Victor D. Jones

Subsidiary Co. - Thomas H. Clark
Alexander H. Fraser

St. John's Co. - Arthur H. Jones
Mark H. Taylor

Northampton Co. - John H. Smith
Daniel H. Johnson

Halifax Co. - John W. G. Fielding
William A. Wick

Antigonish Co. - Frank Crystals
George G. Wilson

Southwest Co. - Alexander Campbell
John H. Jackson

King's Co. - David H. Clark
George H. Williams

Quebec Co. - Mr. Charles E. Clark
John Newberry

Prince Co. - William Gordon
Alexander Grant
Charles E. Taylor

St. John's Co. - Albert H. Jackson
Richard H. G.

Richmond Co. - James Jones
John H. Taylor

Halifax Co. - John H. Taylor
George H. Williams

Members of Nova Scotia Assembly, 1895.

Annapolis County	-	Hon. J. W. Longley	L
		Joseph Bancroft	L
Antigonish Co.	-	Hon. Colin F. McIsaac	L
		Christopher P. Chisholm	L
Cape Breton Co.	-	William McKay	C
		John McCormack	C
Colchester Co.	-	Frederick A. Laurence	L
		Wilbert D. Dimock	C
Cumberland Co.	-	Thomas R. Black	L
		Alexander E. Fraser	L
Digby Co.	-	Ambrose H. Comeau	L
		Eliakim E. Tupper	L
Guysborough Co.	-	John H. Sinclair	L
		Daniel H. McKinnon	L
Halifax Co.	-	Hon. Wm. S. Fielding	L
		William Roche	L
		William A. Black	C
Hants Co.	-	Arthur Drysdale	L
		Charles S. Wilcox	C
Inverness Co.	-	Alexander Campbell	C
		John H. Jamieson	C
Kings Co.	-	Breton H. Dodge	L
		Harry H. Wickwire	L
Lunenburg Co.	-	Hon. Charles E. Church	L
		John Drew Sperry	L
Pictou Co.	-	William Cameron	C
		Alexander Grant	C
		Charles E. Tanner	C
Queens Co.	-	Albert M. Hemeon	L
		Richard Hunt	L
Richmond Co.	-	Simon Joyce	L
		John Morrison	C
Shelburne Co.	-	Hon. Thomas Johnson	L
		Thomas Robertson	L

Victoria Co. - John L. Bethune C
John G. Morrison L

Yarmouth Co. - William Law L
Albert A. Porthier C

Liberals, 25; Conservatives, 13.

Antigonish Co. - J. G. Macdonald 2
 Cumberland Co. - Dr. C. Tupper 2
 Digby Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Guysborough Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Halifax Co. - W. H. Vickrey 2
 Hants Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Inverness Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Kings Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Lunenburg Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Miramichi Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 New Brunswick Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Northumberland Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Pictou Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Queens Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Richmond Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Shelburne Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Westmorland Co. - J. G. Watt 2
 Yarmouth Co. - J. G. Watt 2

Conservatives, 11; Reform, 7.

By Order of the Board, September 11, 1878, and
S.W.H. September 12, 1878.

APPENDIX NO. II

Dominion Members of Nova Scotia. 1878

Annapolis County	-	Avard Longley	C
Antigonish Co.	-	A. McIsaac	R
Cape Breton Co.	-	W. McDonald Hugh McLeod	C C
Colchester Co.	-	McKay	C
Cumberland Co.	-	Dr. C. Tupper	C
Digby Co.	-	J. C. Wade	C
Guysborough Co.	-	Ogden	C
Halifax Co.	-	M.H. Richey M.B. Daly	C C
Hants Co.	-	William H. Allison	C
Inverness Co.	-	S. McDonnell	R
Kings Co.	-	F. W. Borden	R
Lunenburg Co.	-	E. C. Kaulback	C
Pictou Co.	-	McDonald Doull	C C
Queens Co.	-	Bill	C
Richmond Co.	-	E. P. Flynn	R
Shelburne Co.	-	Thos. Robertson	R
Victoria Co.	-	McDonald	R
Yarmouth Co.	-	Frank Killam	R

Conservatives, 14; Reform, 7.

See ACADIAN RECORDER, September 21, 1878, and
HERALD, September 11, 1878.

