

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for scanning. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of scanning are checked below.

L'Institut a numérisé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de numérisation sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages detached / Pages détachées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transparence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents | <input type="checkbox"/> | Includes supplementary materials /
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible | <input type="checkbox"/> | Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été numérisées. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure. | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires: | | Pages 13, 21, 55, 120, 167, 184 & 189 are incorrectly numbered pages 1, 2,
54, 112, 16, 176 & 18. |

Some pages are cut off.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

DURING THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT

OF THE

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA.

1867.

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY JOSEPH C. CROSSKILL, "EVENING REPORTER" OFFICE, 28 BEDFORD ROW.

1867.

INDEX TO PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

A	
ANSWER TO ADDRESS, Moved.....	2
Presented.....	68
Agriculture.....	108
ACCOUNTS—Report on Public.....	162
Debated.....	168
Absent or Absconding Debtors—Bill relative to....	8
Arichat—Commissioners of Streets in.....	105, 106, 118
B	
British and American Telegraph Company.....	199
Board of Works.....	204
C	
Cow Bay Breakwater.....	167
Consumers' Gas Company.....	137, 199, 205
Count Out.....	150
E	
ESTIMATES.....	118, 121
Education Report.....	104, 149
Education.....	136
F	
FINANCIAL STATEMENT.....	65
Fisheries.....	73, 151
FINANCIAL MATTERS.....	149
H	
Hospital for Insane.....	69, 80, 82, 96, 135, 137
Halifax License Bill.....	132
Halifax City R. R.....	106, 160
Halifax Road Scale.....	203
I	
Intercolonial R. R.....	143
Industrial Exhibition.....	157
L	
LOCAL CONSTITUTION.....	77, 85, 91, 96, 98, 99
Legislative Council.....	97, 116, 129
License Fees in Pictou.....	132

M	
Money Votes.....	65
Mines and Minerals—Bill relative to.....	200
N	
Newfoundland and Labrador Trade.....	73
P	
Presbyterian Union Act.....	148, 160, 208
Pilotage.....	151
Post Office Report.....	167, 484
Petition against Chief Justice.....	20
R	
Revenue Matters.....	131
Road and Bridge Service.....	150
Railway Extension.....	152, 202
RAILWAY—Windsor and Annapolis.....	69, 97, 110, 167
Railway—Intercolonial.....	143
REPORT ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—Debate on.....	168, 198
Road Communication.....	73
Road Scales.....	160
Report—Post Office.....	167, 201
Report on Law Amendments.....	166
S	
SPEECH—at Opening.....	1
at Close.....	208
Statute Labour.....	149
Stipendiary Magistrates Bill.....	79, 126
St. Lawrence and Bay of Fundy Canal.....	106
Surveyors—Bill relative to.....	157
T	
Taxes on Military Officers.....	107
U	
UNION—Debate on.....	5

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NOVA SCOTIA.

1867.

SATURDAY, March 16.

At 2 o'clock p. m. the Speaker took the chair of the house, and the gentleman Usher of the Black Rod shortly afterwards announced His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor's command for the attendance of the house in the Council Chamber.

The members having attended in obedience to this command His Excellency opened the session with the following

SPEECH :

Mr. President, and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

In meeting you at a most important epoch in the affairs of British North America, it affords me much pleasure to be able to congratulate you on the continued peace and prosperity of the Province during the past year.

While these colonies have been subjected to the threats of lawless men, our Province has been exempted from any attack, and although our local forces nobly responded to the call which was made upon them in the early part of the year to arm for the purposes of defence, happily no necessity occurred to require their services to repel an invader.

The exigencies of the Province of New Brunswick rendering it necessary for a time to withdraw a large portion of Her Majesty's Troops from this Garrison for the protection of that Colony, it was with the utmost satisfaction that I was enabled to fill their places for Garrison duty by portions of the Halifax Volunteer and Militia Artillery and the Volunteer Battalion, and to mark how well that service was performed. The readiness and good discipline of the officers and men who were then employed, show how much has been effected by the efforts made during the last few years to place our local forces in a proper condition, and how much we can depend upon them in the hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

The Public Accounts will be submitted to you without delay, and will exhibit the finances of the country in a state of unprecedented prosperity. Large as was the revenue of the previous year, the accounts will shew the gratifying fact that it has been greatly exceeded by that of 1866. The Estimates for the present year will also be laid before you.

Mr. President, and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

I have to express my regret that the Government of the United States have adhered to their policy of last year, obstructing that Trade which under the Reciprocity Treaty was so beneficial to their own country as well as to this Province. I have, however, to state that the abrogation of the Treaty has been much less prejudicial to us than was anticipated, and in some respects has been productive of good, by uniting more closely the interests and the Trade of this and the other North American Colonies.

In accordance with a Resolution of the Legislature passed last session, the Commission of the Paris Exhibition was organized, and by the labors of the gentlemen comprising this Board, a large number of valuable articles, exhibiting the varied resources of the Province, have been collected and sent forward to Paris; and it is confidently expected that the results of this exhibition will be of material advantage to the best interests of the Province.

Owing to financial difficulties in the Money Market of Great Britain last year, no progress was made in the construction of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway; but it affords me much pleasure to state that by a new contract made under the provisions of the law relating thereto, this important work has been now placed

in the hands of competent parties, with every prospect of satisfactory accomplishment. Great progress has been made in the construction of the Pictou Railroad, a portion of which has been already opened for the accommodation of the public, and it is fully anticipated that it will be completed at the time mentioned in the contract.

The papers and reports of the Joint Commission to Brazil and the West Indies will be laid before you, and it is hoped much good will result from the efforts thus made to extend the commerce of the British North American Colonies with those portions of the globe.

It is gratifying to me to advert to the great progress made in the important cause of Education under recent enactments.

I rejoice to be able to congratulate you upon the success which has attended the Delegation sent by me under your authority to confer with Her Majesty's Government on the Union of the Colonies. The papers relating to this important subject will be immediately laid before you. In the firm conviction that the Union of Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, upon the terms provided in the Bill submitted by Her Majesty's Government to the Imperial Parliament, will largely increase the prosperity of all these Provinces, and contribute to the strength and stability of those British Institutions which it is their good fortune to enjoy, I commend to your consideration such changes and amendments in our existing laws as may be found necessary.

BILL PRO FORMA.

MR. KAULBACK asked leave to introduce a bill entitled an act to amend the Laws relating to patents for useful inventions.

ANSWER TO THE SPEECH.

MR. BOURNOT said:—Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the reply to the speech of His Excellency, which has been entrusted to me and I must here express my regret that some one better qualified for the task of making this motion has not been selected. I desire to make a few observations on some of the points referred to in His Excellency's address, and I shall do so in the order in which they appear. Before proceeding further, however, I cannot help observing, and in this particular many of those who hear me will coincide in my remark, that I was much pleased to observe the presence of His Excellency Vice Admiral Sir James Hope at the opening of the Legislature. It is an unusual circumstance for the Admiral in command on this station to be present, and I cannot help referring to it. In addition to this remark I must express my regret that Sir James Hope is about to leave our shores. He will leave behind him many pleasing reminiscences of the period of his command.

The most important topic contained in the speech was that embodied in the last clause, but to that I will not refer at this stage of my remarks. First of all our attention has been called to the fact that we have great cause for gratitude and rejoicing on account of the prosperity which this country has enjoyed, especially in view of the devastations which war has inflicted upon some of the countries of Europe. In the second portion of the address a well deserved tribute is paid to the volunteer

forces of the provinces. It will be well remembered that during last session we were much alarmed at the threatened invasion, and that the moment an appeal was made to the noble men composing the military force of the country, they responded with the utmost alacrity and hastened to fill up the positions vacated by the troops who were despatched to the frontier. This conduct was deserving of the highest praise, and I only wish I possessed the eloquence of the leader of the government, that I might use in connection with this subject such language as would be worthy of the occasion, and as the country would be pleased to hear. I would observe also that the same alacrity was evinced in every part of the province, showing that when an emergency arrives we shall find our 50,000 militia men ready to defend their country from the invaders. Not one of them I believe will shrink from the duty that may then be imposed upon him. It is gratifying to us to know that in two or three years our Militia Force has made such improvements in organization. It is true that much remains to be done, but we may rest assured that in a short time a state of thorough efficiency will be attained.

The next clause of the address refers to the public revenue, and in connection with that I am gratified to be able to say, and it will be agreeable to those who hear me to learn that the balance in the hands of the Financial Secretary at the end of the last financial year, after paying all demands against the treasury, shews a large surplus. I must now refer to the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty and its effect upon our commercial prosperity. We all know that the country has felt that abrogation to a considerable extent, more especially in the high duties which have been imposed upon our principal exports. In relation to this subject I may say that I am of opinion that bye-and-bye the old system will be revived, and in this view I am supported by many persons of experience. Since the abrogation of the treaty this country has prospered to a degree that was not at all anticipated, and there is one circumstance in connection with it to which I would especially refer: namely, the mission to Brazil and the West Indies, the report on which is in our hands. That report contains valuable statistics showing new channels into which our commerce can profitably be turned. In Upper Canada alone there is a consumption of 200,000 or 300,000 tons of coal. Why cannot that market be supplied by Pictou or Cape Breton?

Then there is the other topic of the Paris Exhibition Commission. I was glad to find that the commissioners had bestowed so much attention upon their duties, and believe that at the Exhibition we will appear to great advantage, taking a place second only to Canada among the B. American colonies. Our column of coal and our specimens of gold would alone make us prominent in any exhibition. There is one circumstance in connection with this topic which rather puzzles me. I am curious to know why the commissioners selected Louisburg as a place to be represented by a painting at the exhibition. Was it to remind the French that there they had sustained a defeat, or was it shew the present nakedness and desolation of the old city? The contrast is great between the present and past condition

of that place, and if Dr. Honeyman should point to the picture and say, "Louisburg once belonged to you," the answer would be, "but it is not now what it was in old times, as can be seen by its ruinous and forsaken condition." I have before now told the house, and Mr. Fleming's report corroborates my statement, that Louisburg is the port nearest to Europe on this continent, and I trust the time will come when it will have the advantages of railway communication. Its harbour is accessible at all seasons of the year, it was the old capital under the French rule, it was for a long time the rendezvous for the French West Indies, Louisiana and Quebec mercantile fleet, and I am convinced that it will at no very distant day be a city not even second to Halifax, if to any in British America. It is one of those places which under Confederation will receive a large measure of attention, and I may say here that one of the reasons why I supported that measure was that under the Nova Scotia Government Cape Breton never received ample justice;—under Confederation we will be treated as an important integral part of the nationality.

The railway question has received some attention; and as to the Annapolis Railway, I suppose our friends from the westward will speak eloquently on the subject. I am glad to find that the promises held out in relation to that work are being fulfilled, notwithstanding the fears which existed to the contrary. As regards the Pictou line, I had the pleasure of travelling over it from West River, and I must say that the section opened is an admirable one. I hope that the next time I come here I shall be able to travel over it from Pictou. When I had the honour of addressing the house formerly on this question, I mentioned that the benefits to be conferred by the line on the Cape Breton Counties would be by keeping up the communication by a line of steamers by Mabeu or St. Peter's Canal to Sydney. I am still of that opinion, and learn it is intended, when the railway is completed, to establish such a line.

The next point referred to is the subject of Education. You are aware that I never gave a very hearty support to the present educational measure, but I am happy to inform the house that in the county which I represent the Act is working well, and I believe that in the lapse of time the system will be found to improve more and more. The greatest difficulty in connection with the system is the want of a good staff of educators. This want, however, will be supplied by-and-by. I have now come to the most important question of all, and it is one that has been for some time engrossing the attention of the house and of the country,—I allude to the question of Confederation. In the remonstrance which Mr. Howe and his friends recently addressed to the Colonial Secretary, they did me the honor to refer to a speech made by me in 1865, and brought a charge for inconsistency against me, for having in 1866 supported the resolution for Union. It is somewhat strange that such a charge should emanate from Mr. Howe, who has been so inconsistent on this great question. He is a gentleman from whose high abilities I will not detract, but he ought to know well that a politician is some-

times called upon to change his views in an age of progress like this. But if I was open to the charge of inconsistency it was in opposing Confederation in 1865, for in 1861, in course of an address to the house, I took occasion to make these observations:—

"And I may add that a Union of the Colonies should have formed the chief feature of the session. It has already become the great question of the day, and one which now occupies the thoughts of every statesman who looks forward to the future greatness of British North America, for by it alone can we claim rank among the favoured nations of the earth." And again: "Linked with it is the often proposed great Intercolonial Railway, which I shall always advocate. By all these now neglected measures can we become prosperous. An imperishable name, one that will never die, will the statesman gain who matures and renders them acceptable to these provinces."

These were the sentiments expressed by me six years ago, and therefore I say that if there was any inconsistency on my part it was in opposing Confederation at all. The reasons for my opposition to the Quebec scheme are known to many of my friends, and as I have stated them at large to the house, I need not refer to them again, excepting to say that I support the measure from conviction. My mind was not influenced by any freak of a moment, or by any desire for office. It is well known that I have never held office, and that I do not desire any either under the general or local government. In the opinion of some gentlemen every man does wrong who does not strictly conform to their views; but I can fully justify the course I have taken. When I came to the session last year there were many conflicting reasons operating in my mind and I was not fully determined as to whether I should support or oppose Union. In the first place I found on reading attentively that the opinions of the most intelligent men in England were favourable to Confederation; then I saw that the organs of the various religious denominations were likewise favorable, and that the opposition had received the support of the leading men of every political creed.—Everywhere evidence was to be found that the wish of the Imperial Government was to see Union consummated; then came the Fenian excitement, and the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty; and, at length, when our own territory was menaced, I felt that the moment had arrived when a true and patriotic lover of his country should decide. I then came to the resolution that I should support Confederation, in order that we might be prepared to meet the emergencies which were approaching. I gave the proposition my support, however, with the understanding that the Quebec scheme should undergo modification, and I am pleased to observe that there is a great improvement in the Bill, which is likely to become the law of the land. The Quebec Scheme gave us 10 members in the Senate, but the bill gives us 12, which will be a much larger representation in proportion to our population than Canada, has. With regard to the amount of revenue to be placed at the disposal of the local legislature, under the Quebec scheme we were to have had about \$200,000 based on the census of 1861, but under the Bill the allowance will be increased until the population reaches 400,000. Altogether, including the special grant the local subsidy will be increased

about \$120,000 more than the Quebec scheme would have given us for local purposes. There are other important modifications but to these I shall not refer at the present time. The bill which has been introduced into the Imperial Parliament has received the support of our late respected Governor, the Marquis of Normandy, of Earl Russell, of Mr. Watkin, and of the foremost men of the mother country, and who are its opponents? The principal opponents are Mr. Bright and Mr. Ayrton, whose opposition is founded on the expense that will be caused by colonial defence, and on the indisposition which they feel to support the guarantee for the Intercolonial Railway.

I have the honor to represent the largest constituency in the province, with the exception of Halifax, (for Pictou, which follows Halifax in population, is divided), and I feel it gratifying to be able to say that I never presented a petition against Confederation, and that no public meetings against it have been held in the county. It is true I received a document signed by a few persons, whom I highly esteem, shortly after the division had taken place, asking that I should oppose the measure, and I will frankly say that even had I received it before the division my action would not have been different, for I feel that I represent the whole of Nova Scotia, and must regard the interests of all its people, rather than the wishes of the few individuals to whom I refer. In looking at the prospects of the Confederation which is to be, I feel that we have all the elements of greatness within us. We have a territory larger than that of the United States, we have a supply of those minerals upon which the might and prosperity of England have so long rested, we have gold, we have our fisheries and our timber and the agricultural capabilities of Canada which is only second among grain producing countries of this continent, and is one of the granaries of the world. Then there is our mercantile marine, the third or fourth in the world, and I feel that the time will come when we will stand among the very first on the list. Some of the subjects to which I have referred are of such importance that I could not refrain from these observations and I will now conclude by moving the following reply to His Excellency's address:—

REPLY TO ADDRESS:

May it please Your Excellency,—

1. We thank Your Excellency for the speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session, and we are much gratified that your Excellency can again congratulate us upon the continued peace and prosperity of this Province.

2. We are much pleased to learn that the manner in which the loyal population of this Colony responded to the call made upon them for the defence of our country, and the zeal and ability with which they discharged the duties required of them, were such as to earn the warm commendation of your Excellency.

3. It affords us much pleasure to find that the revenue has increased, and we will give our best attention to the public accounts when laid before us.

4. We are glad to know that the interruption

of the trade of this Province, caused by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, has been largely compensated by the increased impetus given to commercial intercourse with the other Provinces.

5. We learn with much satisfaction that the difficulties in connection with the prosecution of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway have been overcome, and that the extension of the Railway to Pictou has been vigorously prosecuted.

6. We trust the efforts made to represent the resources of Nova Scotia, at the International Exhibition about to be held at Paris will be productive of much good to the Province.

7. We reciprocate the hope that the joint missions to Brazil and the West Indies will result in the extension of commerce between those places and British North America.

8. It is very gratifying to know that great progress is been made in the Education of all classes of the people.

9. We have learned with deep satisfaction that the efforts to effect a satisfactory Union of the British North American Colonies have been so successful, and entertain no doubt that the best interests of all these Provinces will be greatly enhanced, and that their connection with the Crown and the Parent State will be thereby permanently secured.

Mr. CHURCHILL:—I rise to second the reply to the Address of the Lieutenant-Governor, and I do so with feelings of pleasure. I feel gratified at the fact that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is under progress, and the Pictou line will be carried to early completion, for I feel that will wipe out the reproach so long resting upon us that we had two pieces of Railway beginning nowhere and ending nowhere. In these facts I especially rejoice.

Mr. STEWART CAMPBELL:—I rise to ask that the usual courtesy be shown in reference to the reply to the Address, and to request that it be allowed to lie on the table until Monday. It may be convenient for the government to know, and it is but candid in me to inform them, that it is our intention to move an amendment to the Address, in reference to the subject of Confederation. In that amendment we desire solemnly to affirm the right of the people of this country to be heard on a measure involving so largely their best interests.

Hon. PROV. SECY.:—I need hardly say that the usual course will be adopted and that the Address will be allowed to lie over for the consideration of gentlemen opposite. I am glad that the hon. member has frankly stated his intention to move an amendment, and I will await with the utmost confidence the decision of what I believe will be the overwhelming majority of the House upon this most momentous question.

The Address was laid on the table until Monday.

The House adjourned to Monday at 3 o'clock.

UNION OF THE PROVINCES.

MONDAY, March 18.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

The adjourned debate on the Answer to the Address was resumed and all the clauses excepting the last were adopted.

Mr. Stewart Campbell's Speech.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said:—In accordance with the intimation given by me on a previous day—on the first occasion when I had an opportunity of doing so, I now proceed to move an amendment to the last clause of the Address in answer to His Excellency's Speech, and I will at once read the paragraph which I propose to substitute.

We regret that we are unable to perceive any grounds whereon to reciprocate your Excellency's congratulation upon the assumed success of the Delegation, commissioned by your Excellency under the resolution of this House to confer with Her Majesty's Government on the subject of the Union of the Colonies.

On behalf of the free people of Nova Scotia we would respectfully submit that in relation to that question the present is in our opinion a most important crisis in the history of this Province, and imperatively demands the exercise of the wisest discretion in the administration of its public affairs. Thus firmly impressed, we deem it to be our duty to convey to your Excellency our solemn protest against the action of the Delegates referred to, and most distinctly to claim and demand, on behalf of Nova Scotia, that no such measure as that proposed should have any operation in this Province until it has been deliberately reviewed by its Legislature, and sanctioned by the people at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, it is with no ordinary feelings that I view my position in regard to the topic of to-day. Gladly would I exchange the prominence in which I have been placed for one of less responsibility, one calling upon me in a more subordinate capacity to advocate the principles which I am prepared to avow. Truly would I have rejoiced if the occasion which has rendered my election necessary had not arisen—in short there had not been the necessity for presenting to the house the views of the people of this country as we conceive them to exist. But although on personal grounds I would have preferred the substitution of another state of things, yet being placed in such a position, and feeling called upon as I am for action in this matter, I do not hesitate to approach this subject as a member of a free legislature representing a free people. In answer to His Excellency's Speech, I feel that we are called on to say that we cannot reciprocate the language in which it is couched,—we cannot see that there is any ground for congratulating ourselves upon the success of a measure in which the people have no sympathy or concurrence. In ransacking the pages of history it is exceedingly difficult to find a case parallel to this. There are records of wrong, and spoliation, and injustice, in comparatively modern times, but we must go back, very far back indeed to find an instance such as that which calls for this amendment. It is true we need only go back a hundred years to find an unhappy state of things subsisting between the mother country and her colonies on this side of the water, and we know the results of the disaffection then induced by arbitrary enactments affecting the integrity of the Empire as it then existed, but I can find no record of rejoicing in such a condition as that in which we are placed until I extend my retrospect and revert to a history of a tyrant, Emperor though he may be called, who dined while Rome was burning. In that case alone can I find a similarity of circumstances and a paralleled contempt and disregard of na-

tional feeling. The delegation referred to in the Address was constituted under a resolution of this Legislature at its last session, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That his Excellency the Lieut. Governor be authorized to appoint delegates to arrange with the Imperial Government a scheme of union which will effectually ensure just provision for the rights and interests of this Province; each Province to have an equal voice in such delegation, Upper and Lower Canada being for this purpose considered as separate Provinces.

That delegation was commissioned as I understand it to arrange with the Imperial Government a scheme of union, but was it even contemplated by the people or the house that that delegation was empowered to be parties to an Imperial act of Parliament, an arbitrary act? I am convinced that no such idea could have entered into the minds of gentlemen around these benches. Did we, the Parliament of Nova Scotia entrusted with and empowered to decide on the weal or woe of our country, and charged with the protection of the interests of the people, part with a right so deeply affecting their welfare as this Union will? No, sir, I conceive then that this delegation has exceeded its authority, and that the commission under which they probably acted was not authorised by this resolution. We had delegates in connection with this subject on a previous occasion, and the resolution under which they were appointed was similar in its terms to this, but was it supposed that the delegates sent to Charlottetown and Quebec were empowered to do anything but prepare a scheme to be submitted for the ratification of this house? Not by any means, and therefore when these gentlemen went across the water and became parties to an imperial act, when they were engaged in the lobby of the British Parliament promoting that act, they exceeded the authority conferred upon them by this house and by their commission. In that view I think that the action of the delegation is such as the house and the people should not sustain. This is a matter which should have been brought back here and subjected to the consideration of the legislature. But they have consummated the act as far as it was in their power to do so, and under what circumstances have their proceedings transpired? It is well known that the people of this country in every section petitioned by thousands praying that the scheme should not receive any consummation at the hands of the Imperial Government until it had been submitted to them at the polls, but how have these petitions been treated? Have we heard that they have even been read or even presented, in order that the wishes of the country should be known? Then this bill, framed by the delegates, under an authority which they assumed but had not, was introduced into the House of Lords, a body composed, I think, of between 300 and 400 members, and how was it there received when presented for consideration? Of the hundreds of members, there could not be found one to witness its formal presentation one round dozen, and that important bill, touching the rights, the property and persons of our people for all time to come, was not even read. It was read by its title only, and the important details it embodied never

reached the ears or the hearts of the members composing that branch of the Imperial Legislature. It passed the House of Lords with more facility than a bill imposing a tax on dogs would have done. It was hurried through in indecent and disgraceful haste, and sent to the House of Commons. How was it received there? I cannot imagine how it should have met with any other reception than it did when I read the observations of members of that house—observations which must have proceeded from information coming from a quarter from which sounder information should have been supplied. It was there stated by prominent members that this matter had been before the people just previous to the last election; that the Premier had gone to every hustings, and at every polling booth in the Province had preached on the question of Union. It was on information such as that that the enlightened House of Commons proceeded and I need scarcely ask members whether that information was true or false. Is there a member of this house or a man in the country who will venture to say that previous to the last election—at the time when the canvass was taking place—this question was presented to the people, or that on any hustings it was even mentioned. And if not, I care not whether it had been at any previous time. In the course of my professional training I have learned this principle: that the last will which a man makes is that which must be recognized. Whatever his previous dispositions may have been, they are cancelled and annulled by his subsequent wishes. When, therefore, at the last election, the matter was altogether ignored I am right in saying that it was not before the people, and that they did not then express their views upon it. But let me be more particular. I have in my hand a copy of the *London Times*, an authority which will be especially acceptable to members of government, and it contains the debate on this question. This report contains so many amusing pieces of misinformation that I must trouble the house with a few extracts. Mr. Watkins who, for many good reasons, but none of them referable to the interests of Nova Scotia, took a deep interest in the proceedings and action of the delegation is reported to have said in reference to this Province: "There was a general election in 1863, and the Prime Minister went through the country preaching this Confederation of the provinces. It was brought under the notice of the electors at every polling booth, and at every hustings the issue was distinctly raised." I am willing to give the leader of the government credit for great versatility of talent, but I never knew that he had the qualifications of a preacher, unless it be true which I do not assert, that a great sinner is likely to be most successful in converting men from sin. If I read on further it would be still more apparent that the Parliament of England has been grossly deceived at a time when there were present about them men who ought to have taken care that the subject should be looked into most carefully. I find also that the debate embodied the idea that this measure was a treaty of peace between these Provinces. I am rather disposed to view it as a declaration of war—war on the rights, the feelings, the interests and the liberties of the people of this country. Those gen-

tle men who, since the last session, have visited their constituencies must be well satisfied of that opposition for no man with open eyes and ears could have travelled through the rural districts without seeing and hearing that the measure was obnoxious to the feelings of the people. If it were a measure good instead of bad, if it had merits instead of demerits without number, I conceive that the people who are to be affected by its operation should be heard upon it in a constitutional manner at the polls, and until they are so heard you may pass this Act of Parliament, calling it an Imperial Act if you will, but it will be a blank piece of paper until the hearts and sympathies of the people rally round it to give it effect. By the amendment which I have submitted we ask to obtain for the people the liberty to speak on the subject, and why should they not speak. According to the constitution of this house the day is not far distant when under any circumstances the House would be dissolved,—its existence can last but for a few weeks and why this haste? I must say that we have approached a crisis of a momentous character in our history. This Province until a recent period was a loyal and happy Colony, having every reason to be loyal, every reason to be happy until this unfortunate and unhappy measure was brought in and cast among us. Shall I be told that loyalty exists now in the same richness among us as it once and recently did? Mr. Speaker, I strenuously opposed the measure last Session on the ground that the course about to be taken would endanger the allegiance and undermine the loyalty of the people and since that time I have seen that that result is but too probable. We are told by members of the Imperial Parliament that it is desirable we should be separated from the British Empire and further we are told that it is not alone for the interests of Nova Scotia that the scheme has been projected—that there are reasons making it desirable that we should be connected with a large country. To secure Canada from foreign invasion the right of Nova Scotians are to be interfered with and trampled upon I conceive that Nova Scotia has at least as just a claim to the protection of England as Canada. Nova Scotia has been truly loyal, and in every hour of danger she has exhibited a disposition to the uttermost extent of her resources to stand by and maintain the honor and integrity of the Empire. I conceive that the transactions of the past few months are exhibiting a poor return for that loyalty and that allegiance. The loyalty which I desire to see is the loyalty of the heart, not the loyalty pampered and fed and fattened by the contents of the treasury. The loyalty of the heart, springing from just and honorable motives—that is the loyalty which is desirable, and anything else is unworthy of the name. In this amendment we beg to approach His Excellency with the respectable submission that this is a most important crisis in our history. The men who best know the country feel this as they travel through its length and breadth. Pass this act without reference to the people whose rights are to be affected, and do you make them its friends? Do you not rather create in them feelings precisely the reverse? Do you not make them enemies and disloyal? Those who are in opposition have been denounced as disloyal, but

that reproach can hardly come from men who by their conduct have brought about this state of feelings. The men who are open to the charge are those who are forcing it on the country. I have said that the country was peaceable, loyal and happy before,—if it is not so now it is because of this measure, and for no other reason whatever. The amendment suggests a solemn protest against the action of the delegation. For the reasons I have mentioned, I think the house should concur in that protest. The delegates have exceeded their authority: they were delegates from the house for the purpose of preparing a scheme, not for converting that scheme into an Act of Parliament, while we had within our own borders a legislature with a right to exercise its own judgment, and one that has never done ought to induce an abridgement of its rights. I need hardly repeat that I desire to see the scheme of Union submitted to the people. That is the view that I have always maintained and expressed, and I should view with sorrow rather than with anger, the adoption of any other course for I believe that any other course would endanger the happiness, the loyalty, and the best interests of our people. It is not my intention now to press upon the House any other view than the necessity which exists for preserving this Province in a peaceful and happy condition, and I think it is our bounden duty to adopt the course which I have urged. I wish before detaining the House further, to hear reasons why that course should not be pursued. I ask those gentlemen who stand in the positions of guardians of the public liberties why they are not prepared to submit the measure to the people? Why this haste? What is the pressing necessity? The more the subject is discussed, the more averse are the people to its features. During the past summer the feeling was comparatively mild and moderate to what it is to-day, and the reason was that in the trustfulness of their hearts the people never could have supposed that a measure so seriously to affect them would have reached the point it has without their voice being heard in a constitutional manner. But the awful note has lately sounded in their ears telling them that their fate is approaching, that their constitution is about to be a thing of the past, that their liberties are to be abridged forever, and they now feel excited if not enraged. If that be their feeling they have just cause for it. Men in whom they trusted—men who held their positions and ate their bread by the breath of the people—these were the men who stood between them and their liberties and sought to cut off their freedom forever. It is a painful thing to receive an injury at the hands of a friend—it is a galling thing to receive the blow of ingratitude, and that is the state of feeling existing in the breasts of the people of this country. They are indignant that the men whom they elevated to power for other and noble purposes, should have been the instruments of the annihilation of their freedom. What should be the feelings of a representative? There should be some regard for the feelings of the men who sent him here and elevated him to so honorable a position, and if any among us should disregard these feelings, the day cannot be distant when their consciences

will be grievously disturbed. I trust none of these individuals will suffer from the remorse which such considerations will induce; for my part I shall have the satisfaction of having in a humble way asserted the rights of the people on this question. I think that the friends of England and the friends of Nova Scotia should require and acquiesce in no other course than that which I have advocated, for he is no friend to this country and an enemy to England who would force this measure on the necks and hearts of an unwilling people.

Mr. PRYOR, hear, hear.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL continued:—The hon. gentleman says hear! hear! I wish he would hear and act in conformity with the views I expressed. What placed him in the position he occupies? It was the voice of the people of this city of the metropolis, and for what? To destroy the rights and sacrifice their liberties? No, not for that, and when he next appeals to his constituents for their suffrages if ever he ventures to do so, I hope they will tell him so. He was placed here to preserve the constitution of the country and to perpetuate its loyalty, and I hope he will be told in a voice of thunder that he is one of those who have forfeited the pledges which he gave. I trust that gentlemen will carefully consider this amendment, they will see that it contains no idea that it is not founded in justice and truth, and is in all respects entitled to their concurrence and support.

Speech of Mr. Killam.

Mr. KILLAM.—I rise for the purpose of seconding the amendment which has just been moved by the hon. member for Guysboro, with whose remarks I fully agree. It is well known in this house that I do not make any pretensions to the eloquence of other gentlemen, but the views I entertain on this question are the result of deep conviction. I may not be able to express these views as I would wish, but I feel them very strongly. The hon. gentleman has referred to the recent delegation and the manner in which the authority given by this house has been exceeded, but he hardly went deep enough into that matter in my opinion. He must recollect that when the Provincial Secretary was pressing his resolution upon the house, last session, he referred some years back for the purpose of strengthening his argument. He stated that the leaders of the political parties in this Legislature had moved resolutions in favour of this scheme of Union, but did he ever hear of a single resolution that had not coupled with it the condition that the question would be referred back to the Legislature, and that means the people. Mr. Johnston, Mr. Young, Mr. Howe were all quoted in illustration of his argument, but can he assert that the question was ever treated by them in a practical point of view. The hon. gentleman has in England quoted these gentlemen as the advocates of this scheme and tried to make the public men of that country believe that the people of Nova Scotia are in favour of a Union of these provinces with Canada. These delegates were to go and see if they could agree on some measure that would suit the members of

this Legislature better than the Quebec scheme. There has never been any measure of Union submitted to this house for its deliberation. Instead of bringing back what they agreed on they have put their hands to an Act of Parliament. We are hereafter to be bound by a paper constitution which has never been submitted to us for our consideration. No more important question than this was ever before the people of this country. If this bill is passed we are deprived of the power of hereafter legislating for ourselves. We shall certainly have a voice in the General Parliament, but that the people don't want at all. Nothing can reconcile the people to the manner in which this measure is being forced upon them. They might have submitted to an Act of Union, if the British Parliament and people had declared that it was positively necessary for Imperial purposes, but that has not been the case. It appears by the papers that Her Majesty's Ministers have all the time been under the delusion that in promoting the measure they are pleasing the people of Nova Scotia—a delusion created and fostered by the delegates. It is not difficult to understand the motives that have prompted the delegates to take the course they have. These politicians wish to put themselves out of the power of the people—to obtain place and emolument without the wishes of the people being at all consulted. The public men of New Brunswick dissolved the legislature when they returned from Quebec, and the people returned a large majority opposed to Union with Canada. Another election subsequently took place, and the people, for some reason or other, reversed the verdict they had given previously. So the people of New Brunswick have been appealed to twice on this question, whilst the people of Nova Scotia have not been consulted even once. The course pursued by these gentlemen is, as far as I know, unprecedented in the history of legislation. Even Napoleon did better than they have done. I look upon this Act of Parliament, if it is passed, as destroying the colonial system.

If British colonies anywhere find that their rights and privileges can be transferred at any time to another country against their wishes—to some other people with whom they can have no sympathy—they will feel that their security and prosperity rest upon a very insecure basis. The people of Nova Scotia are not the only ones opposed to that measure; for we have reason to believe that a large number of the Lower Canadians entertain similar views. Nearly one half of the people of New Brunswick are opposed to the measure. We know how few people it takes to turn the scales in an election. It is quite true that measures often pass the Legislature which are very objectionable to the people, but they know that the time will come when they will be able to express their opinions on these obnoxious measures, and have them repealed. Now, however, you are to fasten a measure upon them which will fetter them for all time—hand them over to Canada for ever. I agree with the hon. member for Guysboro',

that this scheme states a fatal blow at the connection between these colonies and the mother country. Nova Scotia has always hitherto been considered a loyal province. I feel as loyal as any person in this house; I have not been ready to bow down to the authority of every person, but I pay respect to the laws and the government under which I live. I have British feelings in my breast, I feel proud to see England great and prosperous, but a measure of this kind must create discontent among the whole population of this province. The majority in this house who decide against the people assume a very grave responsibility. Many of them will regret it deeply if they act contrary to the sentiments of the people. We are too near a great country to be trifled with in a matter of this kind. Let no one attempt to make the people believe that the British government would barter away their rights unfairly. Let gentlemen consider, therefore, the great responsibility that rests upon them in the present important emergency, and decide wisely before it is too late.

