

commercial prospects look more gloomy than at the present—and he had appealed to the hon. members for Richmond and Halifax to say whether he was right. Neither of these gentlemen had ventured to endorse the statement of the Financial Secretary, because being engaged in trade themselves they knew his anticipations of an increased revenue were without foundation. According to the calculation of the member for Colchester (Mr. Archibald) an additional burden of \$400,000 a year will be placed upon the revenues of the province by the resolution now under discussion. The member for Halifax (Mr. Tobin) makes out that the whole debt will be \$11,085,000, and he calculates the interest at \$500,000. How he arrived at that conclusion he (Mr. B.) was at a loss to imagine; it certainly was not at six per cent. By his own calculations he made out the yearly liability to be \$665,000 on the debt as stated by Mr. Tobin, and this, deducting the present debt, just agrees with Mr. Archibald's estimate. He would ask the house whether they were prepared to assume an additional liability of \$400,000 per annum for twenty years; to come? If the Financial Secretary can demonstrate that the financial condition of the country will bear that enormous burden, he should be surprised indeed. How, he would ask, could the members for Cape Breton go back to their constituents and justify themselves for voting for this resolution which will put £20,000 additional every year upon them. The great cry in that island always had been that Nova Scotia swallowed up the whole revenue, and did not return to Cape Breton a fair share of what she contributed. He for one could not go back to his constituents and tell them that he had consented to put £20,000 more upon them to build a railroad to Moncton and Annapolis. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. C. J. Campbell) denounced the resolution introduced last year, in the strongest manner, in pretty much the same terms as he was then doing; but the resolution of last year sank into utter insignificance when compared with those now on the table. When it was considered that the Pictou railroad was going to cost £100,000 more than was anticipated when it was commenced, he did not envy the man who undertook to justify to the people of this country the increased expenditure which it was proposed to make. He would be the last man to say, that upon every public question, a representative was to be bound and influenced solely by the views of his constituents. It was his duty to regard the interests of the whole country, but still, in a question of this kind, it was proper that he should consider whether he was justified in imposing this additional burden upon them. Any one who took the trouble to look into the statistics on the subject will find that Cape Breton paid into the revenue, for loyalty on coal, \$29,000, being ten thousand dollars more than Nova Scotia proper, and yet this money is to be expended for the construction of a railroad to the western part of the province. The Finl. Sec'y appeared to think that the large expenditure which is going on in Cape Breton will tend to increase the revenue. He (Mr. B.) did not think that there was much in that argument. If any reduction took place in the price of agricultural productions, she would lose more than could be made up in that respect. Cape Breton sent

to market, in 1863, a million of pounds of butter; upon that article alone, if the price remains as it is, which is about one half of what it was a short time ago, she will lose \$125,000. The advantages derived from the expenditure of capital in Cape Breton will be more than counterbalanced by the loss she will sustain in the price of agricultural productions. The Finl. Sec'y admits that we will incur a liability of \$323,000. Now he would ask the house to look these figures in the face. He would ask the members for Cape Breton if they were prepared to assume a liability of \$323,000 in addition to the sum already borne by the revenue?

The Pro. Sec. says the tariff must be increased in order to provide for the increased expenditure upon the public works. What a commentary upon the course pursued by that hon. gentleman a few years ago. The government then to meet a temporary emergency were forced to increase the tariff. Did the Financial Secretary agree to that? On the contrary he denounced the government and appealed to the country with the cry that this reckless and extravagant government, instead of retrenching their expenses, were going to increase the burdens of the people by adding to the duties they would have to pay. He and those associated with him succeeded in frightening the people for the time, and he attained the object he had in view. But what did he propose to do now—instead of carrying out the retrenchment he then advocated, he proposes to add this additional burden of \$323,000 a year to our present liabilities and to increase the tariff as well. He also said that there were certain public services which will not require the assistance they now receive; and first of all he proposes to reduce the grant for navigation securities from \$49,000 to \$5,000. If the people of this province will agree to that reduction he (Mr. B.) would be much astonished. Then again he said the St. Peter's Canal would be finished and that expenditure would be saved. He was at a loss to know how that could be the case. That work would certainly not be completed before this liability would accrue. It was rather singular that the Financial Secretary, in his present retrenchment scheme, should have hit upon the same figures as the hon. Provincial Secretary used a few years ago; or, at all events, should have arrived at the same result. He is going to save \$80,000 a year—just as the hon. Provincial Secretary intended to do before he got into office; but the tables are turned now—he has got into power and not a word is heard about reducing the salaries of public officers. His plan now is to reduce the grant to navigation securities and other important services.

Hon. FINL. SEC.—The only reduction proposed is with respect to those grants which will terminate in this present session.

Mr. BLANCHARD—Then the idea appears to have been to get as much as possible this session, so that none will be wanted next year. He agreed entirely with the member for Halifax (Mr. Tobin) in his remarks as to the advantages of railway extension, but he did not agree with him in some of the calculations he had made—when he talked about the saving that was effected by railroad travel, and put it down at a dollar a day—he forgot that many of these passengers did not go further than the four mile house, or to Bedford—and it could not