Dominion Members of Nova Scotia. 1882

Annapolis County	-	W. H. Ray	L
Antigonish Co.	-	A. McIsaac	L
Cape Breton Co.	-	William McDonald Murray Dodd	C C
Colchester Co.	-	Hon. A. W. McLellan	C
Cumberland Co.	-	Sir Charles Tupper	C
Digby Co.	-	Hon William B. Vail	L
Guysborough Co.	-	John A. Kirk	L
Halifax Co.	-	M. H. Richey M. B. Daly	C C
Hants Co.	-	William H. Allison	C
Inverness Co.	-	Dr. Hugh Cameron	C
Kings Co.	-	Douglas B. Woodworth	C
Lunenburg Co.	-	Thomas Keefler	L
Pictou Co.	-	John McDougald C. H. Tupper	C C
Queens Co.	-	Dr. James F. Forbes	L
Richmond Co.	-	Henry N. Paint	C
Shelburne Co.	-	Thomas Robertson	L
Victoria Co.	-	Hon. Charles J. Campbell	C
Yarmouth Co.	-	Joseph R. Kinney	C

Conservatives, 14; Liberals, 7.

Dominion House of Parliament. 1887

Annapolis	-	John B. Mills	C
Antigonish	-	Sir John S. D. Thompson	C
Cape Breton	-	D. McKeen	C
		H. P. McDougall	C
Colchester	-	A. W. McLelan	C
Cumberland	-	Sir Charles Tupper	C
Digby	-	John Campbell	C
Guysborough	-	John A. Kirk	L
Halifax	-	T. E. Kenney	C
		A. G. Jones	L
Hants	-	A. Putnam	C
Inverness	-	Dr. Hugh Cameron	C
Kings	-	Dr. F. W. Borden	L
Lunenburg	-	Jas. Eisenhauer	L
Pictou	-	Charles H. Tupper	C
		John McDougald	C
Queens	-	Joshua N. Freeman	C
Richmond	-	E. P. Flynn	L
Shelburne	-	Thos. Robertson	L
Victoria	-	J. A. McDonald	C
Yarmouth	-	John Lovitt	L

Conservatives, 14; Liberals, 7.

Dominion House of Parliament. 1891

Annapolis	-	J. B. Mills	C
Antigonish	-	Sir J. S. D. Thompson	C
Cape Breton	-	H. F. McDougall D. McKeen	C C
Colchester	-	W. A. Patterson	C
Cumberland	-	A. R. Dickey	C
Digby	-	E. C. Bowers	L
Guysborough	-	D. C. Fraser	L
Halifax	-	T. E. Kenney John Stairs	C C
Hants	-	A. Putnam	C
Inverness	-	Dr. Hugh Cameron	C
Kings	-	Dr. F. W. Borden	L
Lunenburg	-	C. E. Kaulbach	C
Pictou	-	Hon. C. H. Tupper John McDougald	C C
Queens	-	F. G. Forbes	L
Richmond	-	Gillies	C
Shelburne	-	N. W. White	C
Victoria	-	John McDonald	C
Yarmouth	-	T. B. Flint	L

Conservatives, 16; Liberals, 5.

APPENDIX III

By-Elections for the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia.

1882

- Lunenburg Hon. Chas. E. Church (L) by acclamation on accepting office.
- Yarmouth Hon. Albert Gayton (L) by acclamation on accepting office.
- Antigonish Charles B. Whidden (C) defeated C. C. Gregory (L). Vacancy caused by J. S. Thompson's elevation to the bench.
- Cape Breton Hon. Alonzo J. White (L) on accepting office defeated Colin Chisholm (C) 1

1883

- Inverness Vacancy caused by death of D. J. Campbell (L). Dr. Angus McLennan (C) defeated Samuel MacDonnell (L) 2

1884

- Cumberland Thomas R. Black (L) was elected by acclamation on the election of C. J. Townshend (C) to the House of Commons. 3

1887

William Cameron (C) elected to fill vacancy caused by resignation of Adam C. Bell (C) Pictou. January 22nd, 1887, and A. M. Hemeon (L) replaced Jason M. Mack (L, Queens) who had resigned to go to the Council. February 5, 1887.

1. Dominion Annual Register for 1882, P 414.
2. Dominion Annual Register for 1883, App. No. 1, P 380.
3. Dominion Annual Register for 1884, P 379.

