

singular that that very name has been applied by English travellers to the politicians of Canada. I think it is Mr. Trollope who has said that in that country the term "politician" is synonymous with "blackleg." As I said, I do not like to call names, but it is impossible to get on without calling things by their proper terms. How can I otherwise explain what I mean in referring to those Canadian schemers who stealthily concocted a plan for the subjugation of the people of Nova Scotia—the men who tried by bribery and corruption to jockey us out of our rights. Is the word inapplicable? I think not,—it is the most appropriate, and I say that the men who conducted these practices would be horsewhipped off any race course in England as blacklegs. Our political knaves are not entitled, sir, to have such mild language applied to them,—they deserve something worse. There may have been some excuse for the blacklegs of Canada to lay hold of the revenue of Nova Scotia, but where is the excuse for the statesmen of this Province, who aided and assisted those men in destroying the liberties of the people? How shall I characterize such men as these? Men who, keeping the people from passing on a subject of such vital consequence to their interests, had the wickedness and cruelty in the dark and behind their backs to destroy the rights of their countrymen. Political assassins would be the name for them, and when I heard the hon. member for Inverness mention the name of Judas Iscariot I thought the association was discreditable to the celebrated traitor. Judas brought back the money,—he was therefore an honest man when compared with them. We will never catch one of those men bringing back the price of his treason. Judas also repented and showed himself a considerate man when out of a due regard for the best interests of his country he went and hanged himself. Those politicians have not the manliness to imitate his example and to commit such an act of self-inflicted justice. That, Mr. Speaker, is my opinion.

The hon. and learned member cited the conduct and language of Sir Robert Peel as authority. I did not wonder at his doing so, for I do not wonder at anything, such amazing things do occur now-a-days, that wonders have ceased. The spirit of amazement died within me when I heard the hon. member. Who was Sir Robert Peel? He was a great scholar, an English gentleman, a highly educated man and an orator, but he was a rat. For thirty years he headed a party and then wheeled round and joined his adversaries. And are not the gentlemen whose conduct I have been criticizing all rats—political vermin? Was there one of them true to his political colors? I do not now, of course, refer to gentlemen present. It is said that birds of a feather flock together—animals of some species also become gregarious, and it is well known that rat does not dislike the smell of rat. Sir Robert Peel descended into the grave as damaged a statesman as was ever cited as an authority. But the reference was made to prove what nobody ever denied: that the Parliament can do as it pleases.

The next position which I take as a postulate is that we have on our Statute book no Statute

ratifying or confirming the British North America Act. With these two postulates I proceed to show that the British North America Act is unconstitutional and void and in no manner binds the people of Nova Scotia. And I may say that if we had had in our administration men of high principle—men having any consideration for the rights of the country, when the Queen's Proclamation made its appearance on the 1st of July, our public property would not have been handed over to Canada, our railroads would be still in our hands, our revenues would have been still collected by ourselves and we should not have had the disgrace of coming practically under the operation of that detestable statute. But the enemies of the country had paved the way for its introduction by putting into power just the men to accomplish their iniquitous design. That is the reason why we are placed under a dominion in which *de jure* we are not and do not intend to be.—My argument is this. In 1713, after a British General had conquered Port Royal, now called Annapolis, which means the city of Anne, the treaty of Utrecht was made between the Queen and Louis XIV, by which the King of France yielded the conquest to the Queen of England, and thus Nova Scotia became the absolute property of the Queen, and she and she alone could thereafter legislate for this country.

The House of Commons had no authority over Nova Scotia then or now. They represent the people of England,—not a part of them as was said, for it would appear by the argument of the hon. member that the Catholics were unrepresented before the Emancipation Acts were carried,—they were always represented,—the House of Commons represents every man, woman and child in the British Isles, even the cattle and horses—everything from the grass upwards. The representation in Parliament is complete and why? Because the members of the House of Commons are chosen by the people of England. But did they ever represent Nova Scotia? Never, because the people of Nova Scotia had no voice in their election. Did the House of Lords represent the people of Nova Scotia? No; they represented the landed and aristocratical interests of Great Britain, but they never represented the interests of Nova Scotia, and had no power or authority to make laws for us. The whole legislative power was in Queen Anne and her heirs and successors, under the title of Louis XIV. and the arms of the British soldiery. That Legislative power seems to have been unexercised until 1747, when George II., by his Royal Charter divested himself of his right of legislation. To the full extent to which the charter goes he deprived himself of the power to legislate for Nova Scotia. I do not say that by that act the King's whole legislative power ceased,—all the powers which he did not give he retained, but such as he did give his seal would not allow him to take back, binding him as the seal of any other man or any member of this House would, him and his heirs forever. All who are in privy of estate with him are bound and thus Queen Victoria is bound by it. Having transferred the Legislative power to the people of Nova