Speech of Hon. Prov. Secretary.

Dr. TUFFER replied as follows:—I feel by no means disposed to find fault with the mode and temper in which this subject has been approached. No doubt the hon. mover of the amendment, in confining himself mainly to the constitutional point which he has raised, felt that the peculiar circumstances under which the House meets—the very advanced period of the session and the necessity of dealing immediately with certain portions of the public business which will not admit of postponement—induced him to limit his remarks to the range he has done. The hon. member who has seconded the resolution, with that due regard to the public time which he has always shown, felt also that this was not an occasion when a great deal of debatable matter should be opened up. I intend to follow the example of these hon. gentlemen, and shall as succinctly as possible deal with the constitutional point that has been raised, without going into any lengthy observations on the great subject which is brought under the consideration of the House.

It would have been perhaps too much to expect that the hon. members opposite who entertain very strong opinions on this question should not have availed themselves of the present opportunity of putting upon record their views and opinions in reference to the Address. As one of the advisers of His Excellency I would have been glad, had it been possible, if a different course had been pursued and no debatable issue had been raised on the Address. That course on the present occasion seems to have been impossible, and I must frankly admit that I was fully prepared for an amendment from the hon. gentlemen. I may say with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I feel I can approach this question under circumstances upon which I may congratulate the government, the Legislature, and the country. As far as I am individually

concerned, I need hardly tell the house that from the first hour I felt it necessary as a public man to give my earnest consideration to public matters—from the first hour I felt it due to the people, the management of whose affairs I had undertaken, to express my opinion on public questions—I have never hesitated openly, at all times and everywhere, to avow my deep and settled conviction that in a union of British North America lay the only great future for any portion of these provinces. True to these principles, whether in power or in opposition, to the best of my ability I advocated and sustained these views.—I pledged myself to my countrymen, at all times and under all circumstances, that whatever power and influence they might place in my hands, I would feel bound to use for the purpose of advancing the interests, elevating the character and promoting the security of our common country, by a union of British North America. Believing as I do that not only the most marked prosperity would have followed, but that the only security and guarantee for the continued possession of British principles in any portion of British North America, was involved in that great question, I have never hesitated to declare my opinion that it would have been wise on the part of Nova Scotia to have entered into that union under the terms propounded by the Quebec scheme.—There were many gentlemen around me, however—many for whom I entertain great respect—who felt that better terms should be obtained for the Maritime Provinces than were contained in that scheme. To-day I stand in the proud position of being able to claim confidently the support of gentlemen who were unable to give it to me before because whilst their general principles were in favour of Union they did not consider that the scheme of Union devised at Quebec gave to these provinces all the advantages and consideration to which they are entitled. The position, therefore, that we occupy on this question is one of no little pride for we are able to say that we have not only obtained everything which was granted at Quebec, but that very important concessions have been made in the arrangements that are now being consummated, and that all these alterations are most favorable to the interests of these Maritime Provinces. The narrow range taken by those gentlemen who have opened up this question precludes me from dwelling on this particular feature of it, but an occasion will offer itself later for discussing the scheme in all its bearings. Then gentlemen in this house will have ample opportunity to place before the legislature and country an expression of their opinion on this great question. It will be therefore only necessary that I should briefly call the attention of the house to the position that this question now assumes, and deal with the constitutional point which has been raised by gentlemen on the opposite side.

I need not remind the House that no man can pretend that this is one of the occasions on which a great surprise is attempted. No man can contend that this question of a Union of

British North America is not one to which the public mind and consideration of all classes of the intelligent people of this country have not been again and again turned, until it has become perfectly familiar to all. I need not go into any lengthy review of circumstances that took place on this question, but twenty-five years ago the whole subject, in all its bearings, was placed in the report of Lord Durham before the people of British America and of the whole British Empire, and attracted an amount of attention that few other great public measures ever received. We might claim the proud distinction that this question has been examined and discussed within these walls with an acumen and ability that did the greatest honor to gentlemen on both sides. If there was a section of British America ready to come to the consideration of this question and pass upon it intelligently, it was the Province of Nova Scotia, familiarized as the people have been with it in all its aspects. So far as I am personally concerned I have never hesitated to express my sentiments whether as a member of the Government or Opposition. When opposed to the administration of the day in 1860 I was invited to deliver a lecture at the Mechanics' Institute of St. John, and I was permitted the privilege of choosing the subject upon which I would address them. I took that occasion to proclaim not only to the people of my own province but of British North America, that all the power and influence that I might ever obtain should be exerted to accomplish and consummate the great scheme of British American Union which had been so ably discussed in previous days. I returned from the neighbouring province, and what was the first thing that met me? Some gentlemen opposite who perhaps felt that the eulogiums which that address had received might make me a little giddy, immediately declared that after all there was nothing novel in these sentiments, that they were borrowed from my political opponents, and that the gentleman then at their head, Mr Howe, was one of the originators—as I have never denied he was—of this great scheme of Union. I felt there was no originality in my views, that all I had endeavored to do was to give favor and substance to the question—to pledge myself as a public man, devoted to the service of the country, to promote the consummation of this great scheme. I came back to this city, and at one of the largest assemblages that I have ever addressed, I repeated these sentiments and pledged myself, in the face of my country, that, if entrusted with power by the people of this Province, I would use that power as energetically as I was able for the accomplishment of this great project. I went up, then, into the neighbouring counties of Hants and Kings, and Colchester, and there proclaimed plainly to the people of this country my sentiments on the same great question; I did so by public invitation, and delivered these sentiments amid the united plaudits of men of all shades of politics. Everywhere I was proud to find that

this great scheme which I was advocating was received as an open question, upon which all political parties could co-operate. After I had thus re-opened this question, the leader of the government to which I was opposed, re-committed himself to the principles of British Colonial Union, by moving a series of resolutions on the subject. These resolutions originating with the government, of which he was the leader, broadly stated that so manifold and so great were the advantages that would result from union, that the government asked for power from this House to have a conference for the purpose of taking it up and placing it in a position so that it might receive the solemn ratification of the Legislature of this country. Consistent with the views I had always entertained, I gave my earnest co-operation to the government on this question, and a similar course was pursued by every Conservative sitting on the benches with me. The Lieutenant Governor was requested to appeal to the British Parliament on this question. Mr. Howe having received the authority from the Imperial Government immediately, under his own hand, urged upon Canada and the other British North American Colonies the importance of dealing with the question. In a statesmanlike spirit he pointed out to them that there was only one mode in which this question could be dealt with—that the only true constitutional course was not to refer it to the people at the polls, but to the Legislature. I challenge the gentlemen opposite, instead of indulging in mere empty declamation addressed not to members inside this House but to uninformed persons outside—to point out a single authority here or elsewhere, in this province or in the mother country whence we obtained our system of government, that has ever propounded such a principle as the resolution lays down; and when they are able to do so, I shall be prepared to extend to this amendment an amount of consideration that I feel now it is not entitled to. In Mr. Howe's letter, under his own hand, he says there is only one way of dealing with the matter—that there should be a conference of the different provinces to arrange a scheme of Union—but there is not one word said about submitting the question to the people, but on the contrary, he proposed that it should be disposed of by the legislature. Mr. Howe, sustained by all his colleagues in the government, claimed for the Legislature of this country the right of dealing with this question—a principle which the hon. member for Yarmouth has himself just acknowledged as the correct one, though it conflicts with the position he has taken in seconding the present amendment. That hon. gentleman said that he was imbued with a love for British principles. He was one of the earliest and strongest advocates of colonial responsibility, and true to his principles what has he to-day told you? "*The Legislature represents the people.*" That is the reason when Mr. Young led that side of the House—when Mr. Howe led the government of the Liberal party,—when Mr. Johnston, on

this side, led the Conservative party, each and all, recognizing the fact that we enjoyed responsible government in all its completeness, on every occasion when this question came up, maintained the indisputable right of the Legislature to deal with this question. When Mr. Howe and Mr. Killam were demanding that the people should have the principle of responsible government extended to them, they affirmed the responsibility of the Ministry to the people—that the Ministry should have the people's representatives to sustain them, and that whilst they had that support, they were qualified to discharge all the duties of legislation in such a manner as they thought was consistent with the interests of the country.

The hon. member (Mr. Killam) has referred to Napoleon, and given us the only precedent that these gentlemen can adduce in support of their position. The hon. member for Guysboro', a gentleman of legal attainments—who has sat in the chair you, sir, now occupy,—who has, therefore, held the highest constitutional position in this Legislature, was obliged to sit down without having been able, from the whole range of constitutional history, to bring forward a single example in support of his course. The hon. member for Yarmouth, who has himself a pretty wide acquaintance with the constitutional system we enjoy, did at last find a precedent; but was it under the constitutional principles which it is our pride and glory to have received from England? Did he find it in Great Britain or in any portion of her colonial empire? No; but he had to travel to despotic France, where the universal popular franchise had placed the country under the heel of the most iron despotism that ever existed. All the public men in this house, Liberal or Conservative, have placed on record their deliberate sentiment that the Legislature of the country is the place where this question should be discussed and decided. But that is not all. The Duke of Newcastle was appealed to, and what did he reply? You have only to go to the journals and you will find him endorsing the same principles. Mr. Cardwell was subsequently appealed to, and you see that gentleman himself taking the same view of the question, and declaring the right of the Legislature to deal with it. The present Marquis of Normanby, reflecting the views of the government of the day as he does now his own, embodied in a state paper his opinion that the Legislature is the proper place to deal with the matter.

It was stated that if the British Government had only proper information on this question—if that dark cloud which prevented them from seeing the real facts of the case was only blown away, they would sustain the views of gentlemen opposite. Well all that has been done; I hold in my hand the statement of the late Colonial Secretary, the Earl of Carnarvon, who submitted this question with great ability to the House of Lords. But first let me ask when these gentlemen were advocating responsible government in this country, what did they tell

us they were going to give us? The institutions of Republican America? No. The despotism of France? No. They said that they intended giving us Responsible Government, the British system of government, so that the people of this country might be governed in precisely the same manner that the people of the British Islands are governed. Who are the best interpreters of the British system? When gentlemen raise an issue upon constitutional practice, they should sustain their course by reference to the authorities of that country from which we take our system. Now this whole question was put fully before the statesmen and people of England by a gentleman second in ability to none in this country—who is one of those who can almost make the worse appear the better reason—who can put his views before the public in the most conclusive manner that it is possible to place them. Now when this gentleman had exhausted months in enunciating his views, before the statesmen of the mother country, what did Lord Carnarvon say after full consideration of the whole question? Lord Carnarvon said:—

“Then the noble lord has founded an argument on the franchise of Nova Scotia, but really if this House is to go into all the intricacies and details of colonial government there can be no end to the matter. Such a course would have the effect of raising questions on every clause of the bill. The House has simply to ascertain who are the constituted authorities of Nova Scotia, whom we are bound to listen to and whose opinion we are bound to accept. Now, what have they said? In 1831 the then Parliament of Nova Scotia passed a resolution in favour of confederation in general terms. In 1863 that Parliament was dissolved and a fresh Parliament was elected and is in existence at the present moment. Well, it was only in April last that that Parliament came to a distinct resolution in favour of confederation—a resolution as distinct as words could express it. That resolution empowered certain gentlemen to proceed on their behalf to England to negotiate with her Majesty's Government. These accredited envoys were accordingly sent and the terms have been negotiated and embodied in this measure. It appears to me that it is not competent for us to look behind that vote of the Nova Scotia Parliament, and to inquire what other parties may be in the colony and under what circumstances the colonial local authorities and legislatures were elected. If responsible government means anything, it means this—that you not only give to a colony free institutions and enable the inhabitants to elect their own Parliament, but you also undertake, in matters of colonial policy, to deal only with that colony through the legally constituted authorities. Any other view of the case would lead us to endless difficulty.”

This is the opinion of a gentleman to whom the whole press, irrespective of party, has awarded unqualified praise for the able and perspicuous manner in which he dealt with this question. In fact, we have the opinion of the statesmen and press of all parties in England in support of the principle—that our Legislature has the authority of legislating on all matters touching the constitution for this country save where it conflicts with Imperial interests. I confess I feel mortified when we enjoyed the great principles of responsible government—when these principles had been worked out so as to reflect the highest credit upon all parties—when Nova Scotia had advanced to that position of intelligence that she could be entrusted with the ma-

nagement of her own affairs; I felt mortified, I say, to see the very men who had laid claims to having given us this constitutional system, going to the foot of the Throne and attempting to prove, as far as all the evidence they could gather would prove, that this province was unfit for the government she enjoys—that we were in that condition of corruption and ignorance that the Parliament of the country could not be trusted to discharge those legislative duties which had been entrusted to them under our constitutional system. If these petitions had any effect—if the British Government had accepted such statements as true, they would have been greatly misled, and would have estimated the character, education, and intelligence of this country at a very low standard indeed. We can point with pride to evidence that under the institutions we have enjoyed the people have chosen the best men they have as their representatives, whose acts may challenge the closest scrutiny of the mother country and of the world. If it had been shown that the action of the Legislature had been unworthy of the confidence of Parliament and Government of England, then we would have occupied a position that would indeed be most humiliating to us all. But we have another construction of this resolution besides Lord Carnarvon's. Here is the declaration not of the late Colonial Secretary only but the Queen's Speech, in which the United Cabinet of England give expression to their sentiments:—“Resolutions in favor of a more intimate union of the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have been passed by their several Legislatures, and delegates duly authorized and representing all classes of colonial party and opinion have concurred in the conditions upon which such a union may be effected in accordance with their wishes. A bill will be submitted to you which by the consolidation of colonial interests and resources will give strength to the sovereign Provinces as members of the same empire, and animated by feelings of loyalty to the same sovereign.” I have given you the authority of the leading men of this country—of the Colonial Minister, of the British Ministry—and in addition you have the authority of the Houses of Peers and Commons of Great Britain. Let detraction assail that parliament as it may, the hon. member may endeavour to throw odium upon it, but there is not a freeman through the length and breadth of the British Empire who can fail to admire and respect the body which, amid the convulsions that have shaken nations from centre to circumference, has maintained the proud pre-eminence of England. It does not become a colonial public man, at a time when the Parliament of Great Britain is attracting the admiration of the civilized world—when it is the great object of other nations to assimilate their institutions as nearly as possible to those of the mother country, to attempt to cast obloquy upon such a body. But they require no defence at my hands; the proud position that they occupy—the eminent character of

the statesmen who are called upon to discharge the functions of legislation in that country need no eulogium from me. It is with pride that I am able to state that having sat in the one House and stood in the other, I listened to the discussions on this great question, and not only the constitutional points which are at issue, but the true character of this union were clearly and ably propounded by the Parliament and statesmen of Great Britain. Having had both sides of this question before them they were able to render such a verdict as they never gave before on a great public measure. We are able to stand here and claim that the friends of Union were sustained by the friends of British institutions everywhere—that they have had the support and co-operation of the friends of the colonial empire in the Parliament of England; and what do you find to-day? In the "Morning Chronicle"—the organ of the gentlemen opposite—the debate on the question has been given in full, as I am happy to see, and what do you find in the Lords and Commons? You find this striking fact to which I wish to call the attention of gentlemen opposite who have said that this Union would weaken the connection with the Crown, that the statesmen of Great Britain, without regard to party, Liberal and Conservative, Whig and Tory, united in one common acclaim that the colonies would not only be rendered more prosperous, but that the ties that now bind them to the Empire would be strengthened. The very few members who could be induced by gentlemen opposite to reflect their sentiments did so on the ground that the colonies were a burthen, and that the sooner they were got rid of the better. These are the views of Mr. Bright who complained that if this Union was accomplished the result would be to burthen the Empire with the defence of these provinces and what position did Mr. Ayrton take? He would not commit himself so far as to oppose Union, but what he complained of was that millions of British money were to be expended in connection with a great highway between this province and Canada. Thus we find the British Government, and all statesmen who value the colonies as one of the great sources of the importance and influence of Great Britain among nations arrayed in support of colonial Union, whilst in opposition to this great scheme we find only the men who wish to get rid of the colonies altogether.

I must for a single instant call the attention of gentlemen opposite to the fact that they are bound by their own recorded votes in 1864 to vote against this resolution. I had the honour to move in the session of that year a resolution authorizing a conference to make a much more radical change than it is now intended to make in our constitution. It proposed a scheme of Union that would have merged our local institutions altogether—the Parliament and capital would have been transferred to another place. When I moved that resolution to appoint delegates for a Conference to bring about such a result, was there a man to raise an objection that as it would change the constitution, there should

be an appeal to the people. Where were the gentlemen who now raise these objections when I declared that this House had the power to do what I have said? There was no one then to raise an objection to such a course. They bound themselves to the constitutional principle that this Parliament had the undoubted power, and right to change the constitution of the country without an appeal to the people at the polls. But I can give them another illustration how lately it is that they have discovered this new constitutional doctrine—that it is not constitutional for the peoples' representatives, here in Parliament assembled, to discharge what they believe to be a solemn duty to the country. Can it be possible that these gentlemen have forgotten that in 1863, just before an appeal to the people, the Government of the day brought forward one of the most radical changes, a change in the constitution which, I have no hesitation in saying, would revolutionized England if propounded there to-morrow. This measure was to strike down one-third of the electoral body who were about to go to the polls. When we, on this side of the House, urged specific grounds that it had already been proved that the entire majority which they had obtained at the last general election had been subsequently lost at the polls, that they were only nominally the government, and that therefore they ought not to propose so radical a change before going to the people, we heard no such pathetic speeches from gentlemen opposite as we have had to-day, intended to have effect in the back settlements of the country? What had the hon. member for Guysborough then to say in favour of the people who were so ruthlessly to be deprived of their privileges. He stood here then one of the most violent and declamatory supporters of the Government, declaring that they would carry this measure, that they had the constitutional right to do so. Then he backed up his leader, Mr. Howe, who had put on record the most unequivocal testimony of the views of himself and the Liberal party on this question. It will be remembered that some 26,000 electors, rather taken aback at this attempt to change the election law, appealed to the Lieutenant Governor asking for a dissolution of the Legislature, and what was the answer? That the petitioners had a right to be heard? That such constitutional changes must be preceded by an appeal to the people? No! I hold in my hand the declaration of the leader of the Government stating that it was the undoubted right of Parliament to pass a law in defiance of the people. Yet the gentlemen who voted in support of such declarations are here to-day to express a mock sympathy which the people will never give them credit for. Mr Howe said:—"I am not one of those who shrink from the performance of a duty. I have never yet backed down through outside pressure, or waived my sense of right because of popular influence." He goes on to say:—"The hon. gentleman complained that no answer was ever returned to the petitions for a dissolution. Had they been sent through the Provincial Secretary, the proper official channel of communi-

cation between the people and the Lieutenant Governor, no doubt they would have received an answer; but they pursued a different course—the petitions were sent by a deputation, and handed in through a spokesman to His Excellency." These gentlemen, it appears, considered that it was a sufficient reason to treat the petition of 26,000 electors of this Province with profound contempt because they did not come through the Provincial Secretary. Suppose, now, we say to these same gentlemen that if they had sent in their petitions through the proper channel there would have been a dissolution long ago. (Laughter.) But they have never condescended to bring these documents under our notice, and I think I know the reason why, they did not send them through the Provincial Secretary's Office.

I was surprised at the contempt with which the hon. member asserted that this measure was actually being passed in Parliament without these petitions having ever been read. All I can say is that I sat in the House of Commons the night before I left England, and, up to that time, these petitions had never even been seen. I think when I put this and that together I may be able to venture a pretty good calculation why they had not been seen, and why they had not come through the Provincial Secretary's office. We know that all that men could do was done, by appeals in the press and by public lectures and a paid organization, to excite and stir up disapproval that never existed and does not exist now. Yet despite all the exertions that were made for many months, they could not get 10,000 petitioners to put their names on this table. When I know this fact—that after years of excitement and misrepresentation they were unable to get anything but a response of so feeble a character—I can understand why these 30,000 petitioners were not subjected to the scrutinizing eye of the Provincial Secretary or of any other person who would be able to verify whether there was any substance in these petitions or not. The reason why the Parliament of England had not seen these petitions down to the hour of the second reading of the bill in Commons, was probably that they were of a character that would have excluded them from being presented. I give this to the hon. gentleman opposite as the excuse why these petitions have not been presented, although that apology is not demanded at my hands.

But I must continue my quotations from the constitutional maxims of the late Government Mr. Howe said: "But, sir, if they received no reply in words, they were completely answered otherwise. The constituents of Digby unconstitutionally asked for a dissolution; we answered the prayer of the petition by constructing a valuable wharf in that locality." (Laughter.) Well, I think we have also constructed a few wharves and bridges in that community and elsewhere. (Renewed Laughter.) Again Mr. Howe continued: "As fast as possible I am running a road through Inverness, that the life-blood of that county may flow on through a healthy channel." (Great laughter.) "Queen's has received a grant for deepening Liverpool harbour. To the counties through which the railway passes my answer is the balance in the treasury to the credit of the railway, at the close of the present year. To all the counties I reply,

the general increase in your revenue—the general provincial prosperity—the peace and order that have reigned everywhere,—these are the bases of my reply to this charge." Well, I think we can claim public support on much stronger grounds than those adduced by the hon. gentleman. "But I tell the hon. gentleman that even in a legal point of view he is wrong. I defy him to put his finger on an instance where Parliament has been dissolved at the instigation of petitions. A dissolution involves the exercise of the extreme power of the Crown, and should rarely, if ever, be resorted to, except under necessity most urgent and overpowering. * * * Let me now refer to the opinion of a very eminent divine, who has marked the operation of universal suffrage, and hear what this gentleman says on that subject. After describing the gigantic evils of the system, he says: 'What then is to be done? Universal suffrage is the law of our land. Every one knows that this law cannot be repealed, for I repeat it the masses must vote its repeal; and this, of course, they will not do. There are many indications that of late years, through the vast flood of immigration, through the infamous conduct of designing demagogues, through the increase of intemperance, these degraded masses are gaining in number and in power.' We have the power, if we possess the will, to repeal this law—to strike down once and forever the evil—to relieve ourselves from the charge of being the only British colony, save Australia, governed by universal suffrage—to purge our constitution, and purify our electoral system. Let no man at this crisis hesitate or falter, but manfully and honestly perform his duty, to himself and to his country."

This is the doctrine that suited gentlemen in 1863,—they endorsed it to the fullest extent they possibly could. In 1863 to make a radical change in the constitution was right and proper—to ignore the voice of the 26,000 petitioners was right and proper—to force a law upon the statute book, to prevent a large body of the people passing upon their acts, was fully sustained by these gentlemen, I am glad that I cannot include the hon. member for Yarmouth in these observations, for he was then on this side of the House.

I was a good deal astonished when I heard the hon. member state that the delegates had exceeded the powers which they had received from the house in dealing with this question. I must confess I have had occasion sometimes to find fault with gentlemen opposite for their very short memories, but I was hardly prepared for a statement like that. Is there a man in this house with the exception of the mover of this amendment who does not know that this question was debated in this parliament plainly upon the basis that under that resolution the delegates were to be empowered to go to the Imperial authorities and obtain the passage of an Act without future reference to this Legislature? Is there a single man on either side who will endorse the statement made by the mover, that the delegates exceeded their authority in the slightest degree, or that the whole question was

not argued and discussed upon the basis that we were to deal with it finally; but I do not require to tax the memory of gentlemen opposite, for I shall refer them to the journals of the House, and prove by the resolution moved by the hon. member himself, that he knew that the action taken here last session was the consummation of the measure as far as this Legislature was concerned. In the amendment moved by the hon. member for Guysboro', we read:

"Therefore resolved, That it is the opinion and sense of the House that the Government and Legislature of this Province should be no parties to the consummation of any scheme for the Confederation of the British North American Provinces and Colonies, until an opportunity shall have been first afforded to the several constituencies of the Province at large, to express their views and opinions thereon in a constitutional manner at the polls."

It was, therefore, perfectly plain that the delegates were to go to England and arrange with the Imperial Government a plan of Union which would become the law through the Imperial Parliament, and yet in the face of this well known fact we have heard the hon. gentleman declaring that the delegates had exceeded their authority. The debate in this House, the discussion in the press, all go to show that it was everywhere known that the delegates were to finally arrange a scheme of Union. I have already read to you the Queen's Speech, declaring that we came clothed with the most thorough constitutional power to deal with this question, and that too finally.

New Brunswick, said the hon. gentleman, has been appealed to twice. Why is it that the people of Nova Scotia have not been allowed to express their opinions even once? At Quebec it was agreed that the scheme of Union should be submitted to the several Parliaments. It was the last session of the Legislature of New Brunswick, and the Government found that they had not a majority to carry the measure. They appealed to the people, who decided against the Government, and therefore all action in relation to the measure in this house was prevented, for every man felt that whatever were his opinions on the subject no Union was practicable unless New Brunswick came into it. Action was accordingly suspended in this province until a change should take place in New Brunswick. Subsequently the people there, having had the question fully explained to them, reversed their former verdict and gave a large majority of Union. When it became obvious here that New Brunswick would concur we submitted the question to this House. I ask the hon. mover of the resolution as well as its seconder if either of them will venture to say to the House that the position of the government in this Legislature is in the slightest degree analogous to that of the government of New Brunswick. They were called upon to take action upon the measure, and believed that by an appeal to the country they would be sustained, and consequently they made that appeal. Subsequently it was found that the tide of public sentiment had turned—the explanations which were made on this question had shown the people that they

had been egregiously deceived before, and accordingly the moment they were allowed to speak again they returned an overwhelming majority in favor of the great principle of union. The hon. member said that the Government had pressed this matter here with "indecent haste." Does he not know that this scheme of Union was decided upon at Quebec in 1864? It was a subject of agitation for nearly two years, down to 1866, but more than that, are not these same gentlemen who now charge "indecent haste" against us the men who, session after session, not only two years ago, but last winter as well, taunted the government and myself with cowardice, with failing in what was our duty to the house and country—for not having had the manliness to come forward and submit the question to the members of this Legislature. But when we knew that the time had come, when we could deal with this question not as a hypothetical measure, but one on which the House could take action in consequence of the change of sentiment in New Brunswick in favor of Union—when we found that the duty we owed to the House and country demanded that we should bring the question before the Legislature, to be dealt with in the proper constitutional manner, what did these gentlemen say and do? When they saw that they had miscalculated the intelligence and patriotism of this House and the public sentiment of this country—that instead of having the overwhelming majority that they had deluded themselves into believing they had, they were in an insignificant minority; then these gentlemen suddenly discovered that we were not open to the charge of cowardice and want of statesmanship; but that we were pressing the matter with "indecent haste" (Applause.)

The hon. member for Yarmouth asked why we did not submit the question to the people as they did in New Brunswick. No man, sir, in the history of constitutional legislation ever heard of so unstatesmanlike a course as a government dissolving the parliament in which they had a clear, undoubted majority to carry a measure which they believed would promote the general prosperity of the country. I do not appeal only to gentlemen who are ready to support the government on the question—not to gentlemen in opposition, who are ready to sacrifice the best interests of party at the shrine of patriotism—who think more of their country than of subserving the ends of party—but I ask the opponents of this measure not to give their votes in favour of such a resolution, when its advocates are obliged to confess that they have not in the whole range of constitutional government a single precedent in favour of the course they have chosen to pursue. But what does the hon. member for Yarmouth say about the last election in New Brunswick? "A very few votes did it, I would not be surprized if New Brunswick now went against it." Then the hon. member has himself given us a very clear idea of the futility of appeals to the people. He has seen New Brunswick one day giving its decision in favour of, and on the next against, Union.

But certain gentlemen deputized by some one or other—I do not think there will be anybody hereafter ready to father the act—have written a remonstrance against Union to the Colonial Secretary. If ever there was a libel on the British constitutional system—if responsible government was ever brought down to the very depths degradation, as far as it was in the power of certain parties to put it there, it was when the three unauthorized men, two of whom had been rejected by the people at the polls, presented themselves at the foot of the throne, and told the Imperial Government that notwithstanding our system of government the people are too ignorant, and the Parliament is too corrupt to be entrusted with the free institutions we enjoy, and asked that they should be considered the true constitutional authorities to whom the Government and Parliament of the mother country should pay respect. I know not who authorized this delegation, but I was not a little surprized to find these gentlemen who presented themselves with the authority of some one or other, asking the Government and Parliament of England to accept them as our representatives and to ignore the voice of the government and legislature of this country, but especially was I astonished to find them putting their names to a state paper in which they declared that the position of the people of New Brunswick—where the very thing they are now asking for has been done—is perfectly contemptible and compared the verdict they have given at the polls to that of a brow-beaten jury under Jeffreys. Yet these same gentlemen, professing to represent the sentiments of the people of Nova Scotia, ask the Government of England to allow the people to express their opinions at the polls—on the ground that they had such an appeal in New Brunswick.

The hon. gentleman has taken exception to a statement made by Mr. Watkin. I admit freely that that statement was too strong, and to some extent inaccurate. I think, however, the hon. member for East Halifax who was one of the deputation will admit that it is not a very easy matter to get gentlemen constantly occupied with questions of great national importance immediately touching their own country to understand all the "ins and outs" of our colonial discussions and struggles. I am glad, however, to be able to fully acquit myself of having misled any one on this question in England. I took the liberty of placing in the hands of Mr. Watkin and every other member of the House of Commons an authentic statement of my own, and in that document I have shown accurately as I contend every step that has been taken in the progress of this question. I may state to the House, and I do it in all sincerity, that from the first I have never entertained but one opinion, and that is, the intelligent sentiment of the people of this country is in favour of Union. I do not say that I have ever felt it would be a wise experiment to appeal to the people on this question; that would be an en-

tirely unprecedented proceeding; but I know enough of appeals to the people to be aware that it is quite possible for the public sentiment to be in favour of a measure, and yet for this measure to be unsuccessful when put to the people. I believe a public man is bound in the advocacy of public measures to study as far as possible what is required to promote the public good, and to go as far as he can in his public legislation as the public sentiment will sustain him. I have been, perhaps, as strong a party man as any in this country, but I am proud to be able to say, that anxious as I have been to promote the views of party, much as I believe in the existence of parties in the state, and the advantage of having a strong opposition as well as government,—anxious as I am to serve the party from whom I have received such unqualified support and co-operation—I am able to say that I have regarded one thing as of paramount importance, and that is, the interests of my country. It is not the first occasion on which as a public man, standing in the responsible position in which it has pleased the people of this Province to place me, I have brought forward measures and advocated them with all the zeal and earnestness that I could bring to their discussion, although at the same time I believed them to be as fatal to the interests of my party as it was possible for any measures to be. I need not tell the House what was the sentiment of the country in regard to taxation for the support of schools. I need not tell the House how perfectly I was satisfied that, in the ranks of the party which sustained me throughout this country, there was a very large body of people who would not only resist, but resent such a change in the law as would impose a large burthen upon the people for the support of the schools. But I came to this table, and imposed such a burthen, under the conviction that it was my duty so to do, for my conscience told me that that measure was imperatively required to promote the best interests of the country at large; but although I expected to produce temporary dissatisfaction, I never had a doubt what the result would be after the people had had abundant opportunity of testing the merits of the law.

I believe that the intelligent sentiment of the country is in favour of this Union, but then the mode by which it might be defeated would be this: Whilst the opponents of the measure in the ranks of the conservative party would withdraw their confidence and support from the government, gentlemen who oppose the measure, but prefer another party in this province, would combine with the former, for the purpose of defeating the men in power. How could I have any doubts as to the intelligent sentiment of this country? Long ago it was acknowledged as a question removed from party—one which public men, irrespective of party considerations, should unite in promoting. When it was found that the government must under all circumstances stand or fall by this question, then for the first time were public men who had been them-

selves most enthusiastic advocates of Union prepared to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded.—I will not say an unfair advantage, though I would be justified in saying so—for party purposes. Despite such facts, however, I feel convinced that not only the great Lord of the conservative party, but the majority of the liberals of this country—the standard bearers of which have given this question a support which does infinite credit to their patriotism—are just as warmly in favour of Union as when Mr. Howe was its most able exponent. I do not deny that there has been a large and formidable opposition to this measure, but I believe when the people look at it without reference to other public questions or any considerations of a party character, when it is no longer *sub judice* but become the law of the land, the constitution of the country for weal or woe, all classes will combine to sustain it, and the opponents of Union themselves will feel that there is but one course to pursue if they wish to lay claim to the character of statesmen and patriots—and that is to work out our new institutions in a manner that will be most conducive to the interests of the province at large. (Cheers.)

The hon. member referred to the London *Times* as a great authority, but no person knows better than he does that that journal has been regarded as antagonistic to the interests of British America, and that it has always favoured the Australian colonies. It will be also remembered that it has taken the same view of this question as has been taken by the opponents of Union in Parliament, that these colonies are a burthen to the mother country. The great objection, in fact, which it has urged against this scheme is, that instead of dis severing the connection, Union has bound us for ever to the Crown, and that the British Government are committed to the guarantee for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway.

Reference has been made to the defenceless position of Canada. Now I have always regarded—and I am glad to find that every man who has had an opportunity of studying the question has coincided with me—it would be utterly impossible to retain Nova Scotia unless Canada and New Brunswick were retained. New Brunswick is especially defenceless, and if that province and Canada should fall into the possession of a foreign power there is no British statesman who will undertake to say that the security of this province could be maintained. Therefore this is not a question whether one province is more defenceless than another, but whether the combination and the consolidation of the whole will not give increased security to all. The gentlemen who have been deputed to advocate the views of the opponents of Union have placed on record what I suppose are the opinions of the gentlemen they represent. The organ of the party led by Mr. Howe was the first to propound the principle that British subjects in this country were bound to pay pound for pound for the defence of the empire with every other portion of the British Empire. When the "Morning Chronicle" was wrested from the hands of its

former editor because he had become the friend of British America Union, and the hon. members for East Halifax became its editor as well as proprietor, the first thing he did was to put on record what their scheme was for the defence of the country. If the hon. member says "Leave well enough alone," I will turn him to the record of the leader of the Anti-Union party. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Howe) has given in the most authentic form his opinion that the province has in the present condition of affairs "no security for peace." A number of articles which are now known to be written by Mr. Howe were published in the hon. member's paper, and in these the declaration was made, in so many words, that their scheme for the defence of the Empire was to levy a tax upon the people equal to that borne by the rest of the Empire. The hon. member for East Halifax, in a pamphlet which he wrote as the representative of the Anti-Union party has put it on record that he is prepared to pay "pound for pound with the Canadians." I ask, then, the hon. mover of this resolution with the fact before him that the leader of the Anti-Union party has propounded a scheme—a scheme endorsed by the other Anti-Union delegates—that would absorb the entire revenue of this province for defence alone; does it lie in his mouth or of any opponent of Union to charge us with having attempted to increase the burthens of the country in relation to defence. Not only is this scheme the only means by which British America can remain British America—by which we can retain the free British institutions which it is our pride and happiness to possess—but it opens up to these countries an avenue to prosperity such as was never offered to any people before. Therefore I say this measure of Union instead of increasing the burthens of these people is effected upon terms which are going to continue us under the ægis of Great Britain—to preserve to us her free institutions, to give us the largest amount of prosperity; all this, too, with an immunity from burthens that might well make us the envy of the world.