- 1889 John Drew Sperry (L) became the member for Lunenburg on the death of George A. Ross. ¹
- 1891 Forman Hatfield (L) was returned by a majority of 882 over A. P. Landry to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Albert Gayton, member for Yarmouth.
- On April 7, 1891, elections were held to fill vacancies caused by the resignation of Hon. Angus MacGillivray, member for Antigonish; Joseph MacPherson, member for Cape Breton; and Allan Haley, member for Hants. C. P. Chisholm (L) defeated J. J. Cameron by a majority of 17 in Antigonish; in Cape Breton, Joseph McPherson (L) defeated John McCormack by a majority of 370; in Hants, Arthur Drysdale (L) defeated Adams McDougall by a majority of 12.²
- 1894 December 27, 1894. To fill a vacancy caused by the unseating of John Morrison (C), member for Richmond. Joseph Matheson (L) defeated John Morrison by a majority of 108. ³
- 1895 To fill vacancies caused by resignation of Hon. C. F. McIsaac, member for Antigonish Co., and death of E. E. Tupper, member for Digby Co. On June 13, 1895, Hon. A. Macgillivray (L) defeated D. A. Fraser in Antigonish by a majority of 289, and in Digby on September 28, 1895, Angus M. Gidney (L) defeated Frank Jones by a majority of 428. ⁴
- 1896 To fill vacancies caused by death of A. M. Hemeon, member for Queens Co., and resignations of Hon. J. W. Longley, W. D. Dimock, Hon. W. S. Fielding, J. D. Sperry, and Dr. J. L. Bethune, members for Annapolis, Colchester, Halifax, Lunenburg, and Victoria Counties, respectively. Election August 15, 1896.

1. Journal of House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, 1889, P 4.
2. N. S. Journal, 1891, Appendix No. 13.
3. N. S. Journal, 1895, Appendix No. 13.
4. N. S. Journal, 1896, Appendix No. 17.

1896

Hon. J. W. Longley (L) elected in Annapolis by acclamation; Firman McClure (L) elected in Colchester by a majority of 352 over Richard J. Turner; Allan R. Moreash (L) elected in Lunenburg by a majority of 872 over George A. Parker; Edward M. Farrell (L) elected by acclamation in Queens; and Hon. G. H. Murray (L), Premier and Provincial Secretary, elected by acclamation in Victoria County. ¹

1. N. S. Journal, 1897, Appendix No. 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The material which has been consulted in preparing this thesis is in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia or the Legislative Library of Nova Scotia.

Primary Printed Sources

Debates and Proceedings of the House of Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia 1879 - 1897.

Journals of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia 1878 - 1897.

Journals of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia 1878, 1879, 1881, 1882 - 1887.

The Statutes of Nova Scotia 1878 - 1896.

Canada - Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1886, 1887, 1888 - 1892, 1895, 1896.

The Dominion Annual Register for 1879, 1880 - 81, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886 (ed. Henry J. Morgan, Toronto, Hunter, Rose and Co.)

Newspapers

(for debates and editorials)

ACADIAN RECORDER 1879 - 1897 inclusive
HALIFAX HERALD 1892 - 1897 inclusive
MORNING CHRONICLE 1878 - 1897 inclusive
(1887 is missing)

MORNING HERALD 1878 - 1891 inclusive

HALIFAX CHRONICLE June 24, 1929, for the article on Rt. Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Books

Cartwright, Richard J., Reminiscences (Toronto, William Briggs 1912)

Dafoe, John W., Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times (Toronto, Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd. 1931)

Hopkins, J. Castell Life and Work of the Right Honourable Sir John Thompson (Bradley, Garretson & Co. 1895)

- MacDonald, Hon. E. M.,
 Recollections Political and Personal (3rd ed., Toronto, The Ryerson Press 1938)
- Pope, Sir Joseph
 Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B. (rev. ed. Oxford University Press 1930)
- Saunders, E. M.
 Life and Letters of the Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper (N.Y. Stokes Co. 1916)
- Shippee, Lester Burton
 Canadian American Relations 1849 - 1879 (New Haven - Yale Un. Press Toronto Ryerson Press 1939)
- Skelton, Oscar D.
 Life and Letters of Sir Wilfred Laurier (Toronto, Grundy 1921)
- Smith, Goldwin
 The Treaty of Washington 1871 (Cornell Univ. Press 1941)
- Willison, J. S.
 Sir Wilfred Laurier and the Liberal Party (two volumes, Toronto George M. Morang & Co. Ltd., 1903)
- Woodworth, M.
 History of the Dominion Atlantic Railway (Kentville, N.S., 1936)
- Tansill, Charles Callan
 Canadian-American Relations 1875 - 1911 (Toronto, The Ryerson Press, 1943)
- Canada and Its Provinces (Archives Edition)
- Who's Who in Canada 1928 - 1929 (Greene, International Press Ltd., Toronto.

Theses

- Campbell, R. H.
 Confederation in Nova Scotia to 1870.
- Dickey, R. G.
 Party Government in Nova Scotia 1867 - 1878.