

on the single question of the Intercolonial Railway. I am surprised that he of all others should rise here and speak of the people—he who sold their interests and denied them the right even to speak by petition to the House of Commons. How has he the audacity to mention the people or to present himself before any constituency? Are the people of Nova Scotia less worthy than those of New Brunswick, who have been allowed to speak twice, when we are denied the privilege altogether? If the people of Nova Scotia gave him the treatment he might expect, they would pitch him over the first hustings at which he presented himself. The Prov. Secretary undertook to censure my language in reference to the public men of Canada, but we find the leader of the opposition of that country styling them the “corruptionists of Canada.” What is the history of their finances but a continuation of deficiencies from year to year?

I am told that I tried to destroy the public credit. That is not true; but in speaking of British America under Canadian rule, I had a right to draw the inference that these “corruptionists” would be faithless to their engagements with the mother country. If the credit of Canada has risen lately, as was boasted so loudly, it was by means of manipulations which we fully understand; but I hold in my hand a copy of the *Canadian News*, the organ of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and I find it states that the debentures of Nova Scotia are at present from 97 to 99 while those of Canada are from 95 to 97. With that damning fact stated by their own authorities, how dare any one make the assertion that the credit of Canada is superior to that of Nova Scotia? If the Intercolonial Railway had been fifty times as valuable as it is, my action would have been the same, and I would not even for that consideration have given up the liberties of my country. We knew that the railway scheme was an essential part of the union arrangement, and we hoped, by combining the opposition on these two measures, to defeat the bill. We are told that we may not have the terminus of the railway if we send nineteen members of the Nova Scotia party to Ottawa. If Halifax be the natural terminus, and the interests of trade require that the road should extend here, it would be immaterial whether Nova Scotia formed part of the Confederation or not. But we find Mr. Adderly, the Assistant Secretary for the Colonies, stating that the cost of the road would be four millions sterling, and we find that only three millions have been provided. We see also that this three millions will just build the road to St. John; and I therefore charge it upon the delegates that they were recreant to their duty in not making it a part of the agreement that the construction of the railway should commence simultaneously at Rivière du Loup and Truro. In that case the interests of Nova Scotia would have been safe, which they are not now. It is true the Union Act declares it to be the duty of Canada to carry the road to completion; but we see the Canadians were not bound by their minute of council in 1862, and if it were not for their breach of faith on that occasion, we might now be connected by rail with

Quebec. We are asked what we have to expect in sending nineteen anti-unionists to Ottawa. We expect to be represented by men who will not deny the people the right to speak—who will, as a body of Nova Scotians, protect us, guarding our rights from invasion, and who will not act like the delegates who went to Canada, forgetting their country as soon as they turned their backs upon it. The gentlemen going from Nova Scotia will, I trust, stand in one firm phalanx, true to the people who send them there. I am asked if we requested Mr. Lowe to withdraw his opposition to the Intercolonial Railway: that I cannot say, but I have it from Mr. Howe that the moment Confederation was settled he ceased opposition, and I believe put himself in communication with those from whom he expected support, and asked that their opposition cease. As to Mr. Lowe, I can only say that the first intimation we had that that gentleman would oppose the guarantee was received from an intimate acquaintance of the Provincial Secretary on the other side of the water. The Provincial Secretary, as I have said, is the last man to rise here and make a passionate appeal. If he had done by this people as Mr. Tilley did by the people of New Brunswick, and the electors had given their solemn assent to the measure, I would not have said another word; but as the people have been denied their ordinary rights, I for one will not cease to agitate for the return to Ottawa of men who possess the public confidence—men who would not have denied the people the right to speak. If the people of this Province were to address the House of Commons in something like this language: “You have been imposed on; the chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway told you that the question had been before us at every hustings, whereas our voice has never been asked until recently, when we hurried all these men from power who have ventured thus to mislead you,”—I ask, would there be any harm in requesting the British Parliament to release us, and to restore the old relations making us once more a colony not of Canada, but of England? Surely there can be no treason in that sentiment, and it could not but benefit this Province to have restored to it the large and increasing revenues which we possess, and to remain a dependency of England.

Hon PROV SEC—I have only one remark to make, and that is in relation to the action of New Brunswick. We have given the Opposition two years to find a case in which a minister, with a majority in Parliament, ever appealed to the people, and not being able to produce one such case, they yet rise and repeat the old story about the rights of the people having been invaded. In New Brunswick the Premier thought to advance the measure by dissolving the House, and what a spectacle was presented. By means of certain influences brought to bear an overwhelming majority was returned against the measure, and a second appeal resulted in the people sending an overwhelming majority to its support. Would that be a creditable spectacle for Nova Scotia to present? But let me ask the hon member if he did not, on the face of public document, declare that the action of New Brunswick was the greatest