Look across the borders, and what do you see the allies of our opponents doing? We see the Governor of Maine in his annual message declaring his hostility to Confederation, and asserting that the friends of the United States in these provinces were doing their utmost to prevent the consummation of that scheme. Is there a man in this country who can be so blind as not to see what that means? Can any one fail to see the opinion the sagacious statesmen of the United States entertain of the future which is in store for British America under the scheme of Confederation. The statesmen of that country are bound to do all in their power to promote the stability of the institutions which they possess, but I am not less able to draw my deduction from the course they are pursuing. In the report of the Parliament of Maine, founded upon that portion of the Governor's Address which refers to Confederation, you find a contrast drawn between British America and the United States. They tell you that the population of New Brunswick is increasing three times as

rapidly as that of Maine, and look with disfavor upon a scheme which is going to increase the prosperity of that province as well as of all British America. They see that this scheme will give an increase of power and influence to these provinces—will bring into them a large amount of capital and wealth—will enable them to enjoy an unparalleled amount of prosperity, free from that heavy load of taxation which is now weighing down the people of the United States. It is for reasons like these that the statesmen of the United States look with a jealous eye upon the establishment of institutions that are going to strengthen the connection that now binds us to the parent state and to make us great and powerful. I ask gentlemen opposite to weigh carefully the opinions which American statesmen express in respect to this measure of Confederation, and ask themselves whether they are justified in pursuing a policy antagonistic to the establishment of institutions which are not only going to make us prosperous but to place us in a position that will excite the envy of one of the greatest nations of the world. (Cheers.)

MONDAY, March 18.

EVENING SESSION.

The house resumed at 7.30.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Speech of Mr. Annand.

MR. ANNAND said—I have been for twenty-five years a member of the Legislature—so long a time that, though not very far advanced in years I have become the father of the house, but long as my experience has been, I never until the present occasion witnessed an evening session on the second day of our meeting. But I take this to be all of a piece with the arbitrary proceedings by which Confederation is to be forced upon the people of this Province—time is not to be given for deliberation and free discussion. We have been told that the season is advanced, and that the revenue laws will soon expire, but certainly we had a right to expect that upon so important a subject as changing the constitution of the Province, at least a week's debate would have been allowed us without seriously interfering with the public business. The revenue bills last year were brought down on the 28th of March, and we could therefore have been allowed ten days for this question, and still have left as much time as was deemed necessary last year for arranging the tariff. The Provincial Secretary has said that he stood here last year as the defender of the Quebec scheme—that he was a consistent defender of that scheme—but I was surprised to hear him tell us that its terms were inferior to those which he and his colleagues at Westminster Palace Hotel have obtained for us. I was surprised at that statement, because after a calm examination I have come to the deliberate conclusion that those terms are far worse. Let me remind the House of the remarks made by the gentleman who made overtures to the Government to bring down a resolution for the appointment of delegates. He said he rose to condemn the Quebec scheme—that he desired to see it destroyed, and a bet-

ter one framed. Another gentleman, representing a distant constituency, made similar observations, expressing his pleasure that the Government had abandoned the measure adopted at the Quebec Conference. But what do we find in the English press, and the speech of Mr. Adderly in the House of Commons? That the bill introduced by the Earl of Carnarvon, at the instance of the Delegates, is in substance the Quebec scheme. When then, are we to credit, the hon. Provincial Secretary, or the Under Secretary for the Colonies? And then we have the bill, which speaks for itself. The delegates were charged under the resolution of this house to arrange a scheme of union with the Imperial Government which would effectually ensure just provision for the rights and interests of this Province—far better terms than those embodied in the Quebec scheme, which the Government had virtually abandoned.

We are told that "better terms" have been obtained, and I ask the Provincial Secretary to point out in what respect the new Confederation scheme is an improvement on the old one. Why confine himself to a bald declaration upon a subject of such magnitude and deep interest to the people of this country? I join issue with the hon. leader of the Government on this point. I contend that the terms obtained by the delegates, instead of being better, are far worse than those embodied in the resolutions adopted at Quebec. Under the Quebec scheme our local legislature would have had the right to impose an export duty on coal, from which a large revenue might, if it was thought proper, be raised and applied to the local wants of the country. That right has been taken away from us, and transferred to the Government of Canada, who are clothed with the power of taxing as they please one of the most valuable exports of the Province. It is clear, then, that in respect to our minerals, worse instead of better terms have been the result of the negotiations on the other side of the water. Then there is the much discussed subject of the Intercolonial Railway, estimated to cost four millions of pounds sterling, which it was said would be guaranteed by the British Government if the Provinces consented to unite in a Confederation. But, as I understand the present position of affairs, the Imperial authorities will not venture to ask Parliament to guarantee more than three millions—a sum sufficient to carry the road into the midst of a howling wilderness, leaving it there, and benefitting no one but those charged with the expenditure of the money. But then I will be told that the financial terms are better—that much larger grants for local purposes have been secured under the new arrangement than the old one. The delegates will say, "have we not procured \$60,000 a year for defraying the expenses of your local government, over and above the 80 cents a head you were to receive under the Quebec scheme;—and have we not also made an arrangement by which you will continue to receive your 80 cents a head until your population is 400,000?" This is quite true, but the concession will be estimated at its true worth when I inform the house of the large increase of revenue which has taken place in the Province since the adoption of the resolutions of the Quebec Conference. These were framed in 1864, and the fi-

financial arrangement which was to give us 80 cents a head was based upon the revenues of 1863. Since that time our customs revenues alone has increased \$351,822—considerably more than the annual subsidy; and yet we are expected to be thankful when we are promised an additional \$60,000 a year—about one-third of the increase of the revenue for a single year, 1866, under our present low tariff.—The terms may seem better, but are they such as we were entitled to receive—such terms, as with a full knowledge of the facts, the delegates were bound to secure for the people they professed to represent? \$60,000 a year; what is it? By a single enactment the general government could levy a larger export duty on coal every year. The increased taxes from the advalorem duties alone of a Canadian tariff, 50 per cent above ours, will add nearly \$300,000 a year to our taxation. Talk of taxes! Our people are for the first time in their lives about to realize what taxation is under this precious scheme of confederation.

A great mistake was made in seeking to change the institutions of these Provinces, under which they have all grown to be free, happy and prosperous. They would not leave well enough alone,—and they must take the consequences of their folly in seeking to establish a new nation, which can only exist upon the forbearance of a powerful and exacting neighbor. We are told that the country is familiar with the question. Yes, with the question in the abstract. It has been discussed here from time to time, some favoring a Legislative and others a Federal Union, but no one having a clear and definite view of the subject. Mr. Howe, who I heartily wish was here to defend himself, has been charged with being the originator of Confederation. I deny the truth of that assertion, and challenge an investigation of that gentleman's speeches and writings for a single instance in which he advocated such a scheme as that now pressed upon our acceptance. My friend has written and said much on the subject of Union; he has discussed the subject in its various phases, but he raised objections to them all—to a Legislative Union, to a Federal Union, to union with the United States—and only gave in his adhesion to the larger and more comprehensive scheme known as the "Organization of the Empire." Mr. Howe never favored any scheme of Union that would have destroyed the autonomy of this Province, and certainly never would have been a party to any measure that would have handed over the revenues and resources of Nova Scotia to Canada, or any other country. The Provincial Secretary says that he (Prov. Secy.) held meetings in various parts of the country, where he lectured upon Union. And if he did, what then? He does not pretend to say that he advocated a Confederation scheme like the present, but like Mr. Howe, whom he appears to have a mania for imitating, he was in favor of Union of some sort, without any very clear or definite views upon the subject. But suppose Mr. Howe had written all his life long in favour of Union, or even in favour of Confederation, what then? We are here to decide for ourselves and for the people of this country, and we are bound to examine and see whether it is for their benefit or not to reject this or any other measure, but,

above all, to claim their right to be heard before any change is made.

The Pro Secy. referred to the suffrage question, and told us the late Government introduced a bill to disfranchise a large body of the electors. They did. But the difference between that case and the present is: they did not succeed in passing the measure into law, and going to the elections their action was condemned, and they paid the penalty. The people returned a majority in favor of universal suffrage—they rebuked the action of the late Government, but what chance have the electors of reversing the Confederation policy and bringing back their constitution, when the Bill before the Imperial Parliament becomes law? The hon. member knows that they have none, and that the cases are not parallel.

He has asked us to show a precedent for the course which we urge. It is not for him to ask that of us, but we demand of him where in the history of the world any such attempt has been made to deprive a people of their government and institutions against their will—without even the Parliament being allowed to review the measure. Such a policy may be tried with impunity in a province like Nova Scotia with its 350,000 people, but could it be safely tried in the Canadas with their two and a half millions? Could it be tried in England? Suppose any ministry in the mother country were to bring forward a measure for the annexation of the British Islands to Austria or any other any other kingdom—could it be done without a revolution? We are too weak to rebel if we had the disposition, but it is a fair principle that what could not be done constitutionally in England should not be done here. It is said that the resolution of 1861 introduced by Mr. Howe committed the late Government and every member of the house to the support of Union. That resolution merely declared that the subject of union had been frequently discussed, and that the time had come when it should be set at rest. That resolution speaks for itself—it bound no gentleman to support any particular form of union, or union at all; much less a scheme prepared three years afterwards at Quebec containing provisions which no one could have dreamed of in 1861. That resolution led to a conference in 1862 at which were present delegates from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the whole Executive Council of Canada. I was one of the delegates, and was present when the question of colonial union was discussed. And what was the decision? This House had asked that the question should be "set at rest," and the answer they received was that it was premature even to discuss the question. The delegates considered it premature to consider the subject until the Intercolonial Railway had been built, and free trade between the Provinces established. That then is the answer to the argument drawn from the resolution of 1861 which, it should be remembered, was not even debated in this House. The Prov. Sec. spent nearly an hour in enlarging upon the rights and powers of Parliament. No one disputes the power of Parliament.—what we were discussing is not the power, but the sound and wise exercise of

that power by a body elected for very different purposes—elected to carry on the business of the country under the existing constitution. We are told by high authority that Parliament can do anything but make a man a woman, and while we may admit that it might be right on the part of the Imperial Parliament to override the constitution of a Colony were a great State necessity to arise, we have no right under the limited powers which we possess to transfer to a body of men assembled on the other side of the water our legislative functions. This fact must be borne in mind; that this measure is not the result of the action of the Parliament of the country; the Quebec scheme and the bill before the Imperial Parliament have never been before us, and I deny the right of any body of delegates, however appointed, to make laws for us. We are told that there never was such an attempt to violate the principles of Responsible Government as was manifested by the minority in this house endeavoring to counteract the action of last winter by which the delegates were clothed with power to prepare a scheme. My idea of Responsible Government is that the Administration shall be carried on according to the well understood wishes of the people, and I hold that the gentlemen who crossed the sea as delegates know that the people were opposed to any such change as they proposed to make; that they were arbitrarily seeking to change the Constitution contrary to the well known sentiments of the people. The Prov. Secretary calls upon us to show him an example in the history of the world where a statesman was idiotic enough to dissolve the house when he had a majority at his back. We do not ask a dissolution. Let the duration of the house run down, and the question come before the people in its natural course. But was not Mr. Tilley, who had such a majority, "idiotic" enough to dissolve the house in New Brunswick? We all know that he did, and the consequence was that he and his Government were defeated at the polls. His was the manly course, for which he fairly earned the respect of the people of that Province. This may not be a very inviting precedent, but that is the answer I give to the honorable gentleman. If there can be any doubt about the force of this precedent, I will give another: It was asked in the Canadian Parliament whether Confederation should not be placed before the country, and Mr. Brown, the President of the Council, said that if there could be any doubt about the feelings of the people, then, decidedly, the question should be referred to them.

One reason why this Union is to be forced upon us may be gathered from a conversation between two Canadian gentlemen who were present on the opening of the present Session. When that part of the Lieutenant Governor's Speech was read which referred to the large increase of our revenue, one remarked to the other "Good for us." It is "good for us," says Canada, to get these Maritime Provinces, with their surplus revenues, with unlimited power to tax them as we wish. The Provincial Secretary

asked why the petitions of the people against Confederation had not been forwarded through the Lieutenant Governor I will tell him. In the first place, these petitions were addressed to the House of Commons. The Provincial Secretary made a complaint of their not being sent through him, but I was not aware before that it was customary to send such petitions through the Secretary of the Colony. Petitions to the Queen are in a different position; but the hon. gentleman is incorrect in intimating that he never saw the petitions, for one of them was forwarded to the Lieutenant Governor, and there were other proceedings that passed through his office to which he has not referred. There were petitions and addresses from eight counties. There were addresses asking the members from six counties to resign their seats, because they voted for Confederation; and let me say that if such proceedings had taken place in England—proceedings affecting the entire majority in the House of Commons, no ministry dare attempt to resist such an appeal. The hon. gentleman spoke about the subject being familiar with prominent men in England; let me ask how many members of the houses of Lords and Commons read "The case of the Maritime Provinces," as put before them by the People's Delegates? I use the term "People's Delegates" because we did represent the people; for though a tyrannical majority may rob us of our constitution, yet there is an overwhelming majority behind us who denounce the arbitrary manner in which the measure was pressed.

What were the facts in connection with the Confederation Bill? A more indecent proceeding never took place, even in this house than was witnessed in the House of Lords on the third reading of that bill. When delay was urged by one peer, although the house had been comparatively full at the commencement of his speech, there were but nine members on the benches when he ceased speaking. That is an illustration of the wicked indifference to the wishes and interests of the people of this Province which has prevailed throughout. My hon. and learned friend from Guysboro' very justly said, this afternoon, that more interest would have been excited by a bill imposing a tax on dogs than by a measure involving the future welfare of these British North American Colonies. I was in England for some time, and therefore have had a pretty good opportunity of gauging the public mind, and I know that the recent yacht race across the Atlantic, at which everybody laughed on this side of the water, excited the greatest attention in England, and produced articles in the press which were nauseating to read, while the ablest writers of the day were unable to interest the public in a measure affecting the interests and welfare of these loyal Provinces, and involving perhaps their separation from the mother country. What took place in the House of Commons? The bill was sent down one day, and for the first time in the history of that house, it was read a second time on the following day. Before the papers illus-

rating the subject had been presented—before our “case was printed—the indecent spectacle was witnessed of the bill being hurried through a second reading. I give that has a reason why the petitions were not laid before the house. The bill was brought down, as it were, yesterday, and before they could be presented on the following day, it was read a second time

I can fancy I understand the influences that were brought to bear upon some members of Parliament, among whom was the late Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. There was evidently a feeling that it was necessary to smuggle the measure through. But although there was hot haste as to the second reading, time was afterwards given for consideration, and I am not without hope that there may yet be manly spirit enough to send the scheme back to the people of Nova Scotia. That second reading was carried by declarations that we had no grievance at all, that the subject had been before the people at the last general election, that the opposition was factious and did not represent popular opinion. One very significant fact has already transpired; last year it was said that the Queen desired Confederation—that the Secretary for the Colonies, the Parliament, press, and people of England all desired it, but now, when the responsibility is thrown on the British Cabinet, what do they say? Her Majesty says that the bill has been prepared in conformity with the wishes of the delegates from the various provinces. And what does the act itself say? It says it is introduced because the delegates desire the measure. Her Majesty's Ministers, fearing that trouble may come—that the new nationality may come to grief—shake themselves clear of the responsibility, and can hereafter point to the bill and say—“This is no measure of ours; we merely gave the force of law to the enactment, which you desired.” I was amused to hear the Provincial Secretary say that the friends of union were sustained by the friends of British connection in England. I have had opportunities unsurpassed by any Colonist of ascertaining the feelings of gentlemen connected with the press of England, and I here declare that the leading opinion of the governing classes of England is, that these colonies should be made into an independent nation, and they would gladly have separated Canada from the Maritime Provinces, but they felt that a maritime frontage was essential for her existence. The opinion, I repeat, of the friends of Confederation is that we should be united, and put in such a position that by a single stroke of the pen we may be separated from the parent state. Examine that bill and you will find that the only link of connection which it will leave us is the Governor General who is to receive out of our revenues a salary of \$50,000 a year. Do you suppose that when we are charged with our foreign relations; as was intimated by Mr. Adderly, when we have our own army to maintain; for the troops are evidently to be withdrawn un-

less we are prepared to pay them, when the appointment of the Governor General by the Crown is the only connecting link, can it be supposed that it will be long before we have our President? You cannot engraft this mongrel system upon monarchical institutions,—when you change you must become a Republic, and the game played by the American Government in Mexico will be played over again here. I look upon this scheme as the first step towards a separation from the Mother Country, and I prophecy that ten years will not pass before this new nationality will drift into the United States. Look how easily the thing can be done—just as easily as the Confederation scheme was accomplished.—Several gentlemen were appointed, at the instance of this house, to attend a conference in Prince Edward Island to mature a scheme for the union of the Maritime Provinces. The Canadians came down and spirited them to Quebec where, for reasons best known to themselves, they all agreed to go in for the larger union. They afterwards by some means succeeded in securing the assent of New Brunswick and of this house, though not of the people, and they are now about to consummate it. Can it be supposed that the Americans will not imitate an example which has been so successful, and that by the exercise of that acute diplomacy for which they are famous, and by the expenditure of money, when it is required, sweep the whole concern into the American Union? The Canadians are just the men, and the Confederate Government will be just the place to try such an experiment.

I have ever felt that the moment we ceased to be separate provinces, and came under the dominion of Canada, her fate must be our fate, and we must be dragged wherever she might be pleased to carry us. Many leading men in England entertain that opinion strongly, and tell us that it would be our advantage to join the American Union. There is another reason given why we should confederate and be got rid of, and it has force from an English point of view. It is said in England, “as long as we maintain these colonies, particularly Canada, with its long and defenceless frontier, so long must we have a running sore; but if we were rid of them, we would talk to the Americans in a different style; we would not submit to insult and indignity which we are now obliged to do from day to day.” But we are told that the friends of British connection are the friends of union. What, for example, says the Times? In a recent number that great organ of public opinion wished Confederation God-speed, and trusted it would soon eventuate in the independence of these colonies. But those supporting our opinions took a larger and more

statesmanlike view; they held that when England loses the Maritime Provinces she begins to go down in the scale of nations—that when we are gone, with our 60,000 seamen, our mercantile marine, our noble harbours and fisheries, and our inexhaustible coal fields, then America becomes the first naval power in the world, and England must stand second on the list. I share in these opinions; and it is because I see in Confederation the beginning of England's decline and fall, that I have been heartily opposed to the measure. It has been said that the people's delegates in England manifested great contempt for responsible government. Sir, I hold that those who have had entrusted to them the petitions of well nigh 40,000 of the people—equal to about two-thirds of our adult male population—that they are not unauthorized men, and that they occupy a prouder position than the gentlemen sent by the Government, but not representing the opinions of the country. There are members sitting here who know that they are here contrary to the wishes of their constituents—who have been requested to resign their seats, and who, if they had the spirit of Englishmen, would not for a day occupy their present positions. We were so far authorized as to be recognized as duly accredited delegates at the Colonial Office, where we were treated with deference and respect. Mr. Bright on this subject holds the language of every Englishman I ever met, he says, "give the people of these Colonies the right to speak, let them decide their own future, let them, if they please, confederate, join the American States, or remain as they are in connection with this country." Then we are told that the intelligence of the country was in favour of Union. I should like the Prov. Secy. to tell us how he arrives at that conclusion. When at the last General Election his party were returned with a large majority, he boasted that there was a large and enlightened public opinion in the country, but when he looks around the benches of this house and knows that not one of its members dare face a constituency, I ask him how he can make the statement that the intelligence of the country is in favor of this measure? I have been taunted with saying that Nova Scotians should pay pound for pound with the Canadians towards the common defence. I believe that the time has come when our people cannot escape paying a reasonable contribution, and the question has come to this: shall we pay to the mother country, which with all her armaments of war is able to de-

send us, or to a new nationality without an army or a navy, or the means to create either? Or on the other hand shall we pay to the United States? We must pay such reasonable sum for our defence as we can afford, and I ask if there is any doubt that England would grant us by far the most favourable terms. I assert boldly that these Maritime Provinces must belong to a great maritime power—the first in the world, if they are allowed—and if not to the second, they cannot and will not be governed by Canada. Our position forbids that we should be governed by a people living in the Canadian backwoods. We must, therefore, belong either to the mother country or to the United States, and if we are once separated from England there is no question about our final destination. And while on this point I may remark that in Great Britain I encountered highly intelligent gentlemen to whom I spoke of the strong feeling of loyalty and attachment which prevails among us, and the earnest desire of the people to remain forever connected with England, to equally share her dangers and glories,—I said we would like to be treated as a county of England, as Kent or Surrey, sending members to the British Parliament, and what was the reply: "Well your sentiments do you honour, but we cannot reciprocate them; we care little or nothing about you." We have been asked for a precedent for the course that we urge, and I in return have asked gentlemen opposite to show us a precedent for their action. It is an unfortunate precedent that I can point to for their conduct—that of legislating Ireland into the Union contrary to the sentiments of the people. But even for that measure a majority of the Irish Parliament was obtained,—by what means we know. By what means the majority was obtained in this Legislature we do not know now, but there the majority was secured by corruption most foul, and history is filled with the record of the misfortunes that have grown out of that forced union. Is it not plain that if this union be forced on us you will make Nova Scotia a second Ireland on this side of the Atlantic, but so near the United States that only a few miles of water separate us? By adhering to a policy of coercion you are breaking the loyal hearts of the people of this country. It is not yet too late to refer the scheme to our constituents, and if we can get their consent I pledge myself to never again lift up my voice in opposition to it, but will use every effort to make the measure work well. If, however, the people are forced into the

union, I do not hesitate to say that I will dedicate the remaining years of my life, be they many or few, to endeavor to repeal a union so hateful and obnoxious. I am an Englishman in spirit, if not by birth; I love the institutions of England, but if I am deprived of them and of my liberties as a British subject,—then all I can say is, that by every constitutional means, I will endeavor to overthrow and destroy a union brought about by corrupt and arbitrary means.

Speech of Hon. Financial Secretary.

Hon. JAMES MACDONALD said:—It was not, my intention to address the House this evening but as no gentleman appears ready to speak just now I shall endeavor to compress the few observations I have to make in as brief a compass as possible. I did certainly expect, and the House had a right to expect, that when gentlemen claiming to possess the sympathy of a large number of the people challenged the action of an overwhelming majority of the representatives of the people assembled in their deliberative capacity, on a great and important constitutional question they would have been prepared to adduce some precedent and cite some authority in support of the course they have thought proper to pursue. Especially had we a right to expect this from a gentleman who is a leading member of the legal profession, who has sat in the highest position in this House, and who appears to occupy the position of leader of the Opposition on this great question. The hon. member for Guysboro', the mover of this resolution, has challenged the constitutionality of the action of this House in dealing with this question. That branch of the subject has been so fully and ably dealt with by the hon. Prov. Secretary, that it is unnecessary for me to refer to it at an length, but I must recall to the recollection of hon. gentlemen that, during the debate of last year on the Union question, I took the liberty of laying before the House and country certain authorities which, I claimed, proved conclusively the right of the Legislature to deliberate and finally decide upon this or any other measure which in their judgment affected the right or interests of the people. On that occasion I challenged the hon. member and those holding similar views, to bring forward a single authority from the whole constitutional history of England or of any other country enjoying British constitutions in favour of the proceeding which they wish to pursue. Now these gentlemen have had a whole year to search for these authorities—a whole year during which this question has been engaging the attention of the ablest minds of the Empire—but they have not been able this session any more than they were at the last, to do more than deal in the vaguest generalities and to substitute for argument and authority empty assertions and worthless declamation. It was not respectful on the part of the hon. member for Guysboro', to the members of this Legislature, it did not comport with his own character and self-respect that he should fail to bring forward a single authority

in support of his position, and that he should have felt himself justified in being content to give us only the opinion of a gentleman whom I am not disposed to deal harshly with—but still only the opinion of merely a colonial lawyer against the opinions of the other lawyers in this House sustained and supported as those opinions are by the leading statesmen and lawyers of the whole Empire; that is to say, the opinion of Mr. Stewart Campbell against that of the ablest and best authorities in the Empire at large. That hon. member had the audacity, then, influenced by an arrogant opinion of his own standing in this country not only to oppose every authority which has been produced, but tells you, asks this House to believe that the leading minds of the Empire, the Peers and Commons of England—men who control the destinies of the greatest Empire in the world—who have passed triumphantly through the storms and passions of parties, and of popular excitement—men who at this moment when the country is violently agitated by a widespread movement for Reform, refuse to be actuated by impulse of mere party aims—that men like these are not entitled to the respect and confidence of the House and country on a question like this. Without condescending to produce one single sentence of law or authority, he asks the people of this province to take his unsupported word against the united opinion of the best minds of British America, and of the parent state besides.

I did expect that after the able and argumentative address of the Provincial Secretary we would have seen an effort made by gentlemen opposite to combat the position he has taken, but it is quite evident from the remarks of the hon. member who last addressed you that there is no wish on the part of members opposite to convince the members of this House. Their game is to excite, if it be possible, a feeling of dread and dislike to this measure outside these walls. The amendment of the hon. and learned member for Guysboro' raised only the constitutional feature of this question, but I am relieved from the duty which I felt incumbent upon me to produce authority after authority, record after record, from English constitutional history down to the present time; for the hon. member for East Halifax says boldly, "I admit the authority of Parliament; it has the right and the power to deal with this question; I do not deny that the position we took last winter and that taken by this amendment is entirely unconstitutional; but all I ask you is, whether the exercise of that power at the present time is judicious or not." Who is right? Which is the best authority? I leave the hon. member for Guysboro' and the hon. member for Halifax to answer the question, and reconcile the respective positions they have taken.

We have to decide whether it is at the present moment judicious—whether under circumstances which are transpiring in British America—whether in view of the position of these colonies towards the mother country and the great power on our border—we should accept the terms of

Union offered, or decline more intimate relations with our colonial brethren? The hon. member for Halifax has answered himself. In a Parliament of Englishmen—of gentlemen who all profess to be devoted subjects of their royal Queen, who entertain respect for those institutions which have placed England so largely in advance of other countries, the declarations of the hon. member ought to suffice, ought to be more than enough too for the opinions of the most undecided and irresolute. He has said, and said truly, that we must belong to the United States or to England. If he means anything, he intends that for a declaration of separation from England. He has undertaken to tell you that so regardless are English statesmen of the colonies that they do not know what they are. He has told you that the leading minds and governing classes of the old country desire the separation of the colonies. He has gone further and boldly declared that rather than assist our brethren in Canada to build up a strong power on this side, which will establish British institutions firmly on this continent, he is ready at a moment to rush into the arms of the neighbouring Republic. That is not the first occasion in which the hon. member for East Halifax has taken a similar position. The policy of that hon. member and of the majority of the men associated with him, down to the present time, has been nothing more than annexation to the United States. I regret I have not under my hand just now the manifesto of the anti-Union delegates to the statesmen of England—the case, as they call it, of the Maritime Provinces—but I would ask the people of this country, all who have seen that document, whether it does not contain sentiments most obnoxious to those who desire to live under British laws and institutions, and direct encouragement to those in the United States, who are engaged in promoting the annexation of these colonies. I have said that this hon. member is desirous of annexing this country to the United States, and this is an assertion which nothing but the strongest proof could justify. Let me then recall to the recollection of the House some of the productions of that hon. member's pen—the position which he has assumed from the very commencement of the discussion on this question. What do we find in the paper conducted by that hon. member? From the beginning of this discussion—from the “Botheration” articles down to the present hour—the strongest declarations of the un-British and disloyal sentiments of the hon. member are to be found. In the paper which the hon. member claims as presenting the case of the people of this country—in this paper, purporting to be a vindication of a British colony, the hon. member undertakes to compare the scheme of Union with the sister colonies, and the scheme of annexation to the United States devised by Mr. Banks. Take that document and compare the description of the Confederation scheme—a description which could only emanate from a man imbued with hostility to the country which he pretends to love—with the description of a plan of Union which he proposes with the United States, Mr.

Banks' scheme is portrayed in the most flattering colours; our colonial institutions are vilified, while those of the United States are bespattered with fulsome praise. But to what does he invite us? To pay a portion of the enormous taxation which now weighs down the United States—to participate in the political struggles and convulsions of that country; we are to see our mercantile marine, which is now progressing with a rapidity that no other country can equal, transferred to the United States. And what will be the result when that measure is so transferred? At the present time, according to the belief of the most eminent men of that country, the mercantile marine of the United States is at the lowest ebb, and it would not be at all surprising if a wiser commercial policy does not soon prevail in that country, to see almost all their trade eventually carried in foreign bottoms. Yet the hon. member and his friends would have us enter a union which, in the course of a very few years, has brought the formerly great commercial navy of the Republic to so deplorable a condition.

Let me here call the attention of the House to another interesting fact in connection with this question. The hon. gentleman complains of the indifference of English statesmen to colonial matters. When the bill of Union was introduced to a very full House by the Earl of Carnarvon, in a manner that has attracted the praise of journals of all parties, a noble Lord arose to speak in support of the anti-Union party. And what was the reception he met with? Whilst the supporters of the Government sat in their places, every one of the friends of the noble Lord arose and left the House—so thoroughly did they disapprove of the course pursued by him. Is it at all surprising that the Peers of England should have been disgusted when they read the sentiments expressed by these Nova Scotians professing to be the delegates of the people in favour of annexation to the United States, and that they should have declined to compromise themselves by seeming to encourage their views. When they saw the disloyalty that appeared in every line of that document, I do not wonder that so many of the Peers should have manifested their contempt for those who wished to place them in a wrong position, by rising and leaving the House on the instant. The hon. member tells you that the Parliament of England exhibits the most utter indifference to the interests of the colonies. Yet the same Parliament has always shown the deepest interest in the welfare and progress of the colonies, and we have only to look at the speeches of the leading men in the Peers and Commons to see how deeply desirous they are of promoting the welfare and progress of every section of their great Colonial Empire.

The hon. member says that the governing classes of England desire the separation of the colonies from the mother country. I will take the liberty of joining issue directly with him on that point. I believe that the governing classes of Great Britain have a higher appreciation of what constitutes

the wealth and greatness of the Empire, and I think the people of this country will require higher authority than that of a disappointed partizan for the assertion that the men who have spent the blood and treasure of the Empire, for their colonial possessions, feel any disregard for their interests and the continuance of the connection. But we have higher authority on this point. The debates in the Houses of Lords and Commons are supposed to convey, in the most conclusive manner, the intelligent public opinion of the country—to disseminate through the world the clearest views and ideas of the public sentiment; and every noble lord who rose to speak on this bill vindicated not only the position taken by the Legislature of Nova Scotia, but the conditions upon which this Union is to be effected, but even went further and gave it as his deliberate opinion that the retention of the colonies was essential to the best interests of the British Empire. Even a nobleman whom the hon. member thought he might fairly count upon—a nobleman from whom he perhaps fairly thought he might expect encouragement—told him frankly he could not sustain him because he believed the measure of Union was essential to the best interests of the country, and the Marquis of Normanby even went further and declared to these people's delegates that his residence in this country enabled him to form a pretty accurate estimate of the value of such petitions as those which the delegates pretended gave them authority to present themselves in England on behalf of the people of Nova Scotia.

Mr. ANNAND—I hope the hon. gentleman has authority for what he is saying.

Mr. MACDONALD—The hon member will not deny that the Marquis of Normanby was the friend of the government of which he was the Financial Secretary. It will be remembered that when the hon member was a member of Lord Mulgrave's Government, some 26,000 petitioners approached that noble lord as the governor of this province, and the hon member took the liberty, as the constitutional adviser of his Excellency, of putting on record the statement that these petitions were not worthy of, or entitled to be shown, credit. Lord Mulgrave took the advice of his government at that time, and now naturally feels disinclined to recede from the position he was advised to take. "Gentlemen," he says now, "I hold the same opinion of these petitions that you did when I was Governor. You appear to have changed your opinions: I have not."

The Parliament of England was in session for five or six weeks before the delegates returned, and yet these anti-Union petitions had never been presented. The hon member must have been afraid to present them, or the House of Commons would not receive them. Let him tell us how this is. If the people of Nova Scotia entrusted him as their delegate with the petitions against Union, and he has failed to present them, then he forfeited the greatest trust that was ever reposed in any man.—If he has done this great wrong to the people who entrusted him with so sacred a duty, he should hide in humiliation and shame from an outraged people. But let me call the attention of the people to a most extraordinary and curious fact. What has become of the petitions which we have been told were entrusted to Messrs. Howe and Annand? Who has seen them? Nobody in this country certainly and as far as we yet know no one in England has had that pleasure.

But I can acquit the hon. member of blame on one ground—he was not the delegate of the people of Nova Scotia. The people repudiate the connection which the hon. member wishes to fasten upon them. The people are not only loyal to the Queen, but they are intelligent enough to appreciate the arguments by which they are asked to change their condition. I must protest in their name against the belief that they are ready to tear down the Union Jack and associate themselves with the Republic on their borders. (Applause.) But what is the duty of the people in the present crisis? What will the loyal Scotchmen, Irishmen, and Englishmen of his country do? Are they ready to take the extreme step urged by the hon. member for East Halifax to become rebels and traitors because Mr. Annand is a disappointed partizan? I ask the intelligent people of this country to do this—to act as honorable, sensible men should do on every question—to consider it calmly and on its merits. I do not ask them to take the views of the politicians of Canada, of New Brunswick, or of Nova Scotia; but I ask them, and it is fair to ask them, to take the views of the Parliament and people of England, the body of men who, for centuries, have ruled the destinies of the world—who have worked out the free institutions of England in a manner that attracts the admiration of other nations. I ask the people of this country if with the unanimous opinions of such a body in favour of this Union, they are ready to attach any value to the sentiments of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think that the intelligent people of this country are the men to reject the public opinion of England at the dictation of gentlemen who have themselves entertained views directly adverse to those they entertain now.

Let me advert for one moment to another position taken by the hon. member. The House knows that early in the commencement of this question a gentleman standing high in the estimation of the hon. member—who has occupied a

prominent position in this country—offered a counter scheme of Union in lieu of that submitted to this Legislature. That scheme has been rejected as far as my observation goes by the whole Anti-Union press up to the present hour. I have heard of no opponent of Union who has had the hardihood to advocate the scheme for the organization of the Empire until the hon. member did so to-night. He has had the boldness to declare that this scheme is the one which he and his party favor. He says he does not deny that some political change in our condition is necessary, and has expressed his readiness to adopt the scheme propounded by Mr. Howe for the organization of the Empire. By that scheme we are to pay for the wars of the whole Empire. He says he will make us pay pound for pound with the other portions of the Empire. That same idea was enunciated some years ago by Mr. Howe, but I never heard of any who was prepared to consider it seriously until the hon. member to-night declared that he would make Nova Scotia as Kent or Surrey or any other county of England. The objection to the Quebec scheme was that our representation in the General Legislature was too insignificant, and that we would have to pay for the defence of Canada, that our burthens would be much heavier than they are now. Yet under the plan propounded by Mr. Howe our people may be summoned at any moment to Canada, or any portion of the world, wherever her broad empire extends, to fight the battles of England; we shall be taxed pound for pound with our fellow-subjects of the British Islands—whilst we shall only have a representation of three or four men in the House of Commons. Are the people of this country prepared to accept such a scheme in preference to the one now offered for their acceptance?

