

party. I remember when several gentlemen on this side of the house supported the Government on the question of Education against the opinions of a majority of their friends, and I am glad to be able to say that the people now endorse the action we then took.

Mr. LOCKE—No!

Mr. BLANCHARD.—Let the hon. member for Shelburne with his ten thousand people say "no," but I ask him to come to Inverness with its twenty thousand souls, and he will hear a very different story. They will tell him that we gave them a great boon when we gave them free schools—a system of Education above that enjoyed by the people of England, and which has obtained the encomiums of the publicists of that country. (Hear, hear.)

The hon. member for East Halifax seemed to be remarkably well acquainted with the means used by the American diplomatists, to purchase support in Legislatures. For my part I do not know anything about the matter, but I think that American diplomatists who should attempt to approach the Parliament at Ottawa, would be met in the same manner they would be in this Legislature.

When we are told that we ought to have an appeal to the people, I contend this is an American doctrine. But even in the United States what is the practice? Conventions are elected and held for the purpose in view. But does the convention finally settle the question? No. It goes from that convention to the polls to be reaffirmed by the people. The votes are given, and the whole are counted, and if there is a majority of "ayes," the "ayes" carry it, and if the majority is in the negative, the "nays" carry it. Can we have a plebiscite under such circumstances? I take Hants, Kings, Queens, Shelburne, and Victoria, the united population of which amounts to 65,000 having 16 representatives. Now, on the other hand, take Cumberland, Inverness, Annapolis, Lunenburg and Cape Breton, having unitedly a population of 97,000 and only 14 members. How, under such a system of representation, can we expect to get a fair verdict from the people? It takes two men in Inverness to be equal to one man in Shelburne. Pictou has 35,000 people, and four members—or the same number that Kings has with half the population. How, then, could any house returned after an election fairly and unmistakably represent the wishes of the people? I recollect when there was a majority of two in favor of the Government in this House—this was in the first session of the house elected in 1859—and the Provincial Secretary proved to his own satisfaction that he had a majority of 15,000 in the Province. Suppose we should come back here with small majority on one side or the other, yet it might be that the counties having the least votes would carry the day. The party of Union might actually have the majority of people on their side, and yet be out-voted in this house under our system of representation. I say to the people of the county that I represent—I voted for the general principle of assessment for schools on the ground that it would be found in time a great boon to the country. I did so in the face of a strong popular feeling against the measure, and yet tomorrow I could go back to the people and take a two-thirds majority on that question. But even were it otherwise, I would have been quite satisfied with the knowledge that I had

been defeated on a great general principle which must prove in time of great advantage to the country. On the present question I am influenced by the same feelings. A majority of the people may be opposed to the measure, but I know nevertheless that the time is not far distant when they will warmly thank me for having supported it.

We are told that this is an arbitrary exercise of power—that it is going to prevent us going into a better place after we die. May we venture to hope that the good we did in carrying the education measure will be accepted as a set off to the wickedness we are about to commit?

There are some members in this house who will remember when Cape Breton was an independent province—when it had a government of its own and managed its own affairs. The British House of Commons did not ask the opinion of the people of Cape Breton, or even of Nova Scotia, on the subject, but by an act of a few lines annexed the island to Nova Scotia, with only two members. The union was effected, and for a long while you could find hardly a dozen men in the whole island who did not express themselves against the annexation. There was an old gentleman who was Attorney General of Cape Breton previous to the Union, and he spent all his time and energies in endeavouring to bring about a separation, until finally he found himself all alone. When he died, a few years ago, he was the last man who could say that the union was an injury to the island. Cape Breton went into the union with only two members, but in the course of time the number increased, and now she has nine representatives in a house of fifty-five. If Cape Breton gets justice it is because we are bound to have it—because there is not a government in this country that would dare to ignore the claims of that island for a single year. I would like to see the government that would do gross injustice to Cape Breton.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY—You would not like to see it.

Mr. BLANCHARD—I would have liked to see the Provincial Secretary try it three years ago—how soon my hon. friend from Cape Breton and the other members would have thrown over the government.

Mr. BOURINOT—And so I would.

Mr. BLANCHARD—And how gladly would I have assisted him. So it will be at Ottawa. No Government can dare resist the claims of this Province whilst our members are true to themselves and the interests they represent.

Predictions are the order of the day. We have the hon. member from East Halifax in one breath say that this country—that is to say the Confederacy—is to be a monarchy exceedingly like Mexico. Another prediction, in the next breath, from the same source, is that we are to have a President and be a republic. These two predictions do not agree with each other. Again he says that he will spend the remainder of his days in endeavouring to destroy this Confederation. I make no pretensions to being a prophet, or the son of a prophet, but I venture to predict that are many years pass by he will be found very like old Gibbons, of Cape Breton, solitary and alone, and grey in harness, the only surviving exponent of anti-union principles. He will be found for the remainder of his days fretting and frowning