

being imposed has been removed I would infinitely prefer that a revenue should be raised by a tax on incomes or a *per capita* tax than by an export duty, and I am therefore, I repeat, glad that the right was taken away by the British Parliament. That step was not taken with a view of giving to the General Government the right to impose the duty, but to prevent difficulties from arising. Suppose, for example, that New Brunswick imposed an export duty of twenty per cent upon some articles produced only by her, the result would be that the other Provinces would be taxed to that extent for the peculiar products of the Colony of New Brunswick. We were to be made one in effect, and yet that power would enable the Local Legislature to create hostility and inconvenience, and yet the Provincial Secretary considers this one of the disadvantages of the new scheme. He quoted Dr Tupper to me. I am not bound to look at that gentleman as very high authority, and when the hon member gives me Dr. Tupper I will give him Mr. Howe, and my authority will be as good with him as his is with me. When Dr Tupper said that the House should have been dissolved in 1860, and Mr. Howe said it should not, Mr. Howe was right, and the British Government so decided. He had around him men who were capable of telling him what the constitutional law was. I was not a member of his Government at that or any other time; my advice was never asked by Mr. Howe, nor was it ever tendered to him, but he had around him men who were competent to do their duties well.

The Prov. Secy. said that I had boasted having been brought up at the feet of Howe and Young, and he and others associated me with democratic principles. I repudiate the imputation. The liberal party of this country went in for reform and progress; but they had as much true conservatism among them as the conservative party had. Some of the conservatives of this country jumped over our heads and became radicals, while we were the true conservatives. While I learnt the principles of progress and adopted them, I learnt also that the conservation of the rights of the Crown and of Parliament were as necessary as the conservation of the people's rights. He told us that some one had made the remark that Earl Russell, while in power, was a Tory, and while in opposition was a Liberal. I should like to ask him whether he, now that he is in power, is a Liberal or a Tory? What kind of a heterogeneous government have we? A repeal government some say,—that is all, they are like a bunch of sticks, with nothing to tie them together,—they have no other policy than that expressed in the shout of the hon member for Colchester "Repeal! Repeal! Repeal!" Yet these gentlemen say to me, "get away from us, you are a democrat—you were brought up at the feet of Howe and Young—we are the true conservatives—stand aside and let greater men pass." I did not expect to hear from a member with so soft a voice and gentlemanly a manner as the Prov. Secy. has, such strong language as he used. He talked about people hanging me from every barn in the country. Some one threat-

ened to hang me as high as Haman, but why erect a gallows forty cubits high for that purpose if I have been hung already? The hon gentleman had better be careful that the popular tide does not change, and he will find himself hanging in effigy to a barn in Digby some day. Popularity is often very evanescent, and the day may come when even he will find himself deserted by many of his followers. He can tell us what is to be the result of this appeal to the Throne! He is in the confidence of Her Majesty's Government! and no doubt carries on a correspondence across the water! He tells the country "do not be alarmed, I, the Prov. Secy., having held office for *three months*, have the wisdom and authority to tell you what will come to pass." When we get to the doors of the Colonial Secretary's office, whether we have to knock down its walls with ram's horns or not, I will tell you what the answer will be. It will be "take back your constitution, and then new life will be infused into Nova Scotia, and we will have an immense revenue to distribute." What a beautiful picture of the change that is to take place in this latter-day of his dreams. Nova Scotia is to have such prosperity as was never heard of before, and her trade will be so vigorous that she will not mind a fifteen per cent. tariff. He does not pretend, however, that had we remained as we were, our duties would not have had to be raised.

I have passed over the speech of the Prov. Secretary, more hurriedly than I should like to have done had time permitted delay, but I come now to the speech of the hon member for Lunenburg. I feel it due to him to say that I regret the circumstances under which his speech on the first evening was interrupted. His address was not marred by anything of which I can complain, but while advocating the views he held with all earnestness, he avoided references which others made, and which in my opinion were out of place. He said, and the statement was repeated by others, that the constitution of England was not changed by Catholic Emancipation and the repeal of the Corn Laws, but that these measures increased the liberties of the people. I deny that *in toto*, in the sense in which the terms are applied. Who were the people of Great Britain before Catholic Emancipation was passed? The people who had control of the Government, and of every public office, and from whom alone the Sovereign could come, were the Protestants of Great Britain. Outside of these there were no "people" according to the constitution. The Catholics were not recognized as a part of the people, but were deprived of the rights of British subjects. Instead, therefore, of the emancipation being an extension of the liberties of the people it was a curtailment of them, because by throwing in large additions of Catholics to the constituencies, the powers of those who before had held the franchise were abridged. Some of those who engaged in this debate may be wiser than Burke and Pitt, but these men declared the measure to be an infringement of the constitution as adopted at the revolution. They carried the bill through Parliament, however, in spite of an immense majority of the people, who were