In concluding these few imperfect remarks, I may say that perhaps I shall be able to address the House on another occasion when better prepared to deal with it; but I could not permit the remarks of the hon. member to pass without immediate notice. I shall only repeat what I said previously that before the hon. member can lay claim to the favorable consideration of the loyal people of this province, he should explain away the sentiments which say so little for his allegiance and loyalty to the British Empire.

Mr. ANNAND:—I desire to make an explanation in reply to the hon. gentleman. I have never advocated annexation to the United States, I advocate nothing but that we all remain as we are, and maintain our present institutions. As to the taunt about my adhesion to the scheme for the organization of the Empire, I reply that I advocate

that scheme because it will make us English. How the hon. gentleman will reconcile his imputation of disloyalty with my desire that we should become as a county of England; I will leave it to his ingenuity to say.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY remarked that the house would be expected to divide on the question on the following evening. Another opportunity would be afforded for discussion when the papers in reference to the delegation were brought down.

The debate was adjourned.

The house adjourned to the following day at 2.30

TUESDAY, March 19.

The House met at 2.30 P.M.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Speech of Er. McLelan.

Mr. McLELAN said:—We are told that this debate must be brought to a close this evening, and for those who have opinions to express the time is short. The Provincial Secretary says this haste is imperative, in order that the public business of the country may not be interfered with. The exigencies of the country may now require this, but I ask who produced the circumstances requiring such hasty deliberations and forcing us to decide so important a question in so short a period? We in the country were prepared months ago to come here and discuss this subject and to attend to the ordinary business of the Legislature, but to suit the convenience of certain hon. gentlemen, the meeting of the House has been postponed to such a late period as to require that the most momentous question ever submitted to Parliament should be passed over almost in silence. For that reason we are told that we must limit our remarks to this single point,—the right of the people to be heard upon the question, and to decide on it for themselves. The Provincial Secretary told us yesterday that he felt proud of the position which he occupied on this question—that he felt proud of the improvements in the bill which is soon to come before us, as compared with the resolutions passed at Quebec. I do not see in the position which he occupies anything to warrant such utterances. He told us last session, as he has told us on every occasion, that the Quebec scheme was just and sound in its principles—that it gave to this Province all it had a right to demand; and the hon. gentleman's colleagues in the delegation reiterated the assertion, and they stated that they were prepared to push that scheme through, and to make it the basis of a Union of the Colonies. If the bill gives us more than that scheme, then whatever it gives in addition is due to us who opposed the measure from its inception. If the bill gives us five dollars more, the credit is due to the stern opposition the Anti-Confederates have given the question. The hon. gentleman is in this position: he has told us that the Quebec scheme was just and sound, and he has now come back from England claiming to have got more than justice. If these statements be true, he must have done a dishonest thing to some other people, from

whom he has taken more than he all along declared was just; and surely that is not a position to regard with pride. Turning to the only point we are to be permitted, in the magnanimity of the gentlemen opposite, to discuss—the right of the people to be heard on the question—I would first refer to the taunt made by the Financial Secretary. He said we had brought a case here without a precedent to support us, although we had a whole year to obtain such precedents if they existed. I tell him that I have had an abundance of authorities for the position I have taken—authority which I have not sought in the musty pages of Blackstone, to which the hon gentleman last year referred to sustain his position. I have been reading a nobler page than Blackstone ever wrote—a page which bears the impress and imprint of God himself: I mean “the human face divine.” I have read the authority which sustains us every day in the year in the faces of my fellow countrymen. Our authority is the look of intelligence on their countenances; I see that in their faces which declares that they have the souls and the reasoning and reflecting powers to enable them to decide on a question affecting them and their posterity as this does.

These men till the soil, engage in commerce and fisheries; they have, by their labours and enterprise given us, under the blessing of Providence, all our prosperity, and I take them as my authority. Fifty thousand of these men are devoting their time and means to learn defence: ready to lay down their lives to protect their country, their homes and their altars. They have during the year paid into the Treasury through the customs, excise and other departments, nearly two millions of dollars of their hard earnings, and I say the men who thus in their persons and property are to be affected by this measure are my authority for saying that they should be allowed to decide the question. It is not only to the copies of this authority that are already abroad that I can refer, but every reprint preparing for circulation confirms that authority. Those men are training children; they have sons who will be either taught principles and instilled with feelings that will lead them to rally round the old flag of England, or will lead them beneath a foreign standard to attempt, perhaps, the humiliation of England. When I see that I feel that my authority for maintaining the rights of the people is strong and conclusive, and should be recognised as such by this Legislature. In order to meet the sophistry and destroy the cobwebs which some gentlemen learned in the law are disposed to weave about the question, it is not necessary to labor the argument. I care not how many precedents from Blackstone is brought—I care not if they bring old Blackstone himself from the grave—there is a principle of common sense that would trample them all under foot and proclaim that this right belongs to the people. The very term “responsible government” tells us that the people should decide the question. Responsible to whom? Pass the bill and your responsibility is at an end. Our system of Government implies that you have either had the sanction of the people or intend to return to them for ratification. This bill does not contemplate that you should do that, for the very Act destroys the constitution, and is contrary to the term—Responsible Government. The

gentlemen who have spoken on the other side affect to treat lightly the opinion of the people,—but who gave us all our positions? Who sent us here but the people? It is but a few years since they and all of us were portions of the people, and now forsooth, because they are placed in power beyond the control of their constituents they presume to ignore the rights of those who sent them here, and to destroy the hand that lifted them to positions of honor. I can scarcely restrain my feeling within reasonable bounds when I see the determination of gentlemen opposite to ignore the feelings and rights of the people on this question. We are told that the country has not been taken by surprise—that this is a new question, but I maintain that it is an entire surprise. It is true that for many years the subject of a union of British America has been from time to time discussed, but we all know that these discussions were considered more theoretical than practical, and not the least importance was attached to them as being likely to affect the country.

Reference has been made to the action of the Legislature in 1861, when Mr. Howe, whose name has been so frequently mentioned in this discussion, moved a resolution declaring that the subject of Union had been from time to time considered, and that as serious obstacles existed, which could only be removed by consultation of the leading men of all the Colonies, a delegation should be appointed with the view of setting the question at rest. That delegation met, and it resulted in no action being taken by this Legislature or by the people. The delegates no doubt found it impossible to reconcile the conflicting interests existing among the Province, and they made this report, setting it, as a public question, as was believed, at rest. It may be said that Canada was not anxious for Union at that period,—but in 1858 they had asked for it by a despatch signed by Messrs. Cartier and Galt, men who were prominent in the Quebec Conference. That despatch declared that the harmonious working of their constitution had been rendered almost an impossibility, and asking for a Federative Union of the Provinces of British North America on “grounds peculiar to Canada.”

In 1858, then, you had Canadian ministers expressing a desire for union, and declaring, through a public despatch that the administration of government had been almost an impossibility in Canada; and when Mr. Howe went in 1861 to set the question at rest, the desire existed on the part of Canada to overcome the difficulties of their system, and to unite with us. Why, then, this being the case, was not the Union accomplished? The language of the resolution is, “by mutual consultation,” implying that there should be mutual concession; and perhaps the main reason why a basis of union was not then arranged was that the Canadians were unwilling to make such concessions as Mr. Howe, in a due regard for the interests of Nova Scotia, believed should be made before we went into any Union—And let me ask here what concessions they have made in the scheme under consideration? It is impossible for the delegates to lay their finger on a single feature in this scheme and say, there is something that has been conceded to us by Canada

as a compensation for the great loss we shall sustain in going into this Union. Then I say that in 1863, when the elections took place, the question, as a public question, had been set at rest, and did not come under consideration at the hustings. Take the speech of the Provincial Secretary in 1864, when he introduced the resolution for a Maritime Union, and you will find that the idea of a Confederation with Canada, whatever he may have said about it in his lecture at St. John, was not entertained by him as being likely to yield any practical result. He says in that speech:—

“The proposal which was made and advocated with such singular ability by my hon. friend the leader of the Government several years ago in this Legislature was for a *Legislative Union* of the whole British American Provinces. On that occasion the whole subject of a Union of the Colonies was so fully and ably discussed by the leading minds of both sides of the Legislature as to render it unnecessary that any great amount of attention or time should be occupied in going over the grounds which have been so ably detailed. But difficulties have been found—and I may say insuperable difficulties—in grappling with that which so many of the ablest minds in this country have advocated in connection with this subject. The union of the Maritime Provinces with Canada has hitherto presented insurmountable obstacles.

“I believe that to be a question which far transcends in its difficulties the power of any human advocacy to accomplish.”

In 1864, when this gentleman was on the delegation, he declared to the people of Canada that the people of this Province were uninformed on this question. That was a year after the elections had taken place. This was his language as found in that report of his speech published by Mr. Whelen, of P. E. Island, on page 67:—

“Uninformed as the public mind in the Lower Provinces was on this question, the visit and the statements made by the gentlemen connected with the Government of Canada have aroused attention to it.”

Here, then, we have the acknowledgment made, after the election of this House, that the public mind was not awake to it,—not even when this question was about to assume a practical shape; and yet we are now told that the country was not taken by surprise, and in the House of Commons that the subject was discussed at every polling booth.

The Prov. Sec., however, claims that the intelligent sentiment of the country is with him;—if that be true the hon. gentleman's course is simple and plain,—what objection can he have to presenting this question to the people and saying, “will you who are to be affected for weal or woe by this measure accept it?” The answer he gives is that party feeling is so high that a fair decision cannot be obtained at the polls, but he has the proof that party feeling will not interfere when he has seen gentlemen from his own side of the House rallying into opposition, and leading gentlemen formerly opposed to him in politics forgetting the ties of party and going to his support. This is the best proof that the question overrides party feeling, and that feeling will not interfere with its just consideration at the polls. The question has assumed such importance that no man should allow party spirit to influence his conduct in opposition to his just convictions. I for one honestly believe the measure to be wrong, and I will co-operate with any man holding this opinion and willing to oppose the scheme from beginning to end. This, I claim, is the only question be-

fore the country,—all other parties and all other questions are for the time being set completely aside, and the only plank in the platform of the party with which I wish to co-operate is the determination to stop or repeal the measure. Men, to whatever side they may belong, may express various opinions about the present state and proposed organization of the empire, but the only principle which I can recognize is that this thing must be stopped. Because a leading man connected with the Province has chosen to write an article on the state of the empire, the Prov. Sec. has undertaken to say that is our platform, and that we are bound to stand or fall by it—that we are bound to present something in opposition to the scheme which they have submitted. But I tell him we possessed a satisfactory system of government before this scheme was brought here. Let me now say a word or two respecting the Organization of the Empire. It has been time and again stated and acknowledged that the weakest portion of the British Empire is B. N. America, and we, placed alongside so powerful a neighbour see and feel the truth of the statement. When last night this subject was touched, my imagination pictured the horrors of a war between England and America with Nova Scotia for the battle ground as it would be. The picture presented I cannot find language to describe, nor can the most vivid imagination truly paint the desolation which would come upon us should the demon of war drive his horrid ploughshares over this fair Province. The very graves of our fathers would be uprooted and their cherished dust scattered to the winds. Every man sees and feels, moreover, that the chances of war with us are greatly increased by our connection with the mother country. Yet still if treated as men, permitted to enjoy legitimate rights, the British feeling within us will lead us to maintain at all hazards, our allegiance and our connection with Old England, and to contribute our all; if it comes upon us, to give new triumphs to British arms and new lustre to British fame. Placed in this position—the weakest of the Empire—what does Mr. Howe propose? Simply, to strengthen and protect the weak point by bringing to our aid all the might and power of two hundred and fifty millions of British subjects; whilst the delegates would bring at most but thirty millions to the help of a people perhaps divided in sentiment, or as we verily believe leave us to the protection of this new nationality alone. As was said here last evening Nova Scotia must belong to some great naval power. We are so situated that a gunboat can shell almost any part of our territory, and not only the treasures of coal and minerals we have within call for protection, but our commerce without; our ships on every sea demand it; and yet this scheme which is being forced upon us will leave us only to the protection of Canada. What! leave us only under the protection of Canada? What absurdity! Why, sir, it could not protect one of our potato shallops. Put one in the harbour and bring to its protection the whole navy of Canada, and there is hardly a fifth rate naval power in the world but would consider it a light task to take possession of the boat and perhaps pelt its defenders to death with the cargo. And then as to the protection of

our fisheries against the Americans—it is simply preposterous. They could not protect a smoked herring in Digby, much less a live cod-fish or a school of mackarel sporting along our coast. And feeling the force of these facts and the importance of our position, we are told that in declining to form this connection and set up shop in this new concern in company with Canada, we are disloyal; and all through the story these gentlemen have been preaching to us about loyalty. They rightly estimated, to a great extent, the feelings of the country when they played upon that word. They have from the outset labored to make us believe that the measure was forced on us by the mother country in order that the feelings of attachment and the desire to yield to the wishes of the parent state might lead us to favor the connection, and time and again we have been accused of disloyalty in declining to go into this copartnership.

I may be here pardoned for referring to the fact that the history of Canada has shown that her people have not always paid due respect to the British flag. No such charge, however, could be made against our people, and it would seem, from the despatches which have been made public during the discussion of this question, that the statesmen of England felt a security so long as we remained loyal and were not tampered with by the Canadians. It seems that on the 27th of January, 1860, the Duke of Newcastle sent a despatch marked "confidential," in which he commanded that no delegates should be sent to confer with other Provinces without permission from the Home Government, or without the occasion of their conference first being stated to him. So far, then, from the British Government forcing the union upon us, our Government were obliged to obtain permission before these gentlemen could so upon the delegation. The Lieut. Governor says, in a despatch dated the 18th July:—

"It seems proper that I should call your attention to the despatch of the 27th January, 1860, marked 'confidential,' addressed to my predecessor by his Grace the Duke of Newcastle. In that despatch his Grace, whilst apparently expressing no disapproval of the discussion of such a question as that which is now imminent, concludes with the following instruction: 'Previous to sending delegates to Quebec or elsewhere, such a proposal should not be authorized by yourself without previous communication with the Secretary of State, in order that the question of the delegates and the instructions to be given them may be known beforehand to Her Majesty's Government.'"

We have in the public despatches the clearest proof that the question originated with the delegates themselves: they churned up the whole matter in order to butter the fingers of a few leading politicians; and having done so, they tell us we are disloyal because we are unwilling to adopt it. We refuse rather because we feel that our loyalty might be affected by the connection. Canada has been, within the recollection of men around me, twice in open insurrection, and within a few years there has appeared a manifesto declaring that annexation to the United States was the only remedy for the political evils of the country. That manifesto was signed by many public men who have since occupied prominent positions in her Parliament and Government; and yet we are called disloyal because we refuse to join with her. I ask

gentlemen around me—men of family, who have perhaps daughters whose beauty, whose accomplishments and virtues is their just pride, and whose fair name they would at all hazards maintain,—I ask them what they would say if such a daughter was publicly charged with a want of modesty and virtue for no better reason than a refusal to share the bed of one twice taken in adultery—one who declared publicly (as in that manifesto) a determination to again play the harlot? I tell the hon. gentleman that if there be any disloyalty in the question, or any show of disloyalty, he and his friends have given it. We have been told that Mr. Howe and the other people's delegates are disloyal because they referred to the temptations to annexation, in the case which they placed before the British Parliament. Is there any disloyalty in telling the whole truth? Was it not the duty of these gentlemen, as public men writing a letter to Imperial statesmen, to present all the features of the question? When the Financial Secretary gave that taunt, did he forget that that distinguished statesman Lord Durham, in his report to Her Majesty on the state of these Provinces, took the very same course? Earl Durham came out, and examined and understood the whole case of the Canadians; he saw the position of the country, and does not seem to think he makes himself amenable to the charge of disloyalty in stating the whole truth, and in drawing attention to the contrast which exists on the two sides of the boundary line. Lord Durham says:—

"Throughout the course of the preceding pages I have constantly had occasion to refer to this contrast. I have not hesitated to do so, though no man's just pride in his country and firm attachment to its institutions can be more deeply shocked by the mortifying admission of inferiority. But I should ill discharge my duty to Your Majesty—I should give but an imperfect view of the real condition of these Provinces—were I to detail mere statistical facts, without describing the feelings which they generate in those who observe them daily, and daily experience their influence on their own fortunes. The contrast which I have described is the theme of every traveller who visits these countries and who observes on one side of the line the abundance, and on the other the scarcity of every sign of material prosperity which thriving agriculture and flourishing cities indicate, and of civilization, which schools and churches testify, even to the outward senses."

"It cannot be denied indeed that the continuance of the many practical grievances which I have described as subjects of complaint, and, above all, the determined resistance to such a system of responsible government as gives the people a real control over its own destinies, have, together with the irritation caused by the late insurrection, induced a large portion of the population to look with envy at the material prosperity of their neighbours in the United States under a free and eminently responsible government, and in despair of obtaining such benefits under their present institutions, to desire the adoption of a Republican constitution, or even an incorporation into the American Union."

Here this statesman tells her Majesty that very strong temptations to annexation existed, which can only be counteracted by giving to them (the Canadians) the control of their own institutions and revenues. He puts this in stronger and clearer terms than those used by Mr. Howe and his associates? and I have yet to learn that Earl Durham was for this ever charged with a want of loyalty. Mr. Howe, after having presented the case, and exhibited the temptation which exist to annexation provided our rights are overridden

and disregarded, says that if we are left undisturbed and with the control of our revenues there will be no thoughts of annexation. Listen to this conclusion:—

"We have thus, my lord, simply stated the case as presented to us by General Banks and the Quebec Confederation. With all the temptations offered us at Washington, we ask simply to be let alone, or we ask to be folded to our mother's bosom, and not cast out into the wilderness of untried experiments and political speculation. Nova Scotia says to England, as Ruth said to Naacmi, 'Where you go we will go; your people shall be our people.' This love and affection spring from a thousand sources that we need not linger to describe, but which it would be a fatal mistake to suppose can ever be transferred. You cannot endorse our hearts or our allegiance over to the Canadians as you would a note of hand."

These were the sentiments offered by Mr. Howe, and for which the Financial Secretary undertakes to make the charge of disloyalty. I only wish that there were more men in the British Empire who gave as true and firm allegiance to the Crown as Joseph Howe. I wish Nova Scotia had more sons occupying the exalted position in which he stands, and as mindful of her interests. In all his actions and speeches the interest of the Provinces appears uppermost, and one cannot but be reminded of the Persian ambassador who took with him to France a turf dug from the soil of his own land, to which every morning he paid religious salutation, so that he might bear throughout the day the recollection of his country, and labor for her advantage. So is it with Mr. Howe; he seems ever to have with him a recollection of his country and her interests, while other politicians go on delegations or embassies, engage in exhaustive festivities and in salutations to the products of other countries forget the interests of their own.

We are told that we are disloyal on account of our allies, of some expression made by public men in the neighboring States in connection with this matter. You will remember that at the period of the Canadian insurrection a large amount of sympathy was manifested by the people of the United States with the Canadas, and what does Earl Durham tell us in his report as the reason why that sympathy was drawn towards the Canadians? Was the belief that there was a desire to violate the constitution of the country, and to take from the Provinces the control of their revenues? He thinks that was sufficient cause for the people who had taken so much pride in their war of independence to bestow their sympathy, and it may be that the people on that side of the line look on this measure as an attempt to take from the people of this colony their constitution, and to deprive them of the control of their measures without their consent. But, because these people live on that side of the line are they the less able to judge of the merits of the question?

I hold, as I have said, if there be any disloyalty in the matter it is on the part of those who here and elsewhere are attempting to force on us this scheme of Confederation, and are thereby weakening the Empire and endangering our connection with England. I need hardly remind the house of the term which these gentlemen have used: we are to form a "new nation," the Confederation is to be a "new nationality," and these terms im-

ply that it is to be separate and distinct from the mother country. I turn back to the debate on the Canadian Militia Bill in 1863, and there I find one of the Ministry, Mr. McGee declaring that he favored connection with Britain merely that Canada might have time to grow and strengthen and obtain the Maritime element—"to give Canada and the other provinces time to be linked together, and become a great united nation." Here is the declaration of one of the Canadian Ministry, and again you have the Prov Sec declaring in the following language that the object of promoting union was to effect a change in the system of Government. At a public dinner at Quebec he used this language—"When it is understood that the object of this meeting of delegates is to ascertain whether the time has not come when a more useful system of government can be devised for these British American Provinces, I need not say its importance is one which it is impossible to over-estimate." Again—"As was observed by Mr. Cartier, great as is your country, large as is your population, inexhaustible as are your resources, the maritime provinces have something to give you equally essential to the formation of a great nation."

Hon. PRO SEC.—Go on—the more the better.

Mr. McLELAN—Yes, the more the better, provided the people of this country desired to change their system of government, and, if it were possible, to make of these disjointed provinces stretching along almost the whole length of a continent, a united and prosperous nation. If the provinces, laid side by side as one with one interest, extending over the whole from a common centre, you might talk of forming a nation, and say "the more the better," but you are in this attempting physical impossibilities, and will only bring into conflict separate and distinct interests, which can only be worked harmoniously from England or some other independent centre. Let me just say to the hon. gentleman—"That which God hath put asunder let no man attempt to join."

But Mr. Archibald seems also to have aspirations after a new nationality, I find him using this language in Canada, "Nova Scotia came not asking Canada to accept her, but she told Canada that with the magnificent back country of the latter, and her territory and wealth and her desire to become a great nation, Nova Scotia had a frontier and resources of which she need not be ashamed; but if she enjoyed as she did, all the advantages and freedom of responsible institutions, why was she desirous to change her relations? The time had arrived when we were about to assume the position of a great nation, and such being the case we should not shrink from its responsibilities." I tell him that Nova Scotia was not "desirous to change her relations;" her people regard our relations with the Mother Country with just pride,—and the gentlemen who give utterance to such sentiments and express such desires are not exactly the men to taunt us with disloyalty. Mr. McCully also on a subsequent festive occasion talks of furnishing the maritime element for a new nation.

But if we are chargeable with disloyalty because of our allies, what of the allies of the

hon. delegates? The hon. member for South Colchester in a letter to his fellow-countrymen, claimed to have allies in the United States—allies reflecting his opinions, and among them he named the New York *Albion*. What does that paper say a few weeks after when speaking of the formation of a nation independent of Great Britain.

"We favor and even warmly advocate Confederation with a view to the ultimate realization of these cherished anticipations."

And in another number the same paper says—

"The colonists, unaccustomed to national responsibilities, have been slow to move in the direction so plainly suggested, namely that of a separate national existence entirely independent of the mother country. But, finally aroused to the absolute necessity of action in this direction, a scheme with this end in view has been proposed and very generally accepted. Led by the stronger member of the Provincial family, the Confederation of all the Provinces, we are happy to say, is now very near an actual realization."

Another of their allies (the *London Standard*) referring to the means tried to carry out the scheme, declares that it endangers the relations of the Mother Country—and quotes Mr. Oliphant as authority to say that no genuine effort was made by the Government to secure a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, without which Confederation could not have been secured, and adds the attempt to dragoon the Provinces into Confederation is dangerous to the relations of the Colonies with the Mother Country. I may add this gentleman is not alone in the opinion that no genuine effort was made to secure the renewal of the treaty,—Mr. Brown withdrew from the Canadian Government, dissenting from his colleagues mainly on account of the inefficiency of the policy pursued to effect the end in view.

I feel that I have already occupied more time than belongs to me, but let me say before I resume my seat, that the events of the last few months—within the last few weeks—should operate, as a powerful influence on the members of the House and on the people of the country. We have been told time and again that the British Government were anxious to have the scheme carried out, and were making its adoption one of the conditions on which our defence should be continued; but although a large number of statesmen may be desirous, from mistaken views of the question, to have this union formed, yet there is justice and manliness enough in them to induce them to say on all occasions that they will not coerce us into it. They are telling us and have told us, that they are omitting Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island from the measure, because nothing can deceive them into the belief that the people of those Provinces are favorable to union. The Provincial Secretary said that Lord Carnarvon asked whom he was to accept as authorities on this question, if not the men who conducted the Government; and he (Prov. Secy.) having claimed that a majority of the people were in favor of union, goes to the Colonial Office and states it for a fact, The Colonial Secretary decides that he must accept the statement as au-

thoritative, and having obtained a majority in the Legislature, the measure received the support of the Imperial Government; but these who support it in the British Parliament say, all through their speeches, that if the people are unwilling, it should not be forced upon them. The men who know what the feelings of this country are, and who know that there is no desire on the part of the British Government to coerce us, should now, with this opportunity given, pay deference and respect to the wishes of the people. The Prov. Sec. tells us that the man would be an idiot who would dissolve Parliament as long as he could command a majority. If that doctrine were carried out, it would be found one of the most tyrannical and monstrous that could be uttered: men have lost their heads for putting in practice doctrines less obnoxious. Does he mean that so long as a man can by any means, however corrupt, command a majority in Parliament, he may do what he pleases with the people and their property? No such doctrine can be maintained: there must be some limit, and the men whom the people have sent here to transact their business, and to go back to them with an account of their stewardship, should consider that this question affects the people and their posterity, and they should not assume the unnecessary responsibility of passing it without their instructions, lest, when the evils of this union are realized, they live to be perpetually reproached for their action—live to be told that, members of Parliament though they were, they had no more right to force this measure upon their countrymen than they will have to enter Heaven with so great a crime against the manhood of Nova Scotia unrepentent of.

Speech of Mr. Archibald.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said:—I confess to some embarrassment in addressing the House at this moment. My hon. friend has delivered to us a most impassioned harangue. Not content with giving us his views in the most emphatic manner—not content with announcing that no good will come in this world to those of Confederate faith—he goes on further, and in his closing sentences shuts us out from any hopes of happiness in the world to come. (Laughter.) Is it any wonder that I should feel a little embarrassed in rising to speak after being thus formally excluded from everlasting bliss. (Renewed laughter.)

One thing at all events I shall not aim at. I shall not attempt to soar to the heights my hon. friend has reached. I feel that these lofty flights are beyond me—that my province is the more prosaic one of common sense—and I shall assume that after the House has recovered its self-possession, it will be disposed to listen to something that, if it does not appeal to their imaginations—at all events does to their intelligence and their judgment.

I regret that it was not my good fortune to be present at the earlier part of the discussion. I have not had the opportunity of hearing the learned mover of the amendment put his case before the House—neither have I had the satisfaction of hearing the answer given to it by the Provincial Secretary. All that I can gather as to the line of argument pursued by these gentlemen is what I can infer from the tenor of the speeches of my hon. friend, and one or two of those gentlemen who have preceded him—and therefore in what I have to say, I may be repeating what has already been said to the House, in which case I trust they will forgive me, as I may be misapprehending the views propounded by gentlemen on the other side—and if I do, I shall be glad to be put right, as I proceed.

Now, sir, as I understand the question before the House, the resolution affirms the doctrine that all great questions ought to be first deliberately reviewed by a Legislature and then submitted to the polls before the Legislature is in a position to deal with them. This is the doctrine which the learned mover calls on the House to sanction by a deliberate vote.

Now, sir, this question has been before the public since 1864. It is a question touching a fundamental doctrine of the British Constitution. How are we to ascertain what is, or what is not constitutional? Is it not by examining practice and precedents of that august assembly on which our own is modelled? Is it not by consulting those writers on constitutional history who expound and develop the principles of which these precedents and practices are the illustrations? In the adjoining library are the records of the House of Commons since the earliest history of the empire. They are open to every gentleman who wishes to inform himself, and doubtless have been resorted to for the purpose. There will be found every incident in the long history of legislation in the mother country. Can the learned mover of this resolution point out, in that vast treasury of constitutional usages, a single precedent for the doctrine he undertakes to preach? Or does he ask us to believe that, in these latter days, a new light has dawned on him, and that it is our duty to accept the fresh revelation?

I think I may safely conclude from the speech of my hon friend who has just sat down, that the mover of this resolution has been able to quote no authority for his views. When I find my hon friend deserting the records and the books—when I find he cannot quote even a text writer in his

favour—when I find him driven to say that he has no other authority for his doctrine than the expression of the faces of the people in his neighborhood—I ask myself if he thinks so poorly of the intelligence of this house as to suppose they will accept such an authority for a constitutional doctrine. My hon friend's reasoning would be in place in a farce.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL—It is a tragedy.

Mr. ARCHIBALD—Then it is a very comical kind of tragedy. Let my hon friend address our reason or our judgment—let him quote authority or precedent. Let him give the opinions of lawyers, of historians, of philosophers, or of statesmen, and I listen to him with deference. But when he talks of measuring the length and the breadth of the faces of his neighbours, and asks us to accept that as an argument, can he wonder that I consider such reasoning as bordering on farce. But my hon friend has good grounds for not resorting to authority or precedent; they are all the other way. The idea of a legislature having no power to decide except upon questions that have been sent to the polls for the opinion of the people is entirely un-English. A doctrine to that extent has never been propounded even in the republican institutions of our neighbours, but so far as there is any foundation at all for such a doctrine, it is republican and American as opposed to British and constitutional principles. Do I wish the house to take my unsupported assertion on this subject? No.

Let me turn to one or two British authorities on this subject. Hallam devoted a large portion of his life to the study of constitutional questions. He is accepted as an authority of great weight on these subjects. The learned member for Guysborough will admit that his authority is entitled to great deference. What does he say? In speaking of the Septennial Act passed in 1717, Hallam says:—

“Nothing can be more extravagant than what is sometimes confidently pretended by the ignorant, that the Legislature exceeded its rights by this enactment, or, if that cannot be legally advanced, that it at least violated the trust of the people and broke in upon the ancient constitution.”

Now, what was the character of that act? A Parliament had been elected in 1715, under a law which gave it a duration of three years. Under that law it would have expired in 1718; yet in the year before its expiration a bill was brought in and became law which extended it to 1722, giving it a duration more than double that for which it had been elected. Surely, if ever there was an act which illustrates the power of Parliament, this was one. They were elected for a term, and before that term was completed, without any appeal to the people,

they step in and double, and more than double, the tax; for which they had been elected; and that act, so passed, has continued ever since and is the law of the land at this moment in England. I could quote Blackstone and Coke, and other legal writers, coinciding in these views with Mr. Hallam; but let me ask your attention to the declarations of British statesmen on this subject. Surely, if any two men could be found in the long line of British public men who more than others could be considered practical statesmen, these men are Mr. Pitt and Sir Robert Peel—the men who guided the destinies of England in times of great peril, and whose reputations are a source of pride to the country to which they belonged. During Mr. Pitt's administration, some gentlemen in opposition propounded the doctrine which is embodied in the resolution now before the House. Mr. Pitt took issue upon the doctrine in these emphatic words:—

"This point, sir, is of so much importance that I think I ought not to suffer the opportunity to pass without illustrating more fully what I mean. It is this principle of the incompetency of Parliament to the decision of the measure admitted, or if it be contended that Parliament has no legitimate authority to discuss and decide upon it, you will be driven to the necessity of recognizing a principle the most dangerous that can ever be adopted in any civilized state—I mean the principle that Parliament cannot adopt any measure new in its nature and of great importance without appealing to the constituent and delegating authority for direction. If that doctrine be true, look to what an extent it will carry you. If such an argument could be set up and maintained, you acted without legislative authority when you created the representation of the Principality of Wales; or of either of the Counties Palatine of England. Every law that Parliament ever made without that appeal—either as to its own frame and constitution, as to the qualification of the electors or the elected, as to the great and fundamental point of the succession to the Crown—was a breach of treaty and an act of usurpation.

"What must be said by those who have at any time been friends to any plan of Parliamentary Reform, and particularly such as have been most recently brought forward either in Great Britain or Ireland. Whatever may have been thought of the propriety of the measure, I never heard any doubt of the competency of Parliament to consider and discuss it. Yet I defy any man to maintain the principle of those plans without contending that, as a member of Parliament, he possesses a right to concur in disfranchising those who sent him to Parliament, and to select others by whom he was not elected in their stead. I am sure that no sufficient distinction in point of principle can be successfully maintained for a single moment, nor should I deem it necessary to dwell on this point in this manner that do, were I not convinced that it is connected in part with all these false and dangerous notions on the subject of government which have lately become prevalent in the world."

In 1846 Sir Robert Peel was called upon to deal with the question of the Corn Law, in a Parliament which had been elected in 1841. The subject of this law had been before the people at the elections, and, as far as the returns indicated, the people had sustained the law. Yet Sir Robert Peel had no hesitation, in the very teeth of this verdict, of introducing a bill which he felt was required by the circumstances of the country, and when taunted with the position he had assumed, he adopted and approved the doc-

trine of his predecessor in words equally emphatic:—

"That, I think, would have been a 'dangerous precedent' for a minister to admit that the existing Legislature was incompetent to the entertainment of any question. That is a precedent which I would not establish. Whatever may have been the circumstances that may have taken place at an election, I never would sanction the view that any House of Commons is incompetent to entertain a measure that is necessary to the well-being of the community. If you were to admit that doctrine, you would stake the foundation on which many of the best laws are placed."

When, therefore, I find the philosopher in his closet, and the statesman in the cabinet, combined to reject the doctrine propounded in this Resolution, as unsuited to the genius of the British constitution—when I find the opposite doctrine proclaimed and acted on—when I find a parliament elected for three years extending its life to seven—when I find a parliament excluding from one of its branches at one time the entire body of bishops—when I find even the succession to the throne changed from one dynasty to another—and all these acts of sovereignty performed without any precedents that Parliament had no right to do them without first appealing to the polls, I ask myself on what grounds the mover of this resolution can expect this house to declare as a fundamental doctrine of the constitution, one entirely alien to its genius and character—no man knows better than himself that it is so.

Now, sir, while I entirely contest the doctrine of my hon. friend as to the necessity of appealing to the people, I do not pretend to say that the responsibility which devolves upon a member of this House is not one which should be exercised with great discretion.

Mr. CAMPBELL:—Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHIBALD.—I am glad to find this sentiment meet with the approval of the hon. member. But when he cheers my declaration that the question is one of discretion he gives up his whole case. He admits, as the member for Halifax admitted, that the house had the full power and right, and that the only question for consideration is this, Is the measure submitted to the house of such a character as to challenge approval? Is the change proposed to be made, demanded by the circumstances in which we are placed? Is it a measure which will contribute to the real welfare of the people? On this ground I am prepared to meet him, and on this ground the battle should be fought.

Before adverting to some of the arguments of the member for East Halifax, I must notice one or two observations of my hon. friend from Londonderry.

The hon. gentleman has referred to a speech of mine made in Canada, and has quoted an observation in it in reference to the change of relations which Confederation would make, with a view to create the impression that I contemplated a change in our connection with the Mother Country. But surely my hon. friend could hardly wish me to suppose he could misunderstand the purport of these observations. The change to which I referred was in our relations to each other. The relations of the Confederated Provinces to the

Mother Country will be the same, ay more intimate and secure, than those which the separate Provinces now hold to her.

I don't know that I fully comprehend the purport of my hon friend's quotation from the *Standard*, but I understood it to be a censure upon the British Government for allowing the Reciprocity Treaty to drop, with a view to create a feeling in favour of Confederation, and that no effort was made on their part or on the part of Canada to renew it. I am surprised at such a statement being quoted in this house, where the facts are so well known. The treaty was not dropped by Great Britain; it was terminated by the positive act of the United States; and so far from Canada not having exerted herself to obtain a renewal of it, her public men went further with that object than the people of this country could demand. They were willing to enter into arrangements not secured by treaty, but dependent upon reciprocal legislation; and I consider it as fortunate, and I believe the people of this country consider it fortunate, that we escaped a position which was one of degrading subservience to the caprices of American legislators. I apprehend that if there was a mistake at all in these negotiations, it was on the part of the British Government and on the part of the Canadians to exhibit an anxiety for the renewal of the treaty so great that the authorities of the Union were led to believe we could not exist without it, and that to keep us without it would drag us into a closer connection with themselves. We have lived and we have prospered without it, and having shown the United States that their trade, however important it may be, is not indispensable to us, we have laid the foundation for a renewal of the treaty upon equitable and fair terms.

My hon. friend seems to have a great horror of a future national existence. I should like to ask him what he looks forward to in the future. Does he imagine that for all time to come these Provinces, which in 20 years hence will count 8 millions of people, and which within the life-time of many now born, will comprise a population larger than that of the British Isles; does he suppose that this enormous population is for all time to come to be governed from Downing street? Eighty years ago a country with a population less than we now possess, irritated at what it considered oppressive exactions on the part of the Mother Country, asserted and achieved its independence. That country has added to its population in a century more than England has since the Norman conquest. Does my hon friend imagine that by any possibility these States could have continued to this moment dependencies upon the country, from which they sprung. No sir; there is an infancy and a youth and a maturity in nations as there is in men, and while I yield to no man in my desire to retain the connection which we have with the Parent State, while I trust and hope that the day may be far distant when the ties that unite us may be severed, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that in the future—however distant that future may be—we shall have to assume the responsibilities of a separate national existence. When that time shall come, it is the interest of Great Britain as it is our interest, that we should enter up and youth.

on this change of position with institutions adapted to the new attitude we shall have to assume. That we should be able to continue as the friend and ally of England, the existence which we began as her dependency. And that we should illustrate in the affectionate attachment we shall bear to the parent state, the result of the liberal and generous treatment which she has dealt out to us in our infancy.

I have asserted that I do not consider it constitutionally necessary to send this question to the polls. I do not mean to assert that it would not be exceedingly desirable to know the opinion of the people on the subject. But I can see no certain way of ascertaining that opinion. If this were the only subject upon which the people were asked to express their views, their verdict might be considered as an answer: but if there were an election to-morrow, and if the present Government should be overthrown by the result, who is to analyze this result—who is to define what portion of the vote is against Confederation—what portion against the school system—how much of the result may be due to personal or political unpopularity, entirely independent of this question.

But I am at a loss to understand the arguments of the hon. member for East Halifax. He asks in one breath for an appeal to the people, and in another sneers at it as useless. In Nova Scotia there is no appeal—the act of the Legislature is with him the act of a tyrannical majority. In New Brunswick there is an appeal—and the verdict passed at the polls is with him the result of corruption. Thirty-three men are returned in favor of Confederation to eight against it. If any verdict could be considered to express the unmistakable convictions of the people this would be it, and yet the hon. gentleman treats it with contempt! He says he will not stay to inquire how this result was effected. This is not a hasty expression in the heat of debate. The hon. member has put his hand to this slander of the people of New Brunswick in a solemn document subscribed by him in London, addressed to the Earl of Carnarvon. In referring to the first decision in New Brunswick adverse to Confederation he says:—

“On the methods by which that decision was reversed it is painful for a lover of freedom to dwell; but Your Lordship is aware that in Jeffreys' time many a jury were induced to reverse their decision when threatened and brow-beaten by the court.”

What does this mysterious allusion mean? Has the hon. gentleman any distinct idea in his own mind what he does mean? One thing is very certain—it is impossible to please him. We have to choose between the tyranny of a majority and the tyranny of a Jeffreys. If we carry the Confederation in the Legislature, no language is so strong to express his disapproval; if we carry it by an appeal to people, my honorable friend has such a holy horror of the result, that he will not stay to inquire how it was brought about. My honorable friend from Halifax has a great dread of corruption. A gentleman of high position in Canada—a man who stands perhaps second to none on this continent for personal character and integrity—a gentleman who had been for many long years the friend and political ally of the hon. member, undertook a year ago to compliment him upon his talents, and to suggest the pro-

priety of his applying them on a broader field, and forthwith the hon. member comes down here and informs the house that an attack had been made on his virgin purity, but that he had manfully resisted the assailant. Now he tells us, establish this, and you will have played in the Confederation, by the Government of the United States, the same game that they have been playing in Mexico. Now, sir, does it not occur to him that, if the United States have a game of this kind to play, they could not take a hand at any time more effectively than at this moment? It is their game to keep us isolated and apart—to foment jealousies between the different colonies—to separate them by hostile tariffs—to induce the public men of one colony to slander and abuse those of another—to suggest the advantages of American connection, and to foretell to the people of this country that in ten years they will have a President and be under the Stars and Stripes. I say that if the American Government have money to spend for the purpose to which the hon. member refers, and have the sagacity for which he gives them credit, is it too much to suppose that they may take a deep interest in what is going on at this moment? The hon. member undertakes to say that Confederation will weaken us. Is that the doctrine proclaimed by his allies in the United States? Mr. Banks has lately taken a great interest in our affairs; he has introduced into Congress a bill to provide for our admission into the United States. The advantages which this bill offers us are spoken of in very favorable terms by the representatives in England of the Anti-Confederates. Mr. Banks has studied the question from his own point of view. Let us see what he thinks of Confederation. In speaking to a resolution recently introduced by him into Congress, he said:—

“A Bill had recently come before the House of Lords in England contemplating the establishment of an empire in the British North American Provinces, which might hereafter sur pass in power that of England herself, or might equal that of the United States, or, as has been well said by its mover, might be second only to that of Russia. The Legislature of Maine, more interested in the movement than any other State, had, through its Committee on Federal Relations, made a report adverse to that project which report he would ask to have read to the House. The stage into which that bill had passed in the House of Lords was the most important of any of the stages through which bills pass as all its fundamental principles were in consideration. He did not doubt that the people of this country would look with intense solicitude upon the progress of this great movement in the British Provinces, which contemplated the establishment of an empire, formed on monarchical principles, so framed as to control public opinion, and which could not fail to have in the future a material if not a controlling influence and power over the affairs of the American Continent.”

Can anybody misunderstand this? Mr. Banks has the sagacity to perceive that Confederation is to confirm and establish our position on this continent. He sees that the true policy of the United States—as indicated by the report of the Maine Committee on Federal Relations—is to do just what the hon. member for Halifax is doing; and nobody will deplore the hon. gentleman's failure more than those of his American allies who have the sagacity to see how much his success would promote the interests and the policy of the United States.

Is there any gentleman in this House that supposes Mr. Banks would assume this position—would protest against Confederation—would ask his government to interfere impertinently in matters with which they have nothing to do—if he believed, as the member for Halifax asks this House to believe, that in ten years Confederation will place us under the American flag. If Mr. Banks thought this, instead of protesting against Confederation, he would do all he could to encourage it—instead of aiding the hon. member in his efforts at isolation he would cheer on us who take the opposite view as his friends and allies.

But the hon. member has called the attention of the house to the pecuniary disadvantages under which we shall enter the Union. He says that since 1863 the revenue of Nova Scotia has increased \$351,822 a year, and still all we get back under the arrangements recently agreed to in London in addition to that which was secured for us by the Quebec scheme is \$60,000 a year. The financial arguments addressed to this house can hardly impose upon the members, and are probably not intended to have that effect.

I have not time this morning to verify the hon. gentleman's figures as to the increase of the revenue of Nova Scotia. I will assume that he is correct. But if Nova Scotia has gone ahead, have the other Provinces stood still? In 1863 the revenue of Canada was \$9,760,316. In 1866 it was \$12,432,748, so that while our revenue has increased by \$351,822, that of Canada has increased by \$2,662,432.

Even our weaker sister, New Brunswick, has increased in equal proportion. Her revenue in 1863 was.....\$0,899,991
While in 1866 it was.....1,212,021

Which shows an increase of.....\$312,030
So that great as has been the increase of our Province, and we may well be proud of the evidence it affords of our country's prosperity, the increase of Canada and New Brunswick has been quite equal to our own.

But not only do their revenues bear to ours a fair proportionate increase, but both Canada and New Brunswick shew a larger comparative surplus. There remains to the credit of Nova Scotia, after meeting the expenditure of the year, a surplus of \$60,000, while that of New Brunswick is \$122,000, a quantity twice as much, and that of Canada, after paying the extraordinary disbursements connected with the Fenian invasion, is \$710,000, or over ten times that of Nova Scotia.

But what becomes of our \$351,000? Why, it goes into the same chest with the 2½ millions of Canada—with the one third of a million of New Brunswick. It goes to make a common purse for common objects, and we have the same right to our fair share of that contribution after it goes in as we should have had if it had never gone there.

Not only shall we have a right, but we shall be in a position to assert that right. Nothing

can be more inconsistent and contradictory than the arguments we meet with on this point. One set of men undertakes to tell us that we are victims to the political necessities of the Canadians. It is said that two great counties were separated by dissensions so incurable—by antagonisms so permanent, that finding it impossible any longer to carry on Responsible Government they came down and asked us to join them to get them out of their difficulty. Then another set of men say that the representatives of the Maritime Provinces are a mere handful. What can 34 representatives do in an assembly of 181? We are at the mercy of the Canadians who can do with us just what they think fit. These views can't both be true, and yet they are urged by people in almost the same breath. The hon. member for Halifax adopts one of them when he tells us that we have been wheeled by the Canadians into this Union; he adopts the other when he tells us that we are surrendering our funds hopelessly to the Federal treasury.

Sir, there are strong grounds of difference between the people of the two Canadas. They differ in race, in language, in religion. Upper Canada is mainly Protestant—Lower Canada mainly Catholic. Upper Canada is Anglo-Saxon—Lower Canada chiefly French. You have therefore differences permanent in their nature, and such as to create the elements of opposing parties. In religion, in origin, and in laws we have interests and feelings in common with the people of the West, whilst our geographical position, our commercial pursuits, our industries, largely identify us with the people of East. We are therefore in a position in which we may legitimately choose between the two political parties that divide Canada—that one which we shall consider the best exponent of those principles which are for the interest of our own people and of the people of the whole Confederacy. Need we fear that in Confederation the party which shall be supported by the Maritime Provinces—which shall owe its power very largely to their adhesion—will be in a position to refuse to the Provinces whose aid is so essential to them any fair advantage which they are entitled to ask? No, sir, I have no fears on that point. If there is any portion of the Confederacy which may be in a position to ask more than its fair share from the public funds, that portion is not either of the Canadas,—and we may rest assured that the Maritime Provinces will receive, as they will be in a position to demand, the most ample justice. More than what is fair and right, it would be a reflection on our character to suppose we should ask. Less than that, it would be a reflection on our patriotism, if we did not obtain.

Now, sir, let us see if this is not the actual state of this question. At the present moment the people of the two sections are courting our allegiance. The grounds upon which the people of Upper Canada seek it are explained in the daily press. In the *Quebec Chronicle* of the 8th insti, in the leader of that paper it is said:—

“Beyond the Province and in the General Parliament our course is a clear one. First of all we must form alliances which will tend to strengthen and protect us in our local relations; and secondly, our interests, commercial as well as political, will lead us to co-operate with those whose interests are the same as our own. The Maritime Provinces have been to us a sort of *terra incognita*, as we have been to them the result in both instances of paralysis of enterprise which is a marvel to foreigners, and can only be explained by the narrowing influence of provincial isolation. We are glad to observe some faint symptoms of recovery from this abject condition, the glimmering of an idea that we have neighbors with whom it may be desirable to hold communication by the great highway which Providence has given us for nothing, as well as by that other highway which we are about to build at the expense of twenty million dollars. These neighbors, who will count for one third under the new political system, are our natural allies. All our interests are the same. Whatever act of general legislation benefits or injures them, will have a like effect on us. Our great staple interests are the same, namely lumbering, and maritime, and we have a common interest with them in promoting a system of government which shall maintain the authority of the general Legislature with respect to matters, which if left under local control, are apt to be managed in a way most detrimental to the commercial interests of the country. Our motives for forming such an alliance are of the most practical kind, as reflection may suggest, and as we shall more fully explain. They are motives which do not exclusively pertain to the English section. French and English are equally concerned, seeing it is commercial interests that are chiefly at stake.”

With these views actuating the people of the East—with an equal desire for our support influencing the people of the West, is there a man in this house or in this country, who does not believe that we shall exercise in the general Legislature a just and fair influence, or who does not believe that any part of the Federation will be in a position to oppress or injure us.

But I understood the hon member to say that all the advantage we gain from the London agreement over that made at Quebec is \$60 000 a year. This is not the fact. By the original agreement a subsidy of 80 cents a head was to be granted to each Province of the Federation, but that subsidy was based on the population as it existed at the time of the census of 1861. Many persons have thought it was an injudicious arrangement to restrict the subsidy to the population of that year, and that it would have been better to allow it to increase until the population was ascertained at each decennial census. There are, however, good reasons why that should not be so, and whether these reasons are valid or not the arrangement as agreed upon was not unfavorable to this Province. The population of Canada West increases much more rapidly than our own. Suppose it to double in 20 years from 1861—that Province will then receive but 40 cents a head. The addition to our population in the same period may be 60 per cent., and in that case man for man we should receive a considerably larger amount than Canada. By the arrangement at London this is still further increased in our favor. The subsidy, as regards the Canadas, still remains based on the population of 1861, while as regards the Maritime Provinces it increases with their population until it reaches 400,000. As regards Nova Scotia our rate of increase during

the last decade was over 2 per cent. per annum. This will give us in 1861 a population of 400,000. In other words, it entitles us to 80 cents a head on the additional 70,000 increase of population.

This amounts to.....\$56,000
 We have a special grant of.....60,000
 We have also transferred to the Federal Government the support of the Penitentiary, which costs us.....16,000
 And pensions to the extent of.....2,000

The new arrangement therefore gives us.....\$134,000 a year in addition to the amount we agreed for at Quebec.

This is a large sum annually added to the means placed at the disposal of the Local Legislature. This addition may well justify the support the gentlemen who may have thought the Quebec scheme defective in that particular. There was not one of your delegates who was not anxious to obtain for the Province the most favourable terms in his power; and it is but fair to the representatives of the larger Province to say that they met us in a spirit of generous consideration for the wants, and even to some extent, for the prejudices of this Province.

We are told that the change is not for the better. A different line of argument is adopted in Canada. Will the house listen to what Mr. Brown, the editor of the *Globe*, and late President of the Council, says on the subject:—

"It appears that the delegates have agreed to increase the grants to all the Local Governments, and that not on the just principle of population adopted at Quebec, but in a manner totally irrational and most unjust to Upper Canada. In addition to the eighty cents per head distributed as already shown, the delegates have agreed that the following annual grants shall be paid permanently from the Federal chest:—

To Upper Canada.....	\$70,000
To Lower Canada.....	70,000
To Nova Scotia.....	60,000
To New Brunswick.....	50,000

Total additional grants.....\$260,000

Had this sum of \$260,000 been distributed, according to the population, as given by the census of 1861, it would give as follows:—

Upper Canada.....	\$117,449
Lower Canada.....	93,618
Nova Scotia.....	27,334
New Brunswick.....	21,204

Total.....\$260,000

"The whole grant for local purposes under the scheme as amended will now be as follows:—

Upper Canada.....	\$1,106,873
Lower Canada.....	959,253
Nova Scotia.....	324,686
New Brunswick.....	314,638

Total.....\$2,705,450

"These grants, at the estimated population of the several Provinces on the 1st of January, 1867, give the following rates of grant per head:—

	Population.	Per head.
Upper Canada.....	1,802,056	60 cts.
Lower Canada.....	1,288,830	74 "
Nova Scotia.....	368,811	88 "
New Brunswick.....	295,034	110 "

"Nothing could be more scandalously unjust to Upper Canada than this.

"The second departure from the Quebec Scheme is that, until Prince Edward Island comes into the Union, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall have between them the four seats in the Upper Chamber,

that the Island was to have had. The distribution will now be as follows:—

	Population.	Members.
Upper Canada.....	1,802,056	24
Lower Canada.....	1,288,830	24
Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.....	663,864	24

"There is nothing to palliate this change. Under the Quebec Scheme the injustice to Upper Canada was marked enough, but to add to it in this manner was totally indefensible. Why, the three Provinces of Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick united have but 150,689 people more than Upper Canada and yet they are to have 48 Legislative Councillors and Upper Canada but 24. Every Upper Canada Councillor will thus represent 75,985 people, while the average of all the rest will be but 40,782. The thing is utterly unfair."

In a subsequent paper the editor returns to the charge. He says.

"Now mark the justice of this previous arrangement. The Quebec Scheme gave precisely eighty cents per head to each Province, according to its population in 1861, and (leaving out in both cases the special ten-year subsidy to New Brunswick) here is what our wise-afores in London have changed the arrangement to:—

To Upper Canada, 85½ cents per head.

To Lower Canada, 80½ cents per head.

To Nova Scotia, \$1.19 cents per head!

To New Brunswick, \$1.47 cents per head!!

"And let it not be forgotten that the Quebec scheme was framed in 1864, shortly after the census returns of 1861 had been printed, and the delegates took the census as the basis of the arrangement. But nearly three years have passed away since then, and the relative numbers of the several Provinces are greatly altered. According to the present estimated population of the several Provinces, the annual subsidies are to be distributed by the Imperial Act in the following most unjust fashion:—

	Population	Per head
Upper Canada.....	1,802,056	66 cents.
Lower Canada.....	1,288,830	74 cents.
Nova Scotia.....	368,811	107 cents.
New Brunswick.....	295,034	125 cents.

"The thing is so preposterously unjust that we are amazed how any one could have had the audacity to propose it, much less the folly to concede it."

Now, sir, add to the \$134,000 which we have obtained by the new arrangement, \$264,000 we had before, and we have the sum of \$398,000, which, with the revenues of our mines and Crown lands, constitutes the fund at the disposal of the local Legislature. With this revenue we shall be able to provide in a creditable manner for every local want.

If anybody had undertaken to say a few years ago, when the revenue of the country was insufficient to meet the ordinary demands upon it, at a time when we had only ninety miles of railway, and when to meet the emergency we were obliged to raise our ad valorem duties 2½ per cent, that we should be able by an addition of 2½ per cent. to secure the construction of a railroad to Pictou at a cost of over two millions of dollars; to extend the railway from Windsor to Annapolis; to secure the great international highway for which we have been struggling for the last twenty years; and that with all these secured to our people, we should be in a position to give a road grant equal to that which we gave when we went to our elections in 1863; to devote to education a sum nearly three times that which we granted to it in that year,—is there a member of this Legislature who would not

have felt happy if he could have been sure such prediction would be accomplished, who would not have felt that such a position is one he should be proud to occupy? And yet we are gravely told that with all these advantages secured to us, the country is ruined. If this be ruin, we might agree to be ruined every day of the week.

It is difficult to understand exactly what views the hon. member for Halifax holds as to the "Organization of the Empire." At one time he talks of it as if it was not his scheme—but in the next breath he tells us his idea is, that this Province should be treated as Kent or Surrey or any other English county, and be entitled to have the privileges and be subject to the burdens of the Empire.

Suppose it were, it would according to its population be entitled to about the same number of representatives in the Imperial Parliament which the anti-Confederates had in England at the recent session. I will assume that it could not furnish three able or better men. Those three gentlemen have spent nine months in the single object of endeavouring to enlighten the members of Parliament on the subject of their mission. They deluged them with pamphlets and communications and had, we suppose, a very considerable number of personal interviews with leading statesmen. Yet what does the hon. member himself say was the result? Why that so little could these three gentlemen—with all their talents and assiduity—interest the Parliament of England in the object of their mission, that when the destinies of this country were to be disposed of in the House of Lords, he says that only nine peers could be found to listen to the proceedings—and in the House of Commons the most unaccountable ignorance of the whole question was exhibited. And yet it is to a Parliament exhibiting such carelessness and ignorance that the hon. member and his friend in London would be willing to entrust the dearest rights of the people of this country.

But there is one feature of the hon. member's argument that would surprise me—if anything coming from him now could give me surprise. He says we have not received a guarantee for a sufficient sum to build the Intercolonial Railway. Three millions of pounds, he says, is too small a sum, it will only land you in the wilderness with a road unfinished—and he gives as the foundation of his assertion his belief in a survey made by Mr. Fleming.

Will it be believed that not two months ago this same gentleman subscribed his name to a solemn document submitted to Lord Carnarvon in which he makes a statement directly opposite? Then he supposed the delegates were asking for four millions of pounds on the basis of Mr. Fleming's report. He forthwith stigmatizes the report by which he now professes to be guided as "a most imperfect Canadian survey," and intimates that four million pounds is far too much.

There is something in this document so curious that I can't refrain from calling the attention of the House to it:—

"The framers of the Quebec scheme expect the Chancellor of the Exchequer to go down to Parliament and ask for an advance of £4,000,000 for the construction of this road, Mr. Gladstone promised but £3,000,000."

Mark this. The hon. member charges us that we have secured an advance of £3,000,000 only, and yet he himself hurries to point out to Lord Carnarvon that £3,000,000 was the limit of the Imperial pledge. He warns Lord Carnarvon not to go beyond that sum, and yet he has the assurance to come here and blame us for not getting more. But that is not all. Let me go on with this precious document:—

"The sum has been increased one-third on the faith of a most imperfect Canadian survey, with which Her Majesty's Government, that is to give the money, or the Maritime Provinces which are to pay the interest, have had nothing whatever to do. Four millions of money would build 16 iron-clads, or would furnish a million of breech loaders, which distributed over the Empire, would greatly strengthen it in every part. Is it likely that Parliament will vote such a sum unless the case be clear. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may be reasonably expected to prove—

1. That so large a sum is actually required.
2. That the security of a sinking fund, which Mr. Gladstone demanded, but which Canada refused in 1862, is to be given.
3. That the interest is to be paid in four proportions by the three provinces, and not by the Maritime provinces alone.
4. That Canada is so secure from invasion that the money will not be lost even should she be ever so honestly disposed to repay it.
5. That so large a sum may not, in the altered circumstances which we have to face, be very much better employed in the defence of the whole empire, than in giving facilities to a province which may be utterly unable to repay the money, or to protect the road when it is built."

Sir, I have read the whole of this document that the house and the country may understand what these gentlemen who style themselves the "People's Delegates" have been doing in England. Not content with warning the Chancellor of the Exchequer to confine himself within the limits of the original pledge, they do all they can to show that it is unsafe to go even that far. They urge that the money might be better spent elsewhere; and they do what they can to disparage and discredit the character and reputation of the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we call to mind the addresses we have so often heard from one of these gentlemen on the floors of this House on the subject of the Intercolonial Railway—when we remember the fervid eloquence with which he described the value of such a road in opening up the resources of the great country behind us and in constituting a means of defence—when we recollect the letters which in 1862 the same gentleman addressed to the Secretary for the Colonies, pointing out the enormous saving in time of war which would result from the construction of this great work—and then read the document to which the house has just listened, it is difficult to believe that both are the productions of the same hand. But bad as as all this is, it is almost worse to come here as the hon. member does, and after using every effort to prevent us getting any advance at all, charge on us as an offence that we have not secured something more. If we have got an advance, it has been in spite of all that

he and Mr. Howe could do to prevent it. If we have secured the Intercolonial Railroad, it is because all the efforts of these gentlemen to disparage and discredit us in the opinion of English statesmen have been powerless.

But, sir, if little attention was paid to this question in the Imperial Parliament, it was not because that body was indifferent to the measure, but because there was no member of it who felt an interest in the success of these Colonies who was not persuaded that this measure would promote that success. Any opposition that was offered came from gentlemen who were never friends of the Colonies and who only speak of them as a burden and incumbrance to the parent country.

I am able to bear testimony—and I am glad to do so—to the patriotic and statesmanlike views of the noble Marquis who formerly presided over the government of this Province. If there was any gentleman in either branch of the Imperial Parliament who might be supposed inclined to yield a favorable ear to Mr. Howe's suggestions, that person was the Marquis of Normanby. While he was governor of Nova Scotia, Mr. Howe was for years his Prime Minister, and enjoyed largely his confidence; but the noble lord, in an emergency in which his fellow Peers might be supposed to defer largely to his local information and experience rose superior to any personal ties between him and his former minister and friend, and warmly advocated this measure as one that was essential to our prosperity and safety.

I believe that is only by means of Confederation that we can prevent our Provinces from being absorbed in the American Union. I have more faith in the opinions of the ally of the hon. member for East Halifax than I have in his own. I believe that by the establishment of a large country on this continent, within which labor shall be free and untaxed, we shall present a field for industry which will contrast most favourably with that other field alongside of us in which labor is pressed down by enormous taxation. See how that contrast is already apparent in certain branches of business. In a report to Congress made by the Secretary to the Treasury, no longer ago than December last, he dwells upon the condition of the shipping interest of the United States. "Twenty years ago," he says, "it was anticipated that ere this the United States would be the first naval power in the world." Up to the time when the war interfered with their industry and taxes crippled their resources, this anticipation was being realized. In five years, however, that interest has enormously declined. The United States tonnage employed in their foreign trade in 1860 was 6 millions. In five years it fell to 3 millions; while during the same period the tonnage of foreign vessels employed in that trade has run up from 2,363,000 to 4,410,000 tons.

Is it any wonder that this should be the case when on one side of the boundary line a ton of shipping costs \$100, while it only costs \$50 on the other. Cheap ships, cheaply manned and

sailed, will continue to absorb more and more of the foreign trade of the United States. Within their own borders, where they enjoy the monopoly of the coasting trade, they may impose upon industry the burden of enormous freights, but where they come into competition with the foreigner, they must compete with cheap ships or quit the trade.

As it is with shipping, so it will be with other industries, and the new Confederation may look forward to a future in which the growth and increase of every industrial pursuit will bring into play the vast and varied resources which are scattered profusely over the country.

A brilliant prospect is before us, and when we shall have become a country with our sister colonies in the West, and have fairly entered on our new course, I believe there will be nothing at which some of those who now view the prospect with timidity or apprehension will be more amazed than at the recollection of the doubts and fears that they honestly entertained at this crisis of our history. The men who sit around these benches have a deep stake in the country. They represent not only the intelligence and public spirit—but they fairly represent the wealth and prosperity of the country. If in what they are now about to do they mistake the true interests of the country, they will themselves be the sufferers from the mistake. But there is a feeling dearer to a public man than any considerations of a material interest. It is the desire to enjoy the esteem and respect of those among whom his life is to be spent. If in the course we are now taking, we have misapprehended the true interests of the country, if it shall turn out that the Confederation we advocate shall be what its opponents declare it will, we shall pay the penalty of our rash act by a life long exclusion from the esteem and respect of our fellow countrymen. But, if it be otherwise—and if it shall turn out that we saw what was not only for the interests and prosperity, but what was absolutely necessary for the safety of the people, then we shall see that we have done right to fix our eyes steadily on what was for the permanent benefit of our common country, and to pursue it regardless of the temporary passions and prejudices which may beset us.

EVENING SESSION.

The house resumed at 7.20.

Hon. PROV. SECRETARY said that the public mind had been somewhat excited by a rumor that, by a despatch from the war authorities, the works upon our fortifications had been ordered to be discontinued. He had not given credit to the rumor, because on the last day of his stay in London he had, as one of a deputation called on H. R. H. the Duke of Cambridge and the Minister of War, and those noblemen had evinced extreme satisfaction at the great exertions made by the people of the colonies, and the admirable spirit displayed by their Legislatures in connection with the subject of defence. The deputation had been assured that the Imperial war authorities would feel warranted in asking for an increase of the aid usually granted for colonial protection. On

hearing the rumor referred to he had put himself in communication with the Lieutenant Governor, and was now in a position to state that the despatch causing this surmise had only reference to one of the fortifications, in which some alterations were contemplated.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Speech of Hon. Mr. Shannon.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said:—It is rather the turn of gentlemen opposite to take up the argument, but as no one appears ready to speak on that side I would like to say a few words on this question. I have been so much pleased during yesterday and to-day in listening to the statements made by gentlemen connected with the delegations, that I could have remained here for hours listening to their speeches, and have been satisfied if I heard nothing more. But I happen to be one of those to whom the epithet "dumb dogs" was applied last year. The debate on that occasion had continued to so late an hour of the evening, that I did not think it advisable to say anything, but I found shortly afterwards that the *Morning Chronicle* referred to me as one of those who had been expected to deliver my sentiments but had not done so. And Mr. Howe also, in his addresses in the country, referred to what he called the indecent haste with which the resolutions were carried, stating that some of those who had been expected to speak had not uttered a word. I thought that my sentiments on this subject had been too well known to require that I should say a word, and I do not feel that I can add anything of value to what has already been uttered; but I am willing to say a few words to show that I am still as strongly in favor of this great measure as ever. This is not the first time that I have spoken in favour of Union. As long ago as 1861 my vote was pledged to its support. Mr. Howe, the then Premier, in that year came down with a resolution which received the sanction of the house. On a subsequent occasion, 1863, when we were debating the question of the Intercolonial Railway, though my views differed somewhat from the then Government as to the mode in which the guarantee should be raised, thinking that our Province had been asked to pay too much, still I was in favor of the railroad, and when Mr. Howe detailed in such eloquent terms the prospects rising before us, and when the hon. member for Yarmouth was so carried away as to be willing to vote for the Pictou railway, I then made a few remarks referring to the Intercolonial line as uniting all the Provinces, and expressing the hope that it would give birth to that new nationality of which gentlemen opposite have shown themselves to be so afraid. I then referred to my experience in the old country where colonists were treated with indifference, and I said then as I feel now that if we had a larger field we would not be treated with such contempt on the other side of the Atlantic. Again, in 1864, when the Provincial Secretary moved the resolution in reference to the delegation to Prince Edward Island, I endeavored to express clearly my view on the question, expressing my regret that matters were not in progress for the larger Union. In 1865, when the matter was again before us, I delivered my sentiments as well as I was able

and at length, so that I need not have been charged last year with want of deference to the house, or with want of expression in my opinions.

As I have already said, I feel as strongly upon this question as I ever did, and am determined to support the clause in the speech and to oppose the amendment. And now what are the arguments which have been advanced? First of all, it is said that the gentlemen who were sent on the delegation exceeded their authority. After the debates of last year in which the most frantic appeals were made to members not to support the resolution for the delegation, because the action of the House would bind the people and their posterity forever, and on the resolution being carried, after Mr. Howe had used the same language throughout the country. I supposed that it would be fully understood that the action of the House was final: and I was much surprised to hear gentlemen making use of such an argument on this occasion. Then the hon. member spoke of the tyrannical mode in which the measure had been carried out, and said he could find no precedent for it until he went back to the history of ancient Rome, and compared the act of that Legislature to which we must all bow to the tyranny of Nero. I think that such a remark, made among subjects of Her Majesty, in reference to such a Parliament might have been spared; and I may here ask if it has not been shown that every pains were taken, on the part of those opposed to the measure, to make members of the British Parliament acquainted with the whole subject? We see that in the House of Lords the matter was carefully debated. It has been said that on the third reading, when some discussion had arisen, a number of Peers went away; but we all know what the third reading of a bill is; we all know that the principle is discussed on the second reading, and on the second reading of this bill the House was fuller than it had been for a long time before. And was there not one present who was well acquainted with Nova Scotia? If there was one who might have been expected to lend his assistance to Mr. Howe and the so-called people's delegates, it would have been our former Lieut.-Governor, who was so much attached to his old Premier; but I do not think a better speech could have been given in favour of the bill than that which Lord Normanby uttered. He well knew how parties ran in this country; he understood the whole organization of society here, and knew that this measure was calculated to advance the best interests of the Province. What did that nobleman say to those gentlemen who professed to represent the people? He had some knowledge of petitions, and had come to the conclusion that they were principally the expression of the opinions of those gentlemen who got them up. I am somewhat acquainted with the petitions which came from my own constituency; I am aware that there are a number of mercantile men in the city opposed to Confederation, and they put their names to the petition as a matter of course; but

when those opposed to the measure went into the interior of the western part of the county, the number of signatures was small indeed. Although every effort was made, and men were hired to go down and obtain the names even of boys, whole sections refused to sign. Lord Normanby must have told Mr. Howe that it was no use to come before Parliament with such petitions, when a great public measure was under consideration.

The main point upon which the amendment is being pressed is that an appeal should be made to the people. I need not trouble the House with many arguments upon the constitutional question, because that has been ably handled by gentlemen who preceded me, and because the member for East Halifax has to a great extent, given up the point in admitting the precedents. Mr. Archibald showed that when the British Parliament found it necessary to change the arrangements connected with the succession to the Crown and to bring in a new dynasty—when those noble men who guarded the rights of the country, and were determined to get rid of the Stuart family, had induced Parliament to adopt their views, there was no appeal to the people, although the leading men in the movement knew that their action might be made a ground of impeachment. There was a Union consummated in the history of England to which I may refer, although it is not exactly a precedent. I refer to the union of Scotland with England. It was hardly to be expected in that case that the lesser nation would have concurred. We all know the spirit of Scotchmen—how the ancestors of the men of that day had, with their backs to the unconquerable highlands and their faces to the foe, repelled the English invader on every occasion—and the same spirit led them to oppose the union with England. They feared, as our opponents profess to do, that the smaller state would be swamped by the greater—but what was the result? From that day Scotland went on in the path of improvement, and Scotchmen could take their place with Englishmen in any part of the world. One gentleman some time ago styled the Scotch a race of paupers, but if they were, they found their way down to rich England, and wherever there was an outlet for intellect or industry Scotchmen were to be found availing themselves of the noble education which they had received and of the opportunities of advancement which appeared. From the date of the union there has not been a ministry in England in which Scotland has been unrepresented. When the East Indies were opened to enterprise Scotchmen predominated there; and at the present day Scotland is one of the most prosperous parts of Great Britain. This is, to some extent, a parallel case with ours excepting that we will have far greater influence in the United Parliament and a higher position in every respect; and I feel that the result will be in our case still more satisfactory. If we look at what an appeal to the people really is, we will see that it is not in all cases satisfactory. There were two such appeals in New Brun-

wick, and the one neutralised the other. Who could tell which exhibited the real feeling of the people? In ancient history there is an instance in which an individual appealed from his sovereign drunk to the same authority sober. When was New Brunswick sober? Was it when the Frenchmen were told that they were to be sent to Canada, and the most inflammatory appeals made? Or was it when the real enemy was gathering on the frontier, and the people saw it was necessary to be no longer isolated? Then came the strong English feeling and the strong desire to maintain British connection, and the result was that a majority was returned in favour of Union. I would hardly ask, in reference to the great leader of the Opposition to Union, when he was in his sober senses, but I would ask when he was exercising his best judgment? Was it when, on former occasions, he spoke so eloquently in favour of Union—when he said he wished to visit Canada every year; or was it when, a disappointed man, no longer Premier—disappointed even in going to Quebec, when others, to use a common phrase, had stolen his thunder, he endeavored to arouse hostility to all his former teachings? We have had read to us a state paper, called the case of the people, and setting forth the sentiments of Mr. Howe and his colleagues. Can it be possible that this patriot, who was once willing to pledge our revenues to any extent to build the Intercolonial Railway, after his ambition was disappointed, was unwilling that we should receive that boon? I was trained to consider Mr. Howe an able man, but not one whom it was safe to follow; and I cannot see how those who have been accustomed formerly almost to idolize him could now follow his teachings. As regards the prospects held out to us by Union, perhaps it is hardly right to bring them before this House on the present question, but the subject has been gone into and one of the delegates gave us a financial view of the matter.

The hon. member for East Halifax told us that it was impossible to remain as we are, and he expressed his preference to see Nova Scotia as a county of England, like Kent or Surrey. I would agree to a large extent with that if it were possible, but we know well what the result would be. We would be obliged to bear our share of the burdens falling upon us as portions of the British Empire, and neither the gentlemen composing this Legislature nor the community outside would be willing to enter into such a union. It would utterly prostrate all our energies to be placed under such a burden as that would cause. But the hon. gentleman went further, and said that if we could not become an integral part of the Empire, rather than go to Canada, he would prefer Annexation to the United States. I should like the people to understand this sentiment as I cannot think that they have made up their minds to such an alternative. I think they would prefer the advantages of Confederation to all the temptations held out by Mr. Banks. It is common for the proprietors of newspapers in the United States on the eve of elections to

put at the head of their columns the motto and flag which represent their sentiments. I would advise the hon. gentleman to put at the head of his paper the motto; "The United States rather than Canada," and to hoist the Stars and Stripes as his banner and let the people know what the true issue is: Canada or the United States I am for Canada. In connection with this subject I may say that the only thing which I regret is the name by which the United Provinces are to be designated. I would have preferred the name British America. I feel convinced that under Confederation we are to have such advantages that even gentlemen opposed to it will have to acknowledge as Scotchmen afterwards did in relation to the union with England, that it was the making of the country. I see no ground for the assertion that we are to lose our liberties,—our laws will be as well administered as ever,—the local legislatures will have sufficient funds to meet the local exigencies, and we will enjoy every privilege which we had before. I am convinced that in this respect our people will hardly know the difference.

One of my constituents said to me the other day, "What about this Confederation?" I said to him, "You live in the country; you will get up in the morning and attend to your work; the same money will be expended on the roads and bridges, your children will be educated, and you will never know the difference, except when you bring your wares to market you will get a double price for them." Mr. Bourinot told us the other day what Confederation would do for Cape Breton—that the people of that island will have markets they never had before, and justice will be done to Cape Breton. I believe the statement, and further, next to the county of Halifax, I believe that the county of Pictou will receive the largest benefit. What is the case in that county? I have been the instrument, to some small extent already in bringing Canadian capital into that county and I believe its towns will be the scenes of busy industry. New Glasgow may have its tall factory chimneys, and be the Birmingham of the future Confederation. And what about Halifax and the great railway? I have only to read Mr. Howe's speeches for a description of what we are to have then. You may take any of the labouring men upon the streets of our city, and you will find that they understand the benefits that are to ensue,—men who came here with no capital but their industry, and who have acquired a competency among us—men whose children are being educated for any position to which they may aspire, and who are willing to exert themselves to increase the prosperity of the country. And as to our young men, what great advantages will not they receive? The hon. member for Londonderry said he wished that we should remain as we are. I think we cannot do so, neither politically nor socially. Does he not know that, notwithstanding our progress, there is a constant depletion of our population owing to our young men leaving us—that they

are abandoning their country and going to the United States, and that we cannot retain them until Confederation is accomplished? I mentioned on a former occasion the number of Nova Scotians who had left us, probably never to return. I want to stop this, and to try to get some of our exiles back, and I think we can do it in no other way. Even those among us who have acquired fortunes and desire to keep their means to themselves will find that their securities will be far more valuable hereafter than now. Having made these remarks from a feeling that I should not allow the opportunity to pass in silence, I will now resume my seat.

Speech of Mr. Coffin.

Mr. COFFIN said:—I did not intend to make any remarks upon this subject, but there are two or three matters upon which I wish to make a few observations; The hon. gentleman who just spoke referred to New Brunswick as having had two elections before the consummation of this measure; the only thing we are complaining of is that our government are passing upon it without giving the people an opportunity of considering it at the polls; for I contend that previous to the last election no mention of the question was made to the electors. When the delegates returned from Quebec the leading men of New Brunswick finding that they could not command a majority in the Legislature, dissolved the House and appealed to the people, when a large majority was returned against them. Subsequently a majority was returned in their favour, but the people of that Province have no reason to complain. In Nova Scotia the case was quite different,—the delegates, although the majority was against them, had not the manliness to go to the country. We only ask that the measure may be postponed till the proper time arrives for an election. If the measure were not then sustained it might at some future period be ratified by the people and could then be carried by their consent. As it is, you are depriving the people of their constitution without allowing them to speak for themselves;—you are saying to them, 'you are not fit to judge, we will take away your privileges and consign you to the care of other men without asking your opinion.' This makes the people go into the new government dissatisfied.

It has been stated here that Mr. Watkins told the House of Commons that the question had been before the people, and had been preached at every hustings throughout Nova Scotia,—coming from such authority the statement was no doubt believed. I need scarcely ask whether the statement was true or not. But I must say I felt relieved at hearing it. I thought it a most arbitrary act on the part of the Imperial Parliament to pass the bill without giving us the privilege of being heard, but this piece of information throws new light on the proceeding. I know not whether this information was given by the

delegates or not—that is for them to say, and the responsibility rests on them. It has been said that the delegates obtained better terms for Nova Scotia at the recent Conference than were allowed us before,—if such be the case the Opposition are entitled to the credit; if there had been no opposition we would have had the Quebec scheme. That scheme, however, allowed us certain privileges which we do not now possess. We were to have been allowed to raise a revenue by some other means than direct taxation, and that privilege has been taken from us. Last winter we had before us a bill which was to have put our mining operations in such a position that we would lose the power from that time of levying a tax on coal, but it was a hard bill to get through the House, its passage was not accomplished; but the delegates have effected the same purpose in the conference at the other side of the water. In this connection I could not help thinking of another bill pressed upon us last year by Mr. Archibald; the bill to impose an income tax. The friends of this bill were likewise unsuccessful, but perhaps they mean to accomplish their purpose by leaving us without sufficient revenue to carry on the local departments, and by taking from us all other means of obtaining a supply for the treasury. As regards the allowance to be made to us by the general government it is true some advantage has been gained. But the day is not far distant when we may have a population of 400,000, and that population will go on increasing until by-and-by it will reach double that number, and yet we will receive no more money.

It may be said that in this respect Nova Scotia is served as the other Provinces are; but I think it would have been wise to have arranged a sliding scale, whereby the revenues could be raised in accordance with the increasing necessity. We will find the arrangement a poor one indeed when our people number 800,000 or 1,000,000, and have so paltry a sum out of which to meet the public wants. One of the delegates gave us this afternoon some observations upon the prosperity of Nova Scotia as regards her shipping, and the decrease of that of the United States. We know that from the beginning of the war the shipping of that country decreased not only from privateering, but by vessels being transferred to the British flag. I do not think that in the statistics that were given allowance was made for the shipping under the flags of foreign nations that will go back as soon as circumstances are favorable. Taking all these circumstances into consideration, I think that the prosperity of the American marine is not so small as it would seem. It is true that we can build two ships in Nova Scotia for one in the United States, but one of their ships when built is worth two of ours. Taking everything into consideration, I think it is apparent that the Union will be consummated;—that we are to try a new state of things; but as I have already said, I feel relieved at hearing that the British Parliament acted under false information, and I am convinced that if the truth had

been known, an opportunity would have been allowed us of saying whether we consented or not to unite our fortunes with those of the other Provinces.

Speech of Mr. Tobin.

Mr. TOBIN said:—I have so often spoken on on this question that I feel it is quite unnecessary for me to address the House to-night at any great length. It will be remembered that when this subject was under discussion during the last session of the legislature I was so indisposed that on the last night when the division was taken I was scarcely able to utter a word. While that subject was under discussion, neither the leader of the government nor any supporter of the government knew which way I was going to vote. I have advocated, however, this Union since I first entered public life. Indeed I have advocated it even before I had the honour of a seat in this House. I believe that I was mainly instrumental to the bringing forward of the resolution which was moved by Mr. Howe in 1861. At public meetings in this city, in Windsor, in Kentville, in Truro I have addressed large audiences, and received from them the kindest attention. After a fair discussion of this question, I have invariably found the people of this country in favour of Union. On every occasion when I came before the electors of the city of Halifax and of the Western division, I advocated a Union of the British American Provinces. I have been sustained at three elections—at two by large majorities, and at the last without opposition. So far as I am personally concerned I assume all the responsibility of my position, and I advocate this Union because I believe it is for the best interests of British America. I believe that the time has come when we must enter on a new state of political relations with each other. Look at this House, to-day are we not actually bursting our shell? Is there room for the hon. gentlemen who come here from the different counties? See how the desks are crowded into the lobby. Therefore, I say, we have outgrown our condition, and require expansion. We must do like the Massachusetts man: when the village becomes too large he emigrates to the West. We must look to the great West which opens before us and cultivate trade and intercourse with its people.

We are taunted with endeavoring to take away the privileges of the people, and transfer them to Canada. What is the fact? We give 19,000 square miles, and get in return 400,000 square miles. If we transfer our revenue to Canada, shall we not have a share in her revenue? All the revenues of the Provinces are to be put into a common treasury for the benefit of all. Each county of Nova Scotia now contributes to, and gets a share of the treasury of Nova Scotia. In the same way each Province will contribute to, and obtain a share of, the general treasury of the Confederacy. What is the first object to which our common funds are to contribute? It is the Intercolonial Railway, which is going to bring the whole of the great West immediately into connection with us—to distribute merchandise from one end of the Confederacy to the other. Let me turn your attention in another direction. Who are the men in this house who have voted to refer this question to the British Go-

vernment? Let me just look across the floor, and whom do I see? An hon. gentleman representing the great agricultural county of Kings—representing in himself wealth, intelligence, and ability. Let me look at Annapolis, and I find two members of that fine agricultural county also in favor of union. When I cast my eye down the list, I see gentlemen representing the great coal as well as the fishing interests of this province, all of them arrayed in support of this great measure of progress. I find that only two counties, through their representatives, voted unanimously against the resolution of last winter. I confess that at one time, in order to put down agitation on this question, my judgment inclined me to go to the polls; but when I come to look at the position of things in this house, I feel I would be worse than the infallible juryman if I expected to bring over thirty gentlemen to my opinion.

I have listened attentively to the arguments offered to the house since the debate commenced, and especially to those advanced by my hon. friend the member for East Halifax, who was one of the "People's Delegates," in company with a gentleman whose talents I admire and for whom I entertain the highest respect. What view did that hon. member present of the constitutional aspect of this question? I think that the pleasant time he spent in Kew Garden and Bushy Park, or perhaps the omnibuses rolling down Piccadilly, must have driven all arguments out of his head. I think that my hon. friend might have availed himself of the opportunities within his reach in the great English metropolis, and searched out some precedents and authority for the course he wishes us to pursue. As respects my hon. friend from Yarmouth, he is true to his text. He has always been opposed to railways and all measures of progress; in point of fact, he thinks Yarmouth the hub of the Province, and that we should always be tied to the old stage coach and move to the musical notes of the wooden axle. Now I think that the time has come to give up such antiquated notions; and I hope and trust the gentlemen who will be sent to represent the people at Ottawa—if that is the seat of government—will reflect the intelligence and ability of the country, and be in every way qualified to promote its best interests.

There was another question to which my hon. friend alluded, and that was the "Organization of the Empire" according to the programme issued by Mr. Howe. However highly I value that gentleman's opinion—however much I may esteem him, I cannot help believing that it is a scheme of an entirely impracticable character. Such is the opinion, indeed, of every public man and publicist everywhere who has given the subject the least consideration.

If there is one section of this Province more likely than another to be benefited by this Confederation, it is the city of Halifax. This must be the emporium, whence will be distributed over the Confederacy all the merchandize brought to our shores. Trade must be developed to an infinite degree, labour will be developed, in fact all classes and interests will receive a valuable impulse. Our port will be filled with shipping, and our wharves and warehouses groan with the merchandize that

will be required for the Confederation. I never could understand how certain persons in Halifax have opposed the scheme of Union. Perhaps I may stand almost alone in the profession to which I belong. There are a great many intelligent merchants I know opposed to it, but I cannot understand the reasons that influence them. No man is infallible, and some may not take that broad and generous view of questions which men in a different position of life can and do take on subjects of this kind. There is another question to which I have often referred, and that is, the position of our young men. What is there to excite ambition among our young men in the existing condition of things? The avenues to employment are narrow and confined. I regret to say that I know of many young men belonging to the respective professions whose energies are paralyzed for want of sufficient employment, and of those objects of ambition which are open to them in other countries.

An allusion having been made to the franchise law, I must say that that was an act passed in this Legislature from which I strongly dissented. I have labored not so much perhaps in public as other ways to have this objectionable measure repealed. I am still as anxious as ever to see it struck off the statute book; for I want the men who sent me here to pass upon my public acts during the past four years.

Since the house adjourned last year I have had an opportunity of visiting Canada. I was at Ottawa when the Legislature was opened, and when the Fenian excitement prevailed. I was also at Malone and along the line; but nothing gave me greater pleasure during my visit than the manner in which the Ottawa Parliament was opened. I passed through Canada and looked upon its fertile fields, its vast resources, and its great commerce—its hardy and thrifty population—its noble cities replete with energy and enterprize.

It is only requisite for any one to pass through Canada to see that it is a country with which we ought to be proud to form a close alliance. I passed into the United States, and on my return I had the honor of meeting at Portland the Provincial Secretary and Mr. Archibald, and we had a very pleasant time as far as St. John, and then we went up to Fredericton, and whilst they were in communication with the members of the New Brunswick Government, I drove around the little capital of the sister Province. I was delighted to see so fine a country, such fine residences, and so highly an intelligent people. Previous to going to the United States, I had taken my passage in the Cunard steamer for the 19th of July, but had no idea that I would have had the honor of travelling in company with the delegates to England. It appears, however, that when I got on board I found four or five gentlemen from Nova Scotia and my hon. friend from East Halifax as well. We had a very pleasant passage across the Atlantic. I went ashore at Cork and passed through the old land, and then I left for London, where I saw my hon. friends at the Alexandra Hotel very comfortably situated, though it is true they appeared a little disappointed at the non arrival of their Canadian friends.

As regards the present question, I will take

the whole responsibility of voting against this resolution. I must confess that I have a very high respect for the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, but we ought not to put ourselves in the position of the people of New Brunswick. Suppose we carried that resolution, what spectacle would the house present? Suppose the people, through mistaken notions, and by the influence of the press, undertook to turn out the majority of their present representatives that are in favor of union, and suppose that in the course of eleven months they reversed their verdict, and sent their old friends to the wall, what a spectacle we would present to the world! If we voted for the amendment we would only stultify ourselves—make an exhibition of ourselves, that I trust for the sake of our self-respect we will never be guilty of. After the very able speech delivered by the Provincial Secretary, in which he reviewed the whole subject from its inception up to the present time, and presented the constitutional aspect so clearly and forcibly, that no man can fail to understand it; after the able and elaborate address of the hon. member for South Colchester, (Mr. Archibald), who is so well qualified to speak on this matter, I feel that it is altogether superfluous for me to say much on this question. Indeed these speeches must have fully convinced the house of the unconstitutionality of the course proposed by the hon. member for Guysboro', and of the false position in which the majority would place this Legislature if they supported his amendment.

Speech of Mr. Annand.

MR. ANNAND said—As no other gentleman seems inclined to continue the debate, and having been frequently referred to by hon. members opposite, in terms inviting reply, I feel that I would ill discharge my duty to my constituents and myself if I did not at once meet some of the arguments addressed to the house. And in so doing, allow me to refer to the last speaker first. The hon. member for West Halifax, Mr. Tobin, alluded to my sojourn in the mother country, and playfully suggested that my visits to Kew Gardens and Park, and dinners at the Star and Garter, had made me insensible to the force of the arguments in favor of the change in our institutions which he and his associates are so anxious to accomplish. And in the same spirit I reply that I had the pleasure, besides seeing my hon. friend at those celebrated localities of meeting nearly all the Delegates in those classic gardens of Cremorne, and of visiting the hon. member himself at "Half-moon street"—a very suggestive name, but I hope not an appropriate one in regard to the hallucinations with which he appears afflicted, as to the rights of the people of this country upon the question now under consideration. The hon. member seems to think that after seven months' sojourn in the metropolis of the world, surrounded by elevating objects, and enjoying the society of the foremost people in the universe, I should have come back with larger views, and prepared to support this scheme of Confederation. Sir, I did not go to England to enlarge my views, in presence of which this Canadian scheme dwarfs into insignificance; I did not go there to learn the doctrines which I hold respecting the Or-

ganization of the Empire—to make the nation to which we all acknowledge a common allegiance fearless of aggression, and invulnerable in Britain's vast domain. I had read up to that point years before, and although the proposition to make the Empire one and indivisible may be ridiculed here, the time may come, and I venture to predict will come, when justice will be done to the few, perhaps the very few, who preferred the organization to the dismemberment of the Empire. Sir, we now belong to the greatest nation of these modern times, and what more do we require? Union with Canada—an insignificant portion of a confederacy of four millions of people, unable to protect themselves from aggression and conquest? No; what we should aim at is the consolidation of the Empire—the elevation of the colonist to the same status as an Englishman; and by giving us a voice in the great assembly of the nation, make every Nova Scotian feel, and every Englishman feel, too, that we are not inferiors but equals, and equally entitled with themselves to the honors and distinctions of the Crown.

These were my feelings when I went to England, and they are my feelings now. I belong to the greatest Confederacy the world ever saw—to England, with her fifty Colonies in every part of the globe—to a nation with two hundred and fifty millions of people, and London for our capital. Gentlemen opposite talk of the expense, of the taxation for defence, that would result from representation in the Imperial Parliament. But have they ever thought of the enormous taxes we will have to pay when we are Confederated, when we will have to provide means to erect fortifications and support our own army and navy? It is right, sir, that we should pay such reasonable sum as we can afford for our defence. We must pay to somebody, and the question for us to consider is to whom that contribution should be made. We might pay to the United States, which is able to protect us, but this could only be done at the sacrifice of our allegiance, and is therefore out of the question. We pay to Canada, but it is evident that, with her long and exposed frontier, she is unable to defend herself, and therefore is in no condition, even after the most lavish expenditure of money, to protect us. But I would pay to neither. I would pay to England—not pound for pound with the people of the British Islands, with their vast accumulations of property and concentration of wealth—but such sum as a comparatively poor country, with a sparse population, could afford to pay. With these views I visited the mother country; I cherish them still, and will continue to do so until they are crushed out by tyranny and oppression, in preference to those which are said to animate some gentlemen on these benches who favor Confederation as the readiest mode of annexing these Colonies to the United States.

Our merchants have been referred to—and who more competent to judge of the merits of such a measure? Who more acute and more likely to arrive at a sound judgment? These men, by patient industry, have built up fortunes in the community, and what position have they taken in reference to this question? On the seaboard line of Halifax, from the Dockyard to Moren's wharf, not more than

half a dozen can be found to support the Confederation of the Provinces. The wealth, the stamina, the bone and sinew of the country are against this scheme of Union. One hon. gentleman amused me by asking what was there among us to satisfy the ambition of our young men. What more will there be when we are confederated? Gentlemen talk as if Canada was a foreign country, and as if, at present, we could not go there and embark in any branch of business whenever it may suit us to do so. Is it not notorious that the young men of Canada are crossing by hundreds and thousands to the United States, in much larger numbers than from the seaboard Provinces? Our Province is too small now for some people, but I would like to know the country under the sun where men, with steady industry and strict economy, can more readily acquire independence. My hon. friend from West Halifax was a young man himself when he first came here, and the country would appear to have been large enough for him to acquire, in a comparatively short time, a handsome fortune and a position which we all hope he may live long to enjoy. And if disposed, I could point to dozens of that gentleman's fellow-countryman, who at no distant period landed upon our shores, poor but industrious men, who have become wealthy, and who, with my hon. colleague, have no reason to complain that the country in which it was made was too small.

Reference has been made to the franchise law, and I am not sorry it was made. I was one of the Government that introduced the bill, and Mr. Archibald and the Provincial Secretary, now colleagues, were the two antagonists who fought out the question in this Assembly. The former gentleman was then Attorney General,—he was the father of the bill:—he pressed its acceptance upon the Government, but I am willing to take my share of the responsibility attaching to a measure, which if had the majority opposite have it in their power to repeal. If the franchise act is, as they say, distasteful, why not bring in a bill to repeal it? If such a bill were introduced I would allow the gentleman who originated the term "gutter men" and his new friend, the Provincial Secretary to fight it out and would not oppose it. I am willing to try out this question upon the old franchise, and see if the majority of the men who returned this Assembly are or are not in favour of Confederation. The gentleman who preceded me took passage to England in the same steamer as that in which I went. I enjoyed his society during the voyage, but did he visit England as his position entitled him to. He is a prominent supporter of the Government, perhaps the most influential in their ranks. He is beside a merchant of standing in the community, and to the shame of the Government he it told that neither he nor any other merchant was appointed on the delegation. Five lawyers and a doctor were selected to change the constitution of the Province. No one identified with the commerce of the country, its fisheries or agriculture need apply—and the lawyers and the doctor had it all to themselves. My hon. friend has fully earned his position—and why, I ask, was he treated, as I know he was, first by the Government who ignored his

claims when here, and then by the Delegates on the other side. We have heard of the festivities at Stowe and other places, but who ever heard of that gentleman being included in the invitations? And if not, why not? I think that those gentleman having secured his support, the least they could have done was to have paid him that attention to which his talents and position fully entitled him. It has been asked, what position will we be in if we carry this amendment? We will be situated just in this way: that while the result is trembling in the balance, before the bill is assented to by the Commons, we can telegraph across the Atlantic to say: "The Parliament of Nova Scotia have declared the right of the people to speak on the subject." When that message arrived all action would be stayed and the Imperial Government would await the deliberate opinion of the people of this country. We will then have done justice to the man who sent us here—who did not give us authority to change the constitution, but to make laws under the constitution which we now enjoy. The hon. gentleman who spoke first this evening (Mr. Shannon) alluded to the union of Scotland and England as a case analogous to ours;—but let me point out one or two distinctions. England and Scotland had been at war for centuries, and they formed parts of the same island. Scotland gave England a King, she was without colonies, and by the offer to share the trade of the larger kingdom had every inducement to union with England. These were the arguments addressed to the Scottish mind, and we must all admit their force; but what has Canada to offer us? Does she offer us additional trade with colonies from which we were previously excluded? Have we ever been at war with her? Are we part of the same Island? And instead of our giving her king will she not lord it over us? Is her geographical position like ours? Nature evidently formed the Island, now England and Scotland to be under one government, but with a narrow strip of land connecting the Maritime Provinces with Canada, in many places not more than twenty-six to thirty miles wide, is it not evident that geography protests against the union of Provinces, whose railways and telegraphs in time of war could be severed in fifty places, and all communication intercepted. We are asked to be united to a country which is frozen up five months in the year, which has no trade to offer us of which we cannot avail ourselves now. More than that, Scotland went into the union with the advantage in a pecuniary point of view, and we go into Confederation with the money part of the arrangement all in favour of Canada—so that the cases instead of being parallel, are entirely opposite. We being a maritime and consuming people, will consume, man for man, \$3 for every \$1 consumed by Lower Canadians, and more than even the better class of Upper Canadians. In the face of these facts I think the hon. gentleman has not shown that the measure is desirable from a commercial point of view, nor yet in relation to defence. Reference was also made to the banner which I should hereafter display. I am not prepared to elevate any banner but the one we now have. I prefer to remain as I am until a change is forced upon me. I am opposed to

annexation to the United States as well as to union with Canada; but I think it may be easily shown that every argument that can be found in favour of the smaller Confederation would apply with greater force to the larger. Let me, while upon this branch of the subject, read an extract from the case of the Maritime Provinces, and I will not shrink from defending every line and word that that document contains:—

"The terms offered to the Maritime Provinces are far more liberal than those grudgingly yielded by the Canadians. Let us contrast them. By Gen. Banks's bill Nova Scotia would at once secure free trade with thirty-four millions of people, whose markets are accessible at all seasons, instead of with three millions, who are frozen up for half the year, and in summer can only be got at by a long tedious river navigation. They would participate in the American fishing bounties so long as these last. They would secure protection abroad, which the Canadians cannot give them. Capital would flow in from Boston and New York to work their mines and employ their water-power. Canada has none to spare. Turning from material to political interests, how would matters stand? Nova Scotia would enter the Union as a State clothed with the accustomed rights, and guarded by recognized securities. She would select her own governors, judges and senators, uncontrolled by any Federal authority. All these, by the Quebec scheme, are to be selected for her by the ruling parties at Ottawa; and, while she elected all her own state legislators and officers, the Supreme Court should protect her in case of collision or encroachment."

"With all the temptations offered us at Washington, we ask simply to be let alone, or we ask to be folded to our mother's bosom, and not cast out into the wilderness of untried experiments and political speculation. Nova Scotia says to England, as Ruth said to Naomi, "Where you go we will go; your people shall be our people." This love and affection spring from a thousand sources that we need not linger to describe, but which it would be a fatal mistake to suppose can ever be transferred. You cannot endorse our hearts or our allegiances over to the Canadians as you would a note of hand, or invest a village on the Ottawa with the historic interest and associations that cluster around London."

These lines were penned in London.—I endorse every word of them here and continue to avow that every material advantage offered by Confederation with Canada is offered to us with much greater inducement by Confederation with the United States. But I am opposed to both. I have never sat down to calculate the advantages which annexation would bring to us. I never had any desire to do so, but have deliberately shrunk from the task, because I am too much attached to British institutions. I prefer the British form of government and will not yield it up until I am compelled, but I cannot shut my eyes to the commercial advantages of closer connection with the United States while my sympathies are all with England.—Mr. Shannon said that he disliked the name Canada as applied to the new Dominion. In that particular he and I entirely agree, but it would not have done to have called it *British America*, for the time is coming, owing to the Confederation scheme, when we will not be British, when we will be nothing but Americans. The change of the names of the Provinces shews that we are to be made a Colony of Canada, and I should like to hear some gentleman rise and reply on that branch of the question. But the hon. gentleman has defended the scheme prepared in

England as superior to the scheme laid before us by the delegates to Quebec. It will be remembered that the Quebec scheme left the Provinces concurrent jurisdiction in reference to the fisheries, but by the London arrangement the matter has been removed from the control of the local legislatures so that an agricultural country having no immediate interest in the fisheries and possessing a tonnage only equal to half that of Nova Scotia, is to control an interest deeply affecting the people of the four Maritime Provinces. The government of Canada, in the hope of conciliating the American government, last year compelled us to give up our fisheries for the paltry consideration of 50 cents per ton while a tax of \$2 per barrel was imposed upon our mackerel. What security have we that they will not surrender our entire interests in this particular to the Americans? And who can doubt that the agricultural counties in the rear with their large representation in the Confederate Commons, will receive far more consideration than the seaside Provinces with their handful of members?

The hon. member for South Colchester, Mr. Archibald, with singular inconsistency, says in one breath we must be a new nation, and in the next that our relations with the Mother Country will not be changed by Confederation. I join issue with him upon both points. We want no new nationality. We are well enough as we are, and although I think it would have been wise to have legislatively united the Maritime Provinces in one Government under the Crown, I cannot concur with those who wish to make these Provinces independent of the Mother Country.

We all know how the American Colonies were lost to England, which probably never would have happened had the sage advice of such men as Adam Smith been taken, and a voice given to the old Colonies in the imposition of taxes and the making of laws. These States would now have been a part of the British Empire, and that Empire would now be invincible against the entire universe. What power would dare to assail the Empire if these, the now two greatest nations in the world, were one. Our true policy I contend, and our duty as British subjects are not to dis sever the Empire, but to share the fortunes of England, to cling to, and, if need be, to defend her. I differ entirely from those who advocate the dismemberment of the Empire, and I believe this Confederation scheme to be the beginning of the decline and fall of that great country of which we are all so fond. How long will the West Indies be retained when we are gone? And will not the cry then come up for new nationalities and independence from the Australian Colonies and the Cape. New Zealand and the smaller Colonies will catch the infection, and when all is gone this now powerful and noble Empire will be reduced to two small islands. Against this fatal policy, the inevitable result as I believe of this Confederation scheme, I sincerely and solemnly protest. It is said that in twenty years our

population will be eight or ten millions, enough to maintain our independence as a nation, but we may be assured that by that time the population of the United States, recruited from the old world, most of whom prefer to go there, will more likely be sixty-eight or eighty million, making the discrepancy between that country and ours greater instead of less than now. I repeat what I said last night, that these Maritime Provinces must belong to either England or the United States,—we cannot belong to Canada, nor can we form a new nation. You may call the Confederation, that is to be, monarchical, with a Governor-General at its head, but it must become a Republic.

Look at the clause of the bill which refers to the appointment of Senators: 72 of them are to be created in one batch for life,—and what more likely than a dead lock between them and the House of Commons? And if so how is it to be overcome? I never was in favour of the Upper House being elective, as far as regards Nova Scotia, while our institutions were monarchical; but under Confederation I should say, by all means let them go out in rotation, so that that branch may be influenced by public opinion. Is it not evident that when the embryo republic is fairly in operation, if the local Legislatures, pressed by their various constituencies, should for instance, propose that the Lieut. Governor, instead of being nominated by the Governor-General, should be elected by the people—and I can fancy that such a proposal might be made—at its first meeting here, the conflict that would in such a case ensue between the various legislative bodies would result in serious collision—perhaps smash the whole confederacy into pieces. Suppose a resolution were adopted declaring that the senators should be elected—and I may here say that such a change would be a misfortune to some persons who have stood for a day on the hustings and only secured a handful of votes—you will then be creating not a monarchy, but a republic—a poor imitation of that of Mexico, to be crumpled up whenever the American eagle chooses to grasp it in its talons.

Our relations with England will not, we are told, be changed by Confederation. Were that statement correct, half my objections would be removed. But what are the facts? At the present moment the humblest Nova Scotian, the poorest man in the land, if he has a grievance to redress, if he has received injustice at the hands of the local government, has the privilege of appeal and laying his complaint at the foot of the throne. That is the position now. But the moment the Confederation Bill becomes law, all communication between the people of Nova Scotia and the Home Government will be effectually cut off, and instead of appealing to his Queen at Windsor, he will have to go cap in hand to the Governor General at Ottawa. We are now a colony of Great Britain, but under Confederation we will be a dependency of Canada. And yet the learned member for Colchester says our position in relation to England will be the same!

The hon. gentleman referred to a remark made by me last evening, respecting a tyrannical majority, and commented on the apparent inconsistency of an observation in reference to the mode in which Confederation was carried in the neighbouring Province. How was the measure carried there? Mr. Tilley, man like as he always is, appealed to the people and was defeated. I give him credit for the ingenuity by which he converted a minority into a majority, but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that but for the unconstitutional action of the Governor, who browbeat the Council by whom he was surrounded, using the Queen's name unfairly, taking advantage of Fenian threats, holding out the idea that Confederation was the only means of procuring the Intercolonial Railway, the expenditure on which would make everybody rich, and make New Brunswick a great country,—only for these influences, even Mr. Tilley's clever strategy and perseverance would have failed. The history of that period has yet to be written, but I do not hesitate to say that if New Brunswick had not been operated upon in a way anything but creditable to the chief actors in that Province, I do not believe that the resolution of last session would have been adopted.

The hon. member for South Colchester remarked that if ever there was a period when the Americans had an opportunity of coming in and buying up the Provinces it was the present time, when we are on the eve of an election. I can fancy an easier mode than by going to the polls to corrupt the country. It might, perhaps, be easier to buy a majority of this House in favour of Confederation than to purchase a majority of the electors; and when the time comes, if it should ever come, for buying up not only this Province, but the entire Confederacy a very different system will be pursued from that which the hon. gentleman suggests—it is so much easier buying wholesale than by retail.

American diplomatists, with their ingenuity and with the large means of corruption in their hands, will say, "Come in and enjoy fellowship with us. You are only four millions of people, we are thirty-four millions. Come and have free trade with us; we are your natural customers; there are no markets like ours. Our taxation is enormous, but in ten years it will be reduced one half; and the increase of our population in twenty years will extinguish it altogether." That is the way in which these Colonies may be dealt with when confederated; and this may be a good reason why the name Canada has been substituted for that of British America. Mr. Archibald referred to Governor Banks—our ally, as he is pleased to term him. Is Mr. Banks in favor of the organization of the Empire?

Mr. ARCHIBALD.—The hon. member is alone upon that question.

Mr. ANNAND.—Even if I was, I would not be discouraged. It is not the first time I was in a minority of one, and I had not to wait long before the friends who left me for the moment were forced to admit that I was right. I was in

a minority of one—I stood alone—at a celebrated meeting last winter at which that hon. gentleman was present, and if my advice had been taken, as it ought to have been, it would not have been in the power of the authorities on both sides of the water to say that the leaders of the Opposition, as well as the leaders of the Government were all in favor of Confederation.

The hon. member took exception to my calculations and referred to the Hon. George Brown as a great authority. I admit the authority. That gentleman is one of the ablest public men in Canada, and is rarely wrong on questions of finance, nor is he far wrong in the figures referred to although there is an error of \$13,829, the total amount we are to receive being \$380,000 instead of \$393,829 as stated in the *Globe*, when our population reaches 400,000. But the hon. member for Colchester is, or was, a great authority on finance. The Provincial Secretary, his former opponent, but now his leader, dubbed him the "Figure Man" of the late Government—that gentleman is very dexterous in boxing figures, to borrow an expression from the other side, but, somehow or other, he is rarely right in his calculations. The Financial Secretary will remember the gloomy forebodings of the hon. member for South Colchester in 1866 and 1866,—that we were on the eve of a financial crisis—and his confident and reiterated predictions that there would be a large falling off in the revenue in both those years, notwithstanding which the revenue has largely increased in both of them and our financial position materially improved,—and I am glad of it.

We hear a good deal about able financiers, but in most cases the men who earn that name are those who can convert a deficit into a surplus—the Galts and men of that stamp—who boast of an increase of revenue over expenditure when the credit of the country is at its lowest ebb, and the Government is forced to borrow money at ruinous rates of interest. The hon. member for Colchester has favored us with a long array of figures from the *Toronto Globe*, in which it is attempted to be shown that the Maritime Provinces have received more than their share of money, and Canada far less, by the change in the financial arrangements. The calculation of the *Globe* is ingenious, and may have its effect in Canada, in censuring the people of that Province against the Government to which Mr. Brown is determinedly opposed, but it can hardly impose upon any one in this country. The papers on the table show that our Customs revenue alone increased \$372,000 since 1863, the year selected as the basis of the amount to be paid for the support of the local Governments. That amount has been expended in enlarging our humane establishments, upon education, roads and bridges, ferries, &c. Where would the \$372,000 have gone if we were that year confederated with Canada?—Where but into the Canadian treasury, and so with every increase of revenue in all time to come. I know it will be said that our surplus revenue will form a "common fund." True, the fund may be common, but the question to

us to ask ourselves is: How much are we to get back when the money is in the Federal chest, for local purposes? It is vain to deceive ourselves on this point—the Confederation Bill settles the question.

Whatever may be our wants and necessities, every farthing required for local purposes over and above the 80 cents a head and the \$60,000 a year, must be raised by direct taxation, and by direct taxation alone. My hon friend from Shelburne referred this evening to the coal mines, upon which we might, if severely pressed, have raised additional revenue, but even that privilege accorded by the Quebec scheme, of imposing an export duty, has been taken away from the local and handed over to the general government. We give Canada the power to tax one of our chief exports; and we are then asked to be thankful for a few cents additional per head. Let me give the member for South Colchester another calculation, one to which I challenge a reply. I am now addressing myself to the people of this country, who, if not familiar with the teachings of Hallam and Blackstone and other constitutional authorities, which have been quoted against their liberties, well understand transactions in money in which their pecuniary interests are involved.

Last year we gave in round numbers \$800,000 for local purposes—mark, for strictly local purposes. Now let us see what we are to receive under Confederation:—

And first, there is the 80 cents a head.	\$364,688
Then there is the grant for expenses of the Local Government.	69,000
And lastly, there is to be a further allowance of 80 cents a head un'til our population reaches 400,000, which I throw in, although we are not likely to receive it until the decennial census takes place in 1871.	55,314
	<u>\$380,000</u>

Add to this the local revenue for the mines, crown lands, &c., which I put down at	155,000
--	---------

And we have a total revenue of \$535,000 with which to pay \$800,000, the sum appropriated for local objects last year, showing a deficiency of \$265,000 the very first year, and before the high tariff of Canada, the stamp duties, the newspaper tax, and the other ingenious expedients for raising money are brought into operation. I have said that the total revenue from all sources will be \$535,000. Let us see how far this would go towards the local expenses of the country. We last year granted—

For Education.	\$183,595
Board of Works, for services which will still be chargeable on our local revenue.	79,520
Roads and Bridges,	274,228
Legislative expenses,	46,420
	<u>\$583,763</u>

Here, then, we have four items absorbing the entire revenue you will have under Confederation, leaving unprovided for the following services, which were last year estimated to cost—agriculture, \$14,000; crown lands, \$18,500; mines department, \$17,595; packets and ferries within the province, \$11,070; miscellaneous

\$46,631; navigation securities, \$80,000; making a total of \$187,793, besides salaries, coroners inquests, public printing, &c. This enormous deficiency can only be made up in one way—in the way pointed out in the bill—in the way described by the hon member's own authority—the Hon. George Brown himself—by direct taxation on the people of this country. In the face of these facts—and I challenge their investigation—an attempt is made to influence the house by quoting some paltry figures from an article in the *Globe*, which, after making a show of opposition to the financial arrangements, finishes off with a declaration that "with all these faults we like the scheme."

The hon member has spoken in contemptuous terms of our "foreign allies." Sir, we have no allies but the people of this country, whose "upturned faces" he has ridiculed, and whose wishes he has the hardihood to despise. But it ill becomes that gentleman, so lately in every questionable company, to lecture us upon our allies. Who, when in London a few weeks ago, were his friends and conferees? In what respect is Mr. Cartier, the Attorney General for Canada East, who shouldered his musket and afterwards ran away, when Lower Canada was in rebellion in 1838, a better man than Mr. Banks? Then there is D'Arcy McGee, of cabbage garden notoriety; Galt, who headed an annexation movement in Montreal, when the Parliament buildings were burnt down and the Queen's Representative was pelted through the streets. Another delegate is a born Yankee; the fourth is said to be looking to Washington; and the fifth, the chief scribe at the Quebec Conference, opposed the Union of the Provinces two or three years ago, because, in his then opinion, it would lead to separation from the mother country. These are the allies, the sworn bosom friends of the hon member, who has dared to more than insinuate that my friend Mr. Howe and myself were in league with foreign allies and endeavouring to subvert British institutions. The hon member has sneeringly said that my leader, Mr. Howe, and my follower, Mr. McDonald, spent months in London endeavouring to convince the British public. I reply to that gentleman, who was once a respected leader himself, but is now the humble follower of the Provincial Secretary, that we did largely influence the public mind and shake confidence in the Confederation scheme; and I had it from the lips of gentlemen in England, who did not share our opinions, that we had done much to educate the British public in respect to the position, resources and rights of these Maritime Provinces. We may not have succeeded in reaching the hearts of the Lords, for it was not to be expected that we would to any large extent operate upon the sympathies of a body so far removed from popular influences. We may not have succeeded in reaching the convictions of a majority of the Commons, but what opportunity had we? As every one knows, until Parliament meets, very few of the members are in town—they are scattered all over the country. We sent in our case to Earl

Carnarvon, but when the bill was read a first time the correspondence was not on the table, and the Queen only had the bill submitted to her the day before it was introduced.

As I have said, on the third reading in the Lords, a large number of Peers withdrew, leaving only nine present, when one noble Lord had finished urging our case. Then it was sent to the Commons, and read a second time on the following day, contrary to the practice which has always prevailed there of giving at least a week between the first and second readings for the consideration of any important measure. So rapid was the action of the under Secretary for the Colonies, presed on by those who are now pressing it on us, that the papers on which the members could alone form the judgment were not in their hands until the second morning, and one member stated that he had only time to read that clause of the bill, which refers to the Intercolonial Railway before the division on the second reading was taken. This reminds me that the member for Colchester has turned my attention to the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. It is well known that a guarantee was obtained for that work in 1862 through the exertions of Messrs. Howe and Tilley, and but for the bad faith of the Canadians the railroad might have been finished to-day and working, as to whether working profitably or not, I will not undertake to say. He says I complained of the delegates getting only three millions instead of four, and further, that four millions were not asked for. If so then we were deceived by the press, by the *Canadian News* among others, for it was plainly stated that that was the sum and the impression was confirmed by the fact that Mr. Fleming had estimated that amount as necessary, and our own experience of the estimates and cost of railways gave us no reason to think it could not be built for less. We are blamed for remonstrating against the guarantee,—we were willing to remonstrate against anything and everything to save the interests which were entrusted to us. Would I sell the liberties of my country for a few miles of railroad, even if half the trade of the world were to come over it? Would I say to my constituents "you have elected me, I respect you for your intelligence, but you are not competent to express an opinion on a matter that will sweep away your revenues and place unlimited powers of taxation in a body which you cannot control?" I was going to say that for all the roads in the world I would not consent to that, and we therefore thought it right to use every means to destroy the scheme, and as the road is said to be an essential part of it, and a necessity for Canada, we could take the chances for the future until she came to her senses, and there is no doubt that ere long she would have had to come to us and asked us to build our share. There was another reason, for our suggesting that a guarantee for the larger sum should not be given,—one of the most powerful influences at work in favor of Confederation is the organization known as the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, whose chairman, Watkins, made the statement in the House of Commons that the measure had

been discussed at every polling booth in Nova Scotia. It is the interest of that company to increase the value of their road from Quebec to Riviere du Loup, and more especially to secure the expenditure of the three millions, and get the entire line into their hands. We were apprehensive that the same system of jobbing which extracted ten millions of money from British capitalists some years ago would be repeated over again, and we thought it only right and proper to give a word of caution to the British people.

There was another reason for my action also, and I mention it in the hearing of gentlemen who have known for years the opinions which I held in respect to this railway;—that was that the road, passing through a harsh and forbidding country, having grades too steep for a large and profitable traffic, would not bring to us the advantages that have been promised. There was no reason to believe that a large amount of traffic would be brought to the harbor of Halifax and if we had had any doubts upon that point, Mr. Fleming's report, made after 10 or 12 routes had been explored, shows that the Intercolonial Railway might be tapped at Danville and the traffic diverted by the North American and European line which could carry more cheaply, because the snow does not fall so deeply on its track, while the grades were lighter, and the distance between Montreal and Halifax considerably less. When I read that report, and found further that at St. John and not at Halifax the trade was likely to centre, I must confess that my interest in the Intercolonial Railway was largely abated. I trust therefore that I have answered the hon. gentleman's banter upon this point.

I was in England for several months and had an opportunity during that time of discussing the measure with able and intelligent men, and down to the hour I left, whenever I had a chance of stating the actual state of affairs in Nova Scotia, when I told them that at the only three elections held since the scheme was mooted the measure had been condemned, and when I claimed for our people the right to speak on it, I did not find one who did not say, "you are right; and your people should have the privilege you claim for them." That I believe would have been the feeling of the House of Commons but for the misrepresentations of such men as Mr. Watkins who knows the Colonies well, and who is almost as familiar with the state of public opinion in the Provinces as with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, of which he is the Chairman and Managing Director.

I do not wonder, sir, when such men as Mr. Watkins and Sir John Pakington made the statements which came from their lips to a body of gentlemen utterly ignorant of the facts of the case, that the House was misled. But there is time enough yet to avert this great wrong if members would do their duty to-night, and claim for their constituencies the right they should possess. The tidings would be wafted across the Atlantic with lightning speed that the action of the gentlemen professing to represent Nova Scotia in the Delegation had been condemned,

the measure would be postponed, and our country would be saved. (Cheers.)

Speech of Mr. Blanchard.

Mr. BLANCHARD said: The observations I have to make on this question will be compressed into a very small compass, and shall be chiefly confined to the point which has been brought before the house by the hon. member for Guysborough. I think the constitutional point connected with this amendment has been so thoroughly discussed by those who preceded me that I need not dwell on it at any length—in fact that I need not touch it all. I shall not refer to the remarks of the hon. member for East Halifax, except that when I heard the hon. member drop the unfortunate observation "that it was easier to buy a majority of the members of this house than a majority of the electors" it grated harshly upon my ears. I am glad that the hon. member subsequently withdrew so unwarrantable an insinuation. I think it came with an exceedingly ill grace from the hon. member to make any insinuation against any member of this house of which he claims to be the father. I think it proper to state in my place that I look upon this Legislature as much above corruption as any Legislature that I have ever heard of, and every hon. member composing it as much above corruption as the hon. gentleman himself; and it will not do for him to say to this house or any future one that it could be approached with bribes; or that there is any government who would dare to "buy" gentlemen with the object of effecting some purpose. Such a charge could not be supported for an instant in this house. Gentlemen in it, I am glad to say, have proved themselves above the influence of 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. LODGE—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 97,500 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 in-

to 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 no 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. BOURNOUT.—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 ere 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 against a union which has been carried in spite of all his efforts, and has proved to be the greatest blessing ever conferred upon this country.

Speech of Hon. Prov. Secretary.

DR. TUPPER then rose and said.—I undertook to show the House that every possible means had been taken to familiarize the country with the question under discussion, and to ascertain as far as possible the sentiments of the people, and in making that statement I was met by the rejoinder from the hon. member from East Halifax, that although I had discussed in general terms the principle of union in the adjoining Province, and in various places in this Province, I had not proposed such a plan of union as that devised at Quebec. If the hon. member would refer to the *New Brunswick* newspaper, in which my address was fully reported, and to the same address which was delivered by invitation in different portions of this Province, he would find that I propounded just such a scheme of union as was arranged at Quebec and in Westminster Palace Hotel. The hon. member then challenged me to produce one title of evidence that Mr. Howe had ever committed himself to the question of Confederation. I do not intend to wander over the two volumes containing the name of the hon. member for East Halifax on the title page, and on almost every

leaf of which the reader will find that Mr. Howe's claim to position in this country has been largely rested upon the fact that at all times and on all occasions he advocated the great question of union; but I may trouble the House to read two passages, which, I am sure, will convince the intelligent people of this country that Mr. Howe has pledged himself to the Confederation of the Provinces. I shall refer to a public letter written by him as far back as 1849, when the British American League, of which Hon. George Moffat was Chairman, undertook to suggest important constitutional changes. Mr. Moffat was under the impression that it was a legitimate course of dealing with questions of great public import for public assemblages to be called together, and for the people at public meetings to express their sentiments; but what did the present champion of the people's rights say—the man who has presented himself in London as the exponent of the public sentiment of this country because he has held some public meetings and got up a few petitions? He wrote a letter in 1849 to the President of the League, in which he dilated on the impropriety of any public man undertaking to deal with great public questions in any other place except in the legislature of his country, and when he was clothed with constitutional authority. Here is the letter written under his own hand in which he condemns such public assemblages as he has held in this Province.

"A Confederation of the Colonies may be the desire of your Convention. If so, the object is legitimate; but it must be pursued by *legitimate means*. Believe me, it can only be wisely attained by and through the Provincial Legislatures, not by self elected societies acting independently and in defiance of them. Suppose to-morrow propositions were submitted to the Lower Colonies for a Legislative Union or general Confederation. If made by the Government and Parliament of Canada, they would be treated with deference and respect. If made by a party in opposition, they would not be for a moment entertained."

Here you find Mr. Howe telling the President of one of the most important conventions that ever assembled in Canada, that the course he was pursuing was improper—that he had no right to deal with such matters outside of Parliament. This is the same man who has been perambulating the Province, and undertaking to say that in this free country, where we have been entrusted with British institutions by which the public sentiment can be legitimately expressed, what was the legitimate mode in 1849 should no longer be pursued in 1867. In the paragraph I have read you find the most unqualified contempt heaped upon the course which himself and the gentlemen associated with him have pursued. Having shewn you his opinion as to the mode in which this measure should be treated, let me now explain to you the origin of the phrase "new nationality," so often quoted in the discussion of this question. If we go back to 1849, we actually find that the phrase originated with no less a person than Joseph Howe. In the same letter to the

President of the British American League, he said:

"We desire free trade among all the Provinces, under *one national flag*, with one coin, one measure, one tariff, one post office. We feel that the courts, the press, the educational institutions of North America would be elevated by union; that intercommunication by railroads, telegraphs and steamboats would be promoted; and that if such a combination of interests were achieved wisely, and with proper guards, the foundations of a *great nation* in friendly connection with the mother country would be laid on an indestructible basis."

If in 1849 British America could aspire to a national flag, are not these Provinces at the present day equally qualified to have a common flag? Sir, in this year of 1867 his successors have accomplished that which with him was only an idea and a dream, and instead of receiving from himself and his friends that praise and encouragement to which we are entitled, we are attacked for having adopted those principles thus early propounded and thus strongly advocated through his entire life, as traitors to the constitution of our country, and as having forgotten what we owe to our own people. Let me turn again to his statement in 1851 when the question of union came before the Legislature on a resolution moved by Mr. Johnston, his public opponent, and when, with his incapacity to follow any one but himself, he propounded his views on the organization of the Empire; but did he say anything in favour of a Confederation? Read his speech, and you will find him dealing with the question in terms of the most fervid eloquence. He then propounded what he considered the best scheme viz., representation in the Imperial Parliament; but if he could not get that, then he would propose this:—

"By a Federal Union of the Colonies we should have something like the neighboring republic; and if I saw nothing better, I should say at once, let us keep our local Legislatures, and have a President and central Congress for all the higher and more external relations of the united Provinces. * * * Under a Federal Union we should form a large and prosperous nation, lying between the other two branches of the British family, and our duty would evidently be to keep them both at peace."

Now I ask the hon. member opposite if, with these documents published to the world under his own signature he is still ready to tell the people of Nova Scotia that Mr. Howe has never advocated a Federal Union of the Provinces.

But the hon. member for North Colchester (Mr. McLellan) undertook to prove to this House the extraordinary proposition that, when Mr. Howe, as a public man, moved a resolution in this Legislature declaring that so great were the advantages of Union between this Province and Canada, that he asked for authority to hold a conference on the subject, all he really desired was to get rid of the question altogether—that at the conference the matter was found entirely impracticable, and was accordingly set at rest as it was intended to be. I have heard a good

many extraordinary statements fall from the mouths of gentlemen, but when the hon. member tells you that a public man would pursue such a deceitful course, then he has placed the person whom he professes to follow in a position so abject as to excite the pity and contempt of every respectable and intelligent man. But I have under my hand that which will give the refutation of the charge which the hon. member has brought against Mr. Howe. When Mr. Howe pronounced this resolution he believed in it, and was sincere if ever a public man was in relation to any measure. After this conference was held in Canada what do we find? At Port Robinson, he addressed a large body of Canadians, and among other things said:

"He looked forward hopefully to the time when the great Provinces of Canada would be connected with the Provinces below, and when a man would feel that to be a British American was to be the citizen of a country which included all those fertile lands, all those inexhaustible fisheries, all this immense marine,—carrying to all seas the flag of Old England, if they would let us; if not, the flag of British America."

Can the hon. member for North Colchester, when he hears such language as that, still assert that Mr. Howe was desirous of defeating Union? In that speech from which I have quoted we find him eloquently and forcibly urging the same view he had so often previously advocated with all the energy and talents he possessed.

The hon. member for Yarmouth made an observation yesterday which I forgot to notice at the time. He said that no person in this country desired this union of the colonies except a few politicians who wanted office. I have given the House some evidence in dealing not only with this, but other public questions, that I have a higher ambition than of consulting my own individual interest or of holding office. So far from looking upon this question in this light, from the first hour I felt it my duty to deal with it I have reposed that trust and confidence in the people which I felt they deserved at my hands. I have put my hands to this work, not with the conviction that it was a question upon which a Minister should peril any majority he might have by a reckless procedure—that he should make an unnecessary and unconstitutional appeal to the people. I have never said that the influences of party passions and prejudices, and the introduction of other questions which are inseparable from an appeal to the people, might not jeopardize this question if submitted hastily to the country; but at the same time I have felt that this question, discussed as it has been down to a recent period by all classes and parties, has taken a deep hold upon the public sentiment—that the public opinion of the country had always been in favor of this measure. Instead of seeking office for myself—instead of looking forward to an escape from the verdict of the people at the polls, there is nothing I shall await with greater pride than having accomplished this union by the aid of my own colleagues and the patriotic gentlemen who

have regarded patriotism more highly than partizanship—there is nothing that will give me greater pleasure than to place myself, my public character, and my future career in the hands of the electors of Nova Scotia. I have no hesitation in saying that there is no position, however exalted, that would prevent me for a single instant, asking that verdict from the people which I have a right to demand at their hands (Cheers)

The system of government for British America is the system that now prevails in this Province; it is the responsible system by which we can only retain office by the continuance of public confidence. When did I ever shrink from ascertaining the opinions of my fellow countrymen? I am unwilling to make a rash and irrational appeal to the people at the polls; but when I came back from Canada—having previously to the general election committed myself to this question of Confederation—having obtained the most cordial approval of the sentiments which I entertained—the first thing I did was to court public discussion. At the first moment at Charlottetown it was decided we should take up this question, a public meeting was held at which we proclaimed at once what our intentions were. I brought the Canada, New Brunswick and P. E. Island delegates to this city, and instead of concealing our views from the world, at a table surrounded by the leading men of every profession in the community, we stated freely to the people of the Province and of British America the whole scheme which we proposed to carry out—As far as could be judged, the sentiments of the leading merchants and others were unanimously in favour of the question when it was laid before them. When it was stated that there was a probability of accomplishing the union loud cheers rang through the hall.

But there was a little clause in the Quebec scheme that changed the tone of certain gentlemen. It was considered necessary to place banking under the General Government. I had no doubt that it was of great importance to the business of the whole country that the question of banking should be placed as it is. The result, however, was that, with a few honorable exceptions, the bankers and capitalists ranged themselves against this scheme. The men who had been cheering this question to the very echo—who had invited the Canadian Parliament to come down and feted them with "exhaustive festivities,"—when they found that the tight grasp which a few capitalists have over the whole monetary affairs of this country was to be unclamped, then they came out in violent opposition to the measure. These men came and told me that I must back down—that I must fall back from my duty at the dictation of a few capitalists. A merchant of this city—one of those who thought that they might be obliged to compete with the capital and enterprizes of Canada—met me in the street, and told me that if I attempted to address a public meeting in this city I would be hissed from the platform. Well, I replied, I have never shrunk from meeting

the public; I have looked at no one man's interests, but I have looked broadly at what I believe will elevate our common country; but if the public sentiment is such as you say it is, the sooner I know it the better. What was the result? These bankers and capitalists brought up their Goliaths, and we met them with the same readiness that I have ever met my public opponents. After several meetings with the ablest men they could bring on the platform what was the result? They say this has been a delegation of lawyers with a doctor to look after them, but when the ablest merchants had an opportunity of confronting these lawyers and doctors, they were silenced in the presence of the largest assemblages that ever met in a public hall in Halifax. Why, my hon. friend (Mr. Tobin) could not get any of these merchants to come on the hustings with himself, and give their time and attention to public affairs, when it was only little Nova Scotia that required their care; but the moment they thought their own interests were in jeopardy they were all up in arms. Then they came out with the politicians who have given all their time and talents to the advancement of the public interests, and after the most deliberate and ample discussion, the hon. member himself in the press admitted that Halifax was against him. The night the discussion was closed—the last night they could be induced to meet us—Temperance Hall rang with enthusiastic cheers in favour of Union. Then I went up into Hants, Kings, Cumberland, Annapolis, and Colchester, and in every place where this question was fully discussed, there was not one of these public meetings at which a single resolution hostile to union could be carried. Under these circumstances, then, am I chargeable with a desire to force this measure upon the people, without learning the public sentiment? I made a mistake last night, it appears, in respect to the number of names in the petitions presented to this House. I have asked the clerk to count them up, and I find, after all the excitement and agitation, and all the public lectures that have been given—after all the misrepresentation that has appeared on this subject, the whole number of names only amounts to 6267. In a fortnight, on a previous occasion, when the public sentiment was agitated, spontaneously 26,000 electors sent down their petitions here, because they really felt opposed to a measure which the Government had in contemplation. I ask the people of Nova Scotia if, under such circumstances, I had not the right to believe that I was sustained by the public sentiment of the country.

In opposition to this measure may be found a few politicians, some political partizans, who are ready to abase their country and themselves for the support of a few capitalists who could not make me their tool; but I will go into every county and I shall find the best men there at my back, who have been the standard bearers of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia—the men who have given Mr. Howe in the past the more cordial support. But what more do I find? The clergy of this country, from the highest to the lowest—

Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists—of all denominations, and I stake my public character upon the assertion, display the most remarkable unanimity upon this subject. Representing, as these gentlemen do, the education, refinement, and intelligence of a community—influencing, as they do largely, the people among whom they live—can I have any doubts as to the sentiments of the best informed of the people on this question?

The hon. member has complained of the manner in which the subject has been discussed in England. When, a year ago, I ventured to say to the House that the press, the public men, the statesmen, and the Parliament of England were favorable to this question, how were we met? With the sneers and inuendoes that have now been heaped upon the august Parliament of Great Britain? No; we were told that all that was necessary was to explain the whole question in England in order to set the matter right. When that was done, they would obtain all they wished for. Now this measure has been discussed in the Parliament and press, in a manner that few questions were ever discussed before. The ablest men that could be found to oppose the union have done all they could to make their views and opinions known. What is the reason that when this question came to be discussed in Parliament it was treated as it was? This bill was first introduced into the House of Lords because the Earl of Carnarvon wished to have the honour of introducing it. In a very full House, when he introduced the bill, he met with the most astonishing support. Noble lords in opposition rose in rapid succession to support the Government. Lord John Russell gave it his warm approval; and the last man I could be expected to influence, the Marquis of Normanby—a gentleman whom political conflict has made my opponent—in the discharge of his high duties as a peer of the realm, gave that question the most unequivocal and emphatic support; and having had a better opportunity than any man in the British Parliament of understanding the state of affairs in these Colonies, he told the House of Peers that he did not believe that the public sentiment of this country was opposed to the union. Lord Carnarvon explained that there had been no election here on this question—that the constitution did not require such an appeal; and the whole facts having been explained to the House with the greatest accuracy, there was not a single man to oppose the bill. The *Times* of the next morning placed in the hands of every member a clear statement of the position of this Province, and of everything in relation to this matter. When the Peers found that Lord Stratheden had lent himself to statements they could not sustain, they got up, one after the other, and left the House. Mr. Howe heard Mr. Watkins' statement to which reference has been made, and he was in constant communication with Mr. Bright and if any incorrect statement was made, Mr. Howe is responsible for not having corrected it. Therefore I say, if the House of Commons was misled by a single remark—Mr. Watkins having misunderstood the time at which the Union dis-

cussion took place—Mr. Howe and his friends are themselves to blame if they did not correct him.

Under the Quebec scheme the power to levy an export duty on coal was left in the hands of the Local Governments. We have changed that ourselves. The House well knows the policy that I propounded on the question of the coal mines last year. I regard them as the great source of Provincial wealth and prosperity—not for the royalty which goes into the treasury, but because of their intimate connection with the development of new branches of industry in this country—of the impulse they must give to manufactures in the Province. In fact, the possession of coal mines, together with other natural advantages, must, in the course of time, make Nova Scotia the great emporium for manufactures in British America. We felt that in taking it out of the power of any Legislature to double the amount of royalty, we were giving a guarantee to capitalists who might come in and invest their money in these coal mines, that the Legislature could not come down and say they must pay one or two shillings upon every ton of coal raised.

The hon. member has said that we sacrificed the fisheries. Would it have been desirable to have left the protection of the fisheries in the hands of the Local Government? But there is really no alteration made in this respect. In the Quebec scheme the power of legislation in reference to the deep sea fisheries was given to the General and Local Governments in common, but there was a clause which provided that regulations of the General Government should override those of the Local Government. Now the only difference is that the entire responsibility is thrown upon the General Government. When the House receives the public despatches on the question of the fisheries they will see that the course taken by the Government of this Province was rendered imperative by the action of the Imperial Government. It was a compromise suggested to the British Government by Canada. The Canadians were ready to license the fisheries, and standing as we do to-day we are at the mercy of Canada. If Canada falls we must fall. We have no status by ourselves; we have no standing in relation to the Empire apart from Canada. As respects this question, it is well known that the policy of Canada has always been supreme, although we have the largest interest in the fisheries. Now, however, the Canadians will be interested in them equally with ourselves, and we shall have such a voice in the General Parliament as will enable us in all probability to largely influence that body, for we shall, as shown by the hon. member for South Colchester, hold the balance of power between the two rival sections of Canada.

The hon. member has taunted me with having made use of the Queen's name, and he and his friends have stated in a state paper which they sent to the Colonial Office that this measure had been carried by the abuse of our Sovereign's name. The reference was clearly within the constitution

and such as is made within the Parliament of England. From the lips of our Royal Sovereign I have heard the warmest approval of union. The Province I represented, had the great honor and distinction of my receiving Her Majesty's command to wait upon her at Buckingham Palace, and upon that occasion Her Majesty congratulated me upon the success which had attended our efforts; and when I expressed the gratification with which her loyal subjects would learn the deep interest she had evinced in this measure, she replied: "I take the deepest interest in it, for I believe it will make them great and prosperous." (Cheers.)

I am glad that on the present occasion the hon. member for Halifax has had the manliness—

MR. PRYOR—The hon. member for East Halifax?

DR. TUPPER—I do not wonder that my hon. friend should be anxious that there should be no misapprehension as to who is meant. The hon. member for East Halifax has to-night openly avowed his sentiments upon this question. I have always felt that hon. gentleman was serving the United States rather than his own country: I do not refer to any hasty expression that may have fallen from his lips; but I have been painfully impressed with the fact that from the moment he took his present position he would use every effort to transfer this Province from under the British Crown to the Stars and Stripes. We are told by him to-night that he is ready to sacrifice the best interests of his country in order to satisfy his yearning after connection with the United States—that he is prepared to choose, as between a union with Canada and a union with the American Republic, in favor of the latter. We have heard him characterizing the Parliament of Great Britain as ignorant and imbecile—heaping obloquy upon the grandest institutions that are the pride and glory of the world. He has declared that a preference for a closer union with the Empire would be a weak and foolish prejudice. He has not left the people of this country in any doubt as to his sentiments; and the reason why I congratulate the House and country upon this fact is, that his position is now clearly defined, and he has disarmed himself. In a loyal country like this, when his sentiments are clearly revealed, he must be perfectly impotent to effect any harm whatever.

But is this the time when any man in British America can be ready to give up the

admirable institutions of Great Britain for those of the United States. Let me read to you the picture presented of the latter country by Mr. Howe himself:

"Rai roads, canals, steamers and telegraphs then came in and sought to bind the country together; but in eighty years, with all their aids and appliances, the game was played out; and the same causes which in every quarter of the old world, an in almost every age, have asserted themselves, came distinctly into view, marking the subjection even of the great Republic to the laws which the Creator, for some wise purpose, has established for the government of the universe. It is true that by the expenditure of a million of lives, and of nearly four hundred thousand millions of dollars the country is still nominally held together; but when hearts are estranged and interests are adverse, when communities baptized in blood and tears, find in a great calamity ever recurring elements of discord and reproach, the time is rapidly drawing on when re-union is inevitable and when new combinations will grow out of the play of the passionate ambitions which the wit of man has hitherto been found harmless to control."

That is the condition in which the United States is now, as drawn by the hon. gentleman's leader and co-delegate; and yet this country which has sacrificed a million of lives in a recent struggle—which has incurred a debt greater than that of England—this country riven by discord and strife, in which the Parliament is arrayed against the President, is held up to our admiration as the one to which we ought to be united. These gentlemen having failed to fasten the tyrannical scheme proposed for the organization of the Empire upon us, turn round and say: Instead of allowing you to form part of a great and free community, with an amount of power and influence such as no other people ever possessed, we shall endeavour to drag you under the Stars and Stripes—into that country which Mr. Howe has described as so riven and distracted that neither life nor property is safe. May I not congratulate the House that the mask is at last removed, and that the hon member has shown himself in his true colours? He has presumed to hurl charges of corruption against the loyal and patriotic members of this house. Is it in his own heart that he finds the ground of these charges? Let me ask him if, having found him standing in the presence of the Parliament and daring to disparage the glorious British institutions under which we live, and if, in addition to this, we find him advocating a union with the United States, instead of a union of British America, might not the charge be made that the money of the United States had been used to influence him? He talk to me of corruption!—the man who has taken back every principle that he has ever propounded in this house—the man who goes to England and says to the Imperial Parliament, "Be careful of your money—do not give a guarantee

for a loan of three millions of pounds for the construction of a railway which is going to make Halifax a city of 100,000 souls—give us connection with the United States and Canadas"—who says, "I am aware that I have claimed the confidence of the constituency of Halifax on the ground that I was an advocate of an Intercolonial Railway, but never mind that: I am determined to use every effort I can to prevent the consummation of that work!"

The hon. member tells us that the American Government are so anxious to obtain possession of us, that they may come in and buy up the Confederate Parliament. Is it or is it not an unjust suspicion to suppose that if the American Government are so corrupt that they would buy up the Confederate Parliament of British America, they have found means to buy up one or two individuals in the Legislature of Nova Scotia? Is it because we have always held one view on this question that we are to be taunted by gentlemen who have taken back the declarations of a lifetime with corruption? If this Parliament could be so degraded as that men could be influenced by corrupt means to trifle with the best interests of this country, then I say he has given the best evidence in the world why the confederation should take place. If legislators, second to none that ever sat within these walls for probity, intelligence, education, and everything that constitutes able and valuable men, are of that character he would have us suppose they are, then he has given us the best evidence that Nova Scotia is unworthy of British institutions, and the sooner some other country governs us the better. But I feel I am insulting the intelligence of the country when I suppose for an instance that it would do aught than treat with contempt the unfounded insinuations of the hon. gentleman whose own openly avowed sentiments this evening have placed him in so unenviable a position. I feel that the question can be safely left to the patriotism and intelligence of this deliberative Assembly who have always approached it in a spirit that proves them worthy of the free institutions they enjoy, and that an intelligent and loyal population will cordially sustain them thus seeking to elevate and advance our common country. (Cheers).

Speech of Mr. Fraser.

MR. JAMES FRASER.—I feel it due to myself, as well as to the people I represent, that I should make a few remarks concerning the course which I intend to pursue upon this question. This subject was before us last year, and when the resolutions were before us relative to the appoint-

ment of delegates to see if a better scheme than the Quebec scheme could be devised, I felt it my duty to oppose them, not because I was averse to the principle of union—for it is not merely since I occupied a seat here that I felt the conviction that we could not long occupy our present position—but because of these two reasons: first, I did not know what kind of a bargain the delegates might make when they went thousands of miles away, and I thought it wrong that we should not have the opportunity of saying whether we approved of their arrangements or not; and second, because I knew that a great many of the people were opposed to union. From causes that cannot very well be explained, the people are afraid of change. The first reason for my opposition has now been done away; and, as far as I am able to judge, I am disposed to think that the bargain which the delegates have made is a great deal better than the Quebec scheme, though even that I was not afraid of. I had intended last year to go further than I did; I intended not only to have opposed the resolution but to have supported the amendment, but before the discussion was over I discovered something I did not like—I discovered among some gentlemen a strong desire for annexation to the United States. I was brought up in loyal principles, and taught to cherish British institutions, and while I wished to give our people time for consideration, I could not and never will consent to make a change from the English flag to a flag which I never wish to wave over my head or the heads of my children. And now, although continued opposition might be consistent, I consider the question has come to be in that state in which further opposition would not only be useless, but dangerous. We are all proud of the eloquence and abilities of Mr. Howe, and when he went to England I waited with great anxiety to see if he was going to give us something which we would consider better than the scheme of Confederation; but when I found him propounding a scheme which was long ago condemned by himself as impracticable, I began to think if he had nothing better to propound, there was nothing better to be expected than the scheme which had been before us. If the Quebec scheme would bring taxation to the value of one cent, Mr. Howe's would bring taxation to hundreds of times that amount.

Another matter which operated strongly on my mind was the fact that our American neighbors opposed Confederation. Is that on account of their love for us? No, but because they do not want to see the British power grow up alongside of them. If then I have been sincerely and honestly opposed to the measure hitherto, after viewing these facts and finding that the British Parliament and people, and our honoured Sovereign herself have given their approval of it, I feel that I should be no longer so. I will not deny that among the people opposition still exists, but while no man attaches more value to the wishes of the people, or is more willing to defer to their wishes, I am constrained to take the responsibility of doing what I believe to be right whether I gain popularity by the act or not. I am convinced

the day is not far distant when the people will acknowledge that I have done the best thing for them, and surely they cannot think that I would do more for them than for myself and children—I will take my chance under the new system, and I have as much at stake as many who are less willing. I regretted to hear an hon. gentleman state that if the measure passed he would still do all in his power to oppose it, —I cannot agree in that, and if the bill passes, as I believe it will, I will use my humble endeavors to make it a blessing to our people and to the great Empire to which we belong.

Remarks of Dr. Brown.

DR. BROWN said that he was sorry to hear the hon. Provincial Secretary bear so hard on Mr. Howe in his absence. He was not Mr. Howe's apologist. He had not approved of many of that gentleman's acts when at the head of public affairs, but he entirely concurred in the object of the mission in which he was now engaged on the part of the people of Nova Scotia. He thought that it would have been more manly and generous in the leader of the government if he had waited for an opportunity of conducting the discussions face to face. As to the question before the House, at that hour of the night he had but few words to say. He did not care whether the course pursued by the Government was constitutional or not—he would not enter into the legality of the case; the only question was, was it right, was it just, was it expedient to pass a measure so vitally affecting the rights of the people, as it were by stealth and without their consent? It could not be argued that an appeal to the people would be inconvenient, because an election must necessarily take place in a few weeks, or months at the furthest. He had heard much talk about loyalty. He thought that loyalty like charity began at home. He thought if the British people and Government passed this bill, compelling our people into a union highly distasteful to a large majority, they might be justly accused of disloyalty towards us. The best loyalty was to take care of ourselves, and if Great Britain was weary of the connection, we must only look elsewhere for friends and allies. It was clear that free trade with the United States was the greatest boon we could now enjoy. The trade with Canada could never be large, and we could encourage it as well without union as with it. But free trade with our republican neighbors would be our salvation, in a commercial sense. He hoped the Government would pause before they passed an act so arbitrary and so unjust to the people.

Speech of Mr. C. J. Campbell.

MR. C. J. CAMPBELL—I did not intend to say much on this question, but the hon member for Inverness has made an observation which I must contradict. He says that the people of Cape Breton are proud of their connection with Nova Scotia, and that the only man opposed to the union has passed away. I think I am as fully acquainted with the feelings of that people as he is, and I therefore feel justified in contradicting the impression which his remarks would leave. The case of Cape Breton is not at all parallel with the case now before us,—the union was effected without the consent of the people, and indeed without their knowledge.

The island was at first only represented by two members out of all proportion to the representation of Nova Scotia. We afterwards petitioned for a repeal, and two out of the four members then representing Cape Breton voted against it. About twenty years ago a large petition was sent to England, and a legal gentleman employed on the subject in London, so that the statement made is inaccurate. Even now Cape Breton can scarcely get justice at the hands of Nova Scotia, and session after session we are sneered at by even leading politicians. I attribute the strong feeling of the people of Cape Breton on the subject of Confederation to the treatment they have received at the hands of Nova Scotia. We have not yet a fair share of representation. In the case of the present union, however, we enter on more favourable terms even than either of the Canadas, both as regards representation and the funds to be placed at our disposal.

Mr. Blackwood's Speech.

MR. BLACKWOOD:—As I intend to support the amendment, I feel that I should like to say a few words before the vote is taken. I support it on the principle that however finely argued the case may be in reference to constitutional authority, there is a sense of right and wrong which tells us that this privilege belongs to the people, and if there be no precedent in favour of the course, we urge it is time we made one when the constitution is to be changed, and when the eyes of the world are on us. If ever there was a time when the feelings of the people should be consulted it is the present. The time of the house will shortly expire, and if an election were held the measure could be completed shortly afterwards. I do not consider that within this house is concentrated all the wisdom of the country. We have had Mr. Howe's opinions quoted to us but I do not see that we should consider his views as the subject of discussion now, or the views of any man, but the position and interests and feelings of the people of Nova Scotia. I do not entertain an opinion favourable to the scheme for the organization of the Empire because I think its features could not be carried out with satisfaction to all the Colonies.

With reference to annexation, I may say that I never could feel otherwise than degraded by being subjected to the Stars and Stripes; but in making the charges of disloyalty which have been made, I think that justice has not been done to those expressing their opinions on this side of the house. They have not said, or sought to convey the impression, that they favour annexation, but that they are opposed to any union, and desire to progress as we have been progressing. The people of Nova Scotia have no idea of joining the United States unless they are driven to it; but if you stir up hostility by such legislation as will embitter their minds, and for that purpose take advantage of the position which the Government occupy, the British feeling will be driven out of their British hearts. I feel it due the people to speak out boldly, for if ever there was a time when their feelings should be consulted, it is the present. Let us not take the opinion of this or that individual, but the opinion of the entire country, and by that decision I am content to stand or fall.

Mr. Churchill's Speech.

MR. CHURCHILL:—In the discussion of a question of such vital importance it appears to me that it would have been wise to have allowed more time for consideration than has been given us. From the very moment this subject claimed my thoughts, the responsibilities connected with it have pressed upon my mind with a weight beyond anything that I can express. I have never given to any individual my opinion, and when asked what my opinion was about this great question of Confederation, I have replied that it was not one of so small moment that an opinion could be given hastily. I have not consulted my constituents on the subject, nor they me, but I have viewed the matter in its broadest aspect, and nothing has occurred to shake the opinion which I have formed, although in some respects I have been delighted with the speeches to which I have listened. It is not in the power of any living man to comprehend and grasp the entire subject,—the results lie in the future, and will reveal themselves only after years have rolled round. Therefore when my opinion has been asked I have felt disinclined to give it. Suppose gentlemen were about purchasing Canada. Would they use many words about it? Would they not rather ponder deeply and say but little, and measure the language they used rather than make lengthy speeches? Last session I intended to have been present and to have recorded my vote, but I was unavoidably detained—my mind was made up then as it is to-night. The question now before us is not whether we shall have this union or not—that was decided last winter by an unexpected and sweeping majority. The house then delegated a number of gentlemen to proceed to England, and to make a contract on our behalf, and we all know the result, and every man in Nova Scotia might have known what the result would be with England anxious, Canada anxious, and Nova Scotia willing, constitutionally willing.

It is not fair to ask the legislature to undo what it did last winter when it fixed the destiny of the Province and clothed those gentlemen with the authority of delegates. The petitions sent across the water could not be expected to have had any effect—on any public question of interest a cartload of them could be obtained without any result. One benefit that will accrue from Confederation is that the General Government will control the currency. I look upon the mode in which our Provincial currency has been managed as imprudent and selfish; a number of bankers, by combining, have controlled the currency completely. Instead of £140,000 in Province notes we should have had half a million years ago afloat, and the condition of our finances would have been far better. Another advantage is the construction of the Intercolonial Railroad, and the extension of our other roads, which I believe we could not have without the union. In view of these questions I have felt that if my last hour had come and my opinion were asked, I would say: do not be afraid to venture on the great realities that will break forth on a combined people. Isolated, there is no safety; combined there is wisdom and security. Mr. Howe has been much referred to. I was sorry when he left us, and I can well remember receiving

from his addresses the conviction that union must be the order of the day. What could induce me at my advanced stage of life, to advocate a measure if I did not believe it would be for the advantage of those who are to come after me? The proposal made to us is to submit the matter to the polls. Suppose you could do so would that be the proper way to try it? Does not every man acquainted with the condition of our Province know that at the polls party feelings would override everything? You never could ascertain the real opinions of the people by an election, and the great measure would be almost lost sight of.

I therefore feel no doubt upon that ground. I am now probably in the last year of my political life, and I would have been glad could I have escaped the responsibility now resting upon me; but that responsibility must rest upon some one, and I am here to discharge it. I believe there are hundreds and hundreds of able and deep-thinking men in this Province who are glad to get rid of this responsibility, as I would be, if I could.

I was amused last evening to hear the remarks about annexation. I would ask hon. gentlemen what part of the States would we be annexed to—the North or the South? I always regretted that Halifax, as well as New Brunswick, gave its sympathy to the South—that mistaken people who are wasted like the ranks upon the other side of the House. If war had not occurred, the subject of annexation might have been broached, but after that I hoped never to hear of the proposition. I doubt that the United States would be anxious to have us; they will get our coals and fish, and give us what they please, as they always have done. I would like to have dwelt more largely on the subject, but time will not permit at this late hour of the night; and I would merely say, in conclusion, that I am willing, with my hon. friend from Pictou, who spoke a short time ago, to fall into the ranks of those who seek to unite the Provinces.

Speech of Mr. Hebb.

MR. HEBB said:—I rise not to make a long speech, but to give a few views which I entertain upon this question. Last winter, as well as in this session, a great deal was said about loyalty and about the intelligence of the country, and it has been repeatedly said that all the intelligence and all the loyal feeling of this country were favorable to union. Now I believe that not one member of this house desires annexation to the United States; but supposing a faithful son asked his father for the portion of the inheritance which fell to his share, and the father said, "I will give you nothing," would it not be expected that the son would leave him? Again, if a young man desired a wife, and after seeing many young women of the neighboring Provinces, should find one better suited to him in the States, is it not natural that he should follow his choice? But, as I have said, no member here desires annexation; and if such an impression has been derived from any remarks that have been made, it is no doubt from the haste of expression. There are men here who could talk from now until next September, because it is their business; but it is not to be expected that some of us should be so well trained in expression as those lawyers and doctors.

The blood boils in my veins when I hear some of these gentlemen despising the constituents. There are good and loyal men in this country who will not come to the Legislature, and their opinions should be heard. It has been intimated that the people are not able to judge—that they are too ignorant; but I ask who has made the country but the people to whom this language is applied? Did the handful of members around me make the country? No, but the men who are catching the fish, who are taking the lumber from the forests and the stones from the soil. The laborers of the country should be heard, and I speak thus because I am one of them, and know how wrong it is for men of position and education to look down on the working classes. I should like to see our public men when they are passing through the Province, greeted everywhere with a pleasant countenance and receiving the ready grasp of the hand.

There is an old saying which forbids us to compare men and beasts together, but sometimes the comparison is necessary, and I wish to make one: I know that if you put on a horse a collar that chafes his neck and makes the blood trickle down his breast you will see his eyes become dim and his ears droop,—and what can you expect from human beings if you force on them a measure which they dislike. I am not so much opposed to union as to overriding the opinions of the people. They might at some future time express a desire for Confederation, but if you force it on them now, I can only say that I should not like to be one of those whose names are attached to the records of the country as favoring the measure. The arrangements between the Provinces reminds me of an anecdote which I heard some years ago: A cat and a monkey went to market to buy cheese, they did so, and on returning home, in order to make a division procured a pair of scales;—the monkey was careful to cut one piece larger than the other, and when it did not weigh evenly he got permission to taste, and so went on cutting and tasting until the cheese had nearly disappeared, and when the cat remonstrated she was threatened with a hiding.

That is pretty much the position of our affairs; we are the small Colonies, and if we complain, Canada will threaten to chastise us. It would seem that no one can speak upon this question without referring to Mr. Howe; but supposing that gentleman did at one time speak of union. It is too much the practice for men to stick to the principle they have avowed, whether right or wrong; and the man who acknowledges an error is entitled to credit. As is well known, I am not much of a speaker, and will not therefore long detain the house. I cannot understand how any set of gentlemen dare to impose such a measure upon the country, against the wishes of the people. If the people are favorable to it, why be afraid to come out among them and abide the consequences? For my part, I will stand by the people, and if I fall, I will fall by them.

Remarks of Hon. Financial Secretary.

MR. JAMES MACDONALD said:—I would not address the House at this late hour were it not for some of the observations which fell from the hon. member for East Halifax

as to the financial aspect of the question, and which it is desirable that the country should fully understand. The House knows that the opponents of union have argued that the revenues of this country are to be dissipated by Canada—that the hardly earned revenues of the people are to go to enrich the Canadian treasury. I undertake to tell the hon. member, and I challenge him to contradict me, by reference to the figures open to every one, and which I shall adduce to the House, that so far from the revenues of this country going to enrich the Canadas, the fact is the very reverse. The hon. member has taken the figures furnished in the estimates for the past year laid on the table by the government. I will take the figures from the same source, and will undertake to show that instead of the revenues of Nova Scotia going to pay the debts of Canada, we shall have almost the entire revenue derived from this portion of the confederacy spent within the limits of this Province, in payment of the same services to which our revenue is now applied; for it must be remembered that although the management of these departments—the revenue and post office departments for instance—is transferred to the general government, the services must still be performed by men residing and spending their income in this country. We shall receive, then, first the contribution fixed by the act of union, to be paid by the general government in aid of our local expenditure, amounting to \$324,000 in the first instance, and shall continue to receive in proportion to our population till we number 400,000. Let me see then, how the matter will stand, and I may say that I am entitled to no credit for the statement shewing this view of the matter, as I avail myself of the figures as arranged in a most satisfactory and lucid manner by a recent writer on the subject.

The estimated revenue for 1866 amounted to \$1,631,500; from that amount must be deducted the sum of \$155,000, being the amount included in the estimate as revenue derivable from the departments of mines, casual revenue, gold fields, and the Hospital of the Insane which remain under the management of the local government, and contribute to the local fund. That would leave the balance of the estimated revenue which will pass under the control of the general government at \$1,476,500—from this must be deducted the contribution as above stated to be made to our local revenues \$324,000, which will leave to be disbursed by this government \$1,152,000. We have, therefore, for general and

local revenue taking the estimate as selected by the hon. gentleman himself as a basis, the following sums

General Government	Local Government.
\$1,152,000	
	Amount received from General Government.....\$324,000
	Local sources of revenue.....755,000
	\$479,000

Now, sir, let us see how these sums are to be disbursed. I need not refer to the local revenue as that of course is distributed by the Local Government for the expenses of that Government and the maintenance of the important public services left within its jurisdiction. But where and how is the \$1,152,000 transferred to the control of the General Government paid? Is it in Canada or to Canadian people? No, sir, but in Nova Scotia and to Nova Scotians. The hon. gentleman will admit, indeed it is the basis of his argument—that the services transferred to the General Government would be sustained as now. These services then are as follows:

The General Government would pay—

The Lieut. Governor.....	\$15,000
Judges.....	17,500
Pensions.....	4,800
Governor's Secretary.....	1,250
Statistics.....	4,000
Prosecutions.....	12,000
Debt, interest on.....	480,000
Judiciary expenses.....	1,400
Militia.....	38,000
Protection of fisheries.....	40,000
Support of Light-houses.....	50,000
Post Office.....	65,000
Revenue expenses.....	70,500
Drawbacks.....	16,000
Steamers.....	10,000
Proportion of Legislative expenses.....	30,000
Miscellaneous.....	10,000
Sable Island.....	5,000
Government buildings.....	10,000
Penitentiary.....	12,800
Agriculture and Immigration.....	20,000
Total.....	\$1,103,600

leaving a balance of merely \$50,000 as the only contribution by this Province towards the construction of the Intercolonial Road—a work which the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he was a member considered so essential to the interest of this country, that they were willing to mortgage a very large proportion of the revenues or the country forever to construct not our own fair proportion of the road, but 50 or 100 miles with New Brunswick.

But if we take the actual expenditure of this year in some of the services named, instead of the estimated amount, what do we find? We find, sir, that the amount paid greatly exceeds the estimate, and that in reality, instead of a balance of \$50,000, there would be a deficiency on the side of the

neral Government. Let us compare some of these. The militia Service was estimated to cost \$80,000; it cost in reality about \$138,000, or \$58,000 in excess of the estimate. The several services under the Board of Works, including St. Peter's Canal, were estimated to cost \$180,320; the expenditure of the year was \$284,017, being an excess of \$93,697. I need not compare the estimate and expenditure on the other items, but the House will see that on these two services alone there is over \$151,000, or three times the sum which by the first calculation appeared to go into the general treasury without an equivalent. Nor is this all, for it must be remembered that the cost of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway must come out of the general revenue. It will be therefore seen that the Province actually receives more than she puts into the general fund, and sufficient besides to pay her proportion of the Intercolonial Railway debt. I challenge the hon. gentleman to refute a single statement I have made. If he is unable to do so, and he knows he is, what becomes of the whole fabric he has built upon his financial argument, on which he is now content to rest his opposition?

Speech of Mr S. Campbell.

MR. S. CAMPBELL.—At this late hour, and after the fatigues of a long day, and in an atmosphere to say the least of it oppressive I proceed to perform the duty accorded to me by my friends and by the courtesy of the house to conclude this debate, and I feel upon the present occasion as I felt in my previous address, that my present office and responsibility place me in conflict with great odds. I feel that I have great antagonists both within and without these walls, but I am at the same time assured that I have the warm and hearty concurrence of the people to sustain me. I believe I have a righteous cause and I know that—

*"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just,
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."*

Hence, sir, I feel emboldened in proceeding in my present task, and I shall take the liberty at starting to review some of the observations which have been made by gentlemen who have preceded me before I remark upon the main question which this amendment discloses. The first name I find on my notes is that of a gentleman who stands high in this country in point of rank and talent; I mean the Prov. Sec'y, and I may say I think it would have become that gentleman to have pursued a different course in reference to an absent rival. I

am not the apologist or champion of Mr. Howe but I claim the honor of his personal friendship. I am an admirer of his because I believe him to be a valuable public man and a pure-souled patriot. I deprecate the course taken by the Prov. Sec'y, in reference to Mr. Howe because he is absent. There are those among us who have met him in conflict, and I wish heartily that he was here to repel the changes which have been made against his consistency and patriotism. We would not try the meanest criminal at the bar of justice in his absence; common decency would repudiate such a monstrous procedure. but here, in reference to that gentleman who is absent from his native land on a mission connected with its best interest, who Curtius like has cast himself into a wide and deep chasm for his country's sake, it is thought not indecorous to put him on trial and to ask the country to condemn him.

Sir, this is entirely wrong. But not content with pouring the vials of his wrath upon Mr. Howe, the Prov. Sec'y, went on to refer to the capitalists of the city in terms which cannot be justified by their character or their conduct. And who, sir, are these capitalists? Are they not the men who have been at the back of the hon. gentleman in many a fierce political encounter, and who, on such occasions, have rendered him effectual service? He was therefore guilty of ingratitude of the blackest dye in endeavoring to make them the objects of odium and scandal before the country. The capitalists of this city, sir, have a deep stake in the interest of Nova Scotia; their lot is cast here for all time; and if the city or province prosper, their means must be correspondingly enlarged. To say that they are actuated by the sordid motives that were asserted, is a libel on them which I feel called on to throw back in the teeth of the man who made it. I am not bound to them by any considerations or connection, but as they have no one here willing, although bound, to answer in their name, I cannot but take notice and vindicate them from the gross calumny which we have heard.

Next we were told that the petitions presented here at the last Session numbered but a few thousands. I well recollect the circumstances under which those petitions were withdrawn from general signature. While they were being circulated for that purpose the country was told by members of this house, and their partizans elsewhere, that Confederation would not be brought here; that the Government dare not bring it here; and I think I might bring it to the

recollection of one of the delegates that he proclaimed the opinion that the subject would not be presented to us for many years. It was under these and other circumstances that the people ceased petitioning, and but for the representations I have referred to, the number would have reached that of those which were sent across the water.

The Provincial Secretary, in referring to the scheme, touched upon one important topic—the fisheries. My constituents, sir, are deeply interested in that branch of industry—none more so, perhaps, except those of the county of Halifax, and what is the history of Confederation in that aspect? How damagingly has Canadian influence operated on those engaged in the fisheries of the country? Every one knows that they have been sold and sacrificed; and whether it be Canadian or Imperial agency that has been at work, I care not—the melancholy fact remains: our fisheries and our fishermen have been sold. This, sir, is a foretaste of the fruits of Confederation—this is a specimen of the policy that will be pursued in reference to the many other interests of the Maritime Provinces when it suits the objects of the new “Dominion.” There is no man, young or old, engaged in the prosecution of the fisheries, and dependent upon them for his support, but has this melancholy conviction forced upon his mind—that to be a British subject is to occupy a position inferior to that of an American. All that valuable property which the Legislature has been from year to year declaring to be the peculiar possession of the country has been transferred for a consideration too paltry and contemptible to mention. Every member here who has fishermen for his constituents must feel that this Canadian policy should induce him to pause a long time before giving his assent to this Union.

I now come to that part of the Provincial Secretary's observations which relate to a gentleman who, though he is here, is debarred from answering for himself, inasmuch as he has exhausted the privileges which the rules accord to him. The so-called annexation sentiments of the hon. member for East Halifax have been proclaimed by the Provincial Secretary. I understood my hon. friend to say this: “I do not wish to be an American, I wish to be a British subject—I wish to remain a Nova Scotian, and to enjoy my birthright and my constitutional freedom as such; I do not wish to be a Canadian.” That is the whole extent of the ground on which this charge of annexation sentiments has been founded

and sought to be fastened upon the hon. member. The next name on my list is the hon. member for Inverness, who referred to a topic that is very distasteful to me, because it refers to a state of mind and intention which it is derogatory to the honor of this House to suppose that any member of the House is moved by—that is, the matter of corruption. As I have said, the topic is derogatory to us, it is distasteful to me, and I will pass it by with only this remark—let the people be our judge. But the hon. member thought he had made a great point when he asked if we had the machinery for testing this question at the polls, taking into consideration the population of the various counties, and the number of members returned. But he forgot that that is the machinery by which this House is constituted, under any and all circumstances and in relation to every question, and therefore I consider that his analysis of the population and representation of the several constituencies was no proof in support of his position. Then the hon. member spoke of the union of Cape Breton with this Province; but he forgot to tell us, as he should have done, that at that time the island had no representative institutions; its affairs were managed by the Governor and Council, and its people were not represented at all. The people of the island were therefore elevated in the scale of constitutional freedom when their interests were placed under the protection of representatives duly elected by them. I now come to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Shannon.) He greatly mistook the reference which I made to the period and the doings of Nero. I meant and made no allusion at all to the proceedings of the Imperial Parliament, in connection with the merry-making in which the “speech” called us to join, but my remarks were aimed at the concocters of that speech. It was in connection with the proposed rejoicings that I made the reference to the tyrant who, in the midst of a calamity such as never afflicted this Province, saw such great reason for merriment. The hon. gentleman then went on to give us a glowing picture of the period when Confederation was consummated in this Province. He told his constituents through this House: “You farmers, you fishermen, you artizans, all of you are to get a double price for all the wares and commodities you bring to market.” On what grounds has he made such an assertion? Has he offered us any grounds for it? Am I to suppose that this is all clap-trap intended to influence a constituency on the approach of an election? I can

imagine any other reason for such a statement. Then, again, he told us that the laboring men of the city of Halifax understand this question well, and are going to be greatly benefited by Confederation. I ask, do not the merchants who give these men their living understand the question at least as well? Is it not the interest of the merchants to advance the general prosperity, and how is it that they are opposed to the scheme? Do men generally act in opposition to their interests? No; they are men of intelligence, and from north to south of this city they in a very large proportion reject the measure.

Then we were told that Confederation would keep all the young men in the country: if the hon. member's expectations are realized the young men will be too numerous, and Nova Scotia will be too small a field for them. To this I answer the world is wide enough. There is the neighboring Republic, to which many of them have already repaired, and in which they have raised themselves to positions of eminence and wealth. I am reminded in this connection of one who has become one of the most eminent shipbuilders in the world. He went from one of our western counties.

MR. CHURCHILL.—He failed at last.

MR. S. CAMPBELL.—Perhaps so; but has he not benefitted the world in the meantime? It would seem from the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Tobin) that he, too, is impressed with the same notion that Nova Scotia is not large enough for our young men. The Dominion is to enlarge the field, but they can go to any part of the new Dominion now. I come now to the Financial Secretary, who has entitled himself to special notice at my hands, having extended to me a certain class of civilities rendering such recognition necessary. He termed me "a mere colonial lawyer." Let me ask what he is? Is he so puffed up by being placed in his present position, and by having been sent on an unnecessary and expensive delegation abroad, and having so little to do at home that he can afford to sneer at members of his own profession, and endeavour to derogate from their position by the contemptible epithet he has used? Sir, let him bear in mind that his position is but for a day. He also charged me with recklessness and audacity in my views and expressions. Sir, as a British subject, and a British freeman, I shall entertain any opinion that may commend itself to my judgment, and will express that opinion as freely as I please.

Annexation to the United States, says the

hon. member, is the object of gentlemen on his side. The hon. gentleman, in so saying ventured on a statement as untrue as it was bold. No man shall venture with impunity to hurl that charge at us, or convey without challenge the imputation of disloyalty. Disloyalty is no part of my nature—it has marked no act of my public career. I am willing to lay down my life—to shed the last drop of my blood, on behalf of the country in which my lot is cast, and with whose fortunes my best affections are entwined; but at the same time I know my rights, and shall take every constitutional means to vindicate them. And, sir, let me remind the hon. member that I am not paid for my loyalty—it is an inborn principle; it is not of that spurious kind which is fed upon and fattened by the sweets and solids of the public treasury.

Again, the hon. member says, "If the people feel any embarrassment in the consideration of the question, would it not be wise in them to take the opinion and to act upon the conclusion of those standing at the head of affairs on the other side of the water?" Sir, I do not admit that he has the right to call on a free people living under constitutional government to forego their own indubitable privilege and to commit the decision of any question, much less the present one, to any other than themselves. They are clothed from their very birth, with the privilege of deciding upon every question that can possibly arise; and though it has been not only insinuated but asserted that they are ignorant, I know well this fact, that in every county in the Province there are fifty-five men to be found quite as capable of giving a righteous decision on the present question as the fifty-five members who compose this house. I insist, therefore, that the people ought not to be content to leave this question to any arbitrament in which their voices are not heard.

Before passing from this portion of the hon. member's remarks, let me present to the house my idea of some of the hon. gentleman's reasons for raking up these phantom charges about annexation and disloyalty. The hon. member knew what was the inborn, ordinary and natural feeling of a great portion of the people of the county that he nominally represents. Scotchmen, he knew, were distinguished for their patriotism, and he thought it might be advantageous, in view of his own dubious position, to excite the hostile feelings of the men of that nationality by charging upon the opponents of Confederation the aims and sentiments to which I have referred. But, sir, to retort upon the hon. member, let me ask, not what have been his views or his sentiments, but what has been his conduct? He has done his utmost to denude his Scottish friends and constituents of the constitutional liberties. When I think of this, I feel bound to tell him, though it may not be a very comfortable piece of information for him to bear in his remembrance, that Scotchmen everywhere are like the guarded emblem of their never-conquered land, and are ever ready to

meet the foe who wantonly would tread upon or rudely touch the foliage or the flower of their freedom. (Hear.) They will not be Scotchmen if, when he again ventures to approach them, he does not feel the thrust of their indignation piercing the very marrow of his political existence.

I now come, sir, to the gist of the amendment—the constitutional question, as it has been called; and let me ask if this is a subject in the consideration of which we are to be met with an objection, what I cannot but call a constitutional quibble? We have been repeatedly and vauntingly told that we have shown no precedent that would justify the House in adopting the amendment I have had the honor to propose. To this quibble, sir, I offer in reply the substantial precedent of common sense. It will be time enough when these expounders of constitutional law furnish me with a state of things similar to that existing in relation to this question—it will, I, say be time enough to produce the now impossible precedent. Sir, the question of Confederation is upon us—it is widely regarded as a new and unprecedented malady, endangering the entire body politic,—and how is it to be met? It must be dealt with out of the usual course,—no ordinary applications would be reasonable or wise; it urgently demands the freest treatment, and no treatment seems to me more prudent or consonant with wisdom than the one which I propose in the amendment. This branch of the Legislature must, according to the principles of its constitution, terminate its existence in the course of a very few weeks. Every member of this House will then be called on to meet his constituents face to face. What, I ask, even in reference to the position and prospects of the Administration itself, can possibly transpire between the present period and the period of that inevitable election to induce the Government to oppose the postponement of the question until then?

I must not be understood as wishing to take the final decision of the question out of the hands of the Legislature, but let the matter remain as it is, let the public business go on to completion, and after that is done let the people as is customary and constitutional record their votes, and let the result of that election be their decision of this question. If favorable let it finally incorporated into law when our successors come here. There is and there can be no other question pending in the country of greater importance than this, and I assert that the electors are intelligent enough to decide it on its own merits. With their verdict I shall be satisfied. This is no sudden impulse with me—this is no factious view. From the first moment that the question of union was mooted I have given expression to the same unchangeable sentiment—and in doing so I, of course advocated a proceeding that would have the effect, if adopted, of bridging the term of my own parliamentary existence. Particularly do I consider it as dishonourable in the extreme to adopt any other course than the one I advocate inasmuch as gentlemen here in favor of this measure well know that they are acting in opposition to their own convictions of the existing feeling throughout the Province. In several counties public meetings have been held which have been attended,

not by men of one party, but by men representing every political class; and no man can be ignorant of the sentiment which those general gatherings enunciated. The opinions and wishes of other counties have also in other modes been unmistakably expressed. It is, therefore, tyrannical, wrong and unjust in the extreme, with that conviction on the minds of members, to refuse the people the ordinary right of passing on a measure that is to affect them and children forever. What is the end and object of government but the happiness and welfare of the people? Governments are not institutions created for the purpose of hampering a few officials, but to enlarge the interests and promote the prosperity of the country in entire subordination to the well understood wishes of the people. Is this measure, regarded in that aspect, in the least degree likely to secure that much desired end? Mr. Speaker, I have from the outset of this debate purposely abstained from going into the general question of Confederation, the resolution I have submitted affirms the one grand principle that the question should not be decided until the people are heard upon it at the polls.

I might have pointed out many incongruities and unsound and unjust provisions, and many others likely to produce dissensions in the dominion about to be erected, but I have preferred confining myself to the simple but sound principle of appealing first to the people of this country to ask them, the sovereign people as I will call them, whether they will have this Union—this Dominion—or not? I cannot close, however, and resume my seat without this single observation. The Government are about to pass, or expect ere long to see enacted this measure of Union. When passed and enacted will it be worth the paper on which it is printed if the minds and the hearts of the people do not endorse it. Is it merely a stretch of the imagination to fancy a majority returned in opposition to the principles of the bill,—may we not justly anticipate that contingency? And what then? Why of course that there will be an agitation wide and violent for the repeal of this union. In what temper and under what pledge will the representatives of the people come from the polls? by a large majority this house, or the house to succeed it, will be composed of the men opposed to Confederation. Do you suppose, sir, that the sense of wrong and injustice will so soon be effaced from their hearts and memories? No the same convictions that operate now will operate then with tenfold force, and lamentable will be the condition of disorder and confusion in which public matters will then be involved. It is surely more than wise to avoid this almost certain consummation. I ask the house to consider its position and its duty in that view. This argument I feel should operate favorably upon the vote to-night. I conclude, sir, with the hope, sincere and ardent, that the course taken on this occasion may not produce any such fatal result. At all events, if it should, I shall have the consolation that I have done my best to avert it by submitting the amendment I have the honor to propose.

At 2½ o'clock the question was put to the House when there appeared

For the Amendment—Townsend, Ebb, Balcom, Ross, More, Killam, McLellan, Robert-

son, Blackwood, King, S. Campbell, Coffin, Locke, Ray, Annand, Brown—16.

Against the Amendment—Heffernan, James Fraser, Shannon, Chas. Campbell, Bourinot, Hill, Whitman, D. Fraser, Churchill, Allison, Pryor, Parker, McKay, Kaulback, Hill, Tobin, Hamilton, Jost, Donkin, Longley, J. Campbell, McKinnon, McFarlane, Financial Secretary, Tupper, Cowie, Robichau, Archibald, Blanchard, Colin Campbell, Smyth, Caldwell.—32.

The last clause of the answer to the address passed by the same vote.

WEDNESDAY, March 20.

The House met at 3 p. m.

Hon. PROV. SECRETARY moved the appointment of committee for the nomination of standing committees.

MONEY VOTES.

Mr. COLIN CAMPBELL said he had a number of petitions to present in relation to money grants; the practice, he said, had been for gentlemen to hand them to the Financial Secretary in the House, stating the object; he enquired whether that course was to be pursued this season.

Hon. FIN. SEC'Y said that the rule required that such petitions should go to the Government, but members had been in the practice of presenting them in the House, so that the petitioners might see that they had not been neglected. The same end would be answered if gentlemen sent them in privately, and a weekly list could be laid on the table.

Hon. PROV. SEC'Y and Mr. LOCKE urged the adoption of a uniform course in such matters.

Hon. FIN. SEC'Y stated that the course which he proposed would be expected to be adopted by members of the House, and he would prepare such a list as he had mentioned.

ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS PRESENTED.

The House then proceeded to Government House to present the Answer to the Address of his Excellency at the opening of the session. The Speaker, upon their return, announced that his Excellency had been pleased to make reply, thanking the House for their Address, and stating that the important matters mentioned therein would receive the most careful consideration.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

Hon. FIN. SECRETARY said: In laying upon the table the Trade Returns for the year ending 30th September, 1866, I feel pleased at being able to congratulate the House upon the prosperity of the country. That prosperity, it was at one time feared, would have been largely affected by the

diminution of commercial intercourse from the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty, but an examination will shew that our commercial relations present an aspect of prosperity truly gratifying to every friend of his country. The returns, I may here state, exhibit an increase of revenue during the last year as compared with 1865 of \$185,815. The revenue of 1865 produced \$1,040,583, the total receipts of last year being \$1,226,198, shewing an increase to the amount mentioned, and embracing all duties from customs and excise, with exception of excise on the two items of tobacco and ale, the one being \$3178 and the other \$2324. Therefore the whole duty of customs under the existing law was \$1,226,398, and of excise \$5,402, being altogether \$1,231,902.

The next question of importance is the source from which the revenue has been derived; and the House will permit me as a matter of curiosity, if not of profit, to review the progress which the country has made, and the regular expansion of its trade in the last few years, as is indicated by the consumption of dutiable goods. This is shewn by a short review of the gradually increasing receipts, because I need not tell gentlemen accustomed to deal with trade that there can be no safer indication of the prosperity of a country—no surer index of the progress that a people are making than a gradually increasing ability to buy largely those necessaries and luxuries which go into the general consumption of the people.

The amount of revenue receivable depends on the population which is to buy, and the ability of that population to pay. In some countries of the same population a smaller revenue would have been obtained, and the increase of the latter, as compared with the increase of the former, shewed most clearly that the country was increasing and expanding in wealth and prosperity. In 1850 the revenue derived from customs and excise was only \$322,778—not quite a fourth of the revenue of to-day. In 1851 the amount received was \$375,052 from the same source. A fairer comparison perhaps will be to take the customs duties of a more recent period, when the circumstances of the country had been affected by the commencement of our railways. In 1856 the receipts from customs were \$571,588—somewhat more than one third of our present revenue from the same source. This indicates, as I have said, a rapid and sure progress in trade and prosperity. The next features presented by these returns are the sources from which this revenue is derived, and undoubtedly the accounts shew a peculiarity which at first might strike the house as requiring explanation, and the explanation for which will appear to every gentleman acquainted with commercial transactions. The increase in the revenue is, as I have said, \$185,000—a large per centage over last year—while the returns shew that the

total importations of goods, instead of having increased in the same ratio, are within a shade of the amount of last year; the importations in 1865 being \$14,381,662, while in 1866 they were \$14,281,008, leaving a difference of \$658 in favour of 1865. In view of the state of commercial matters throughout the world, and in view of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty and other measures affecting the usual channels of our trade, it is most important that we should see how far the current of trade has been affected by the repeal of that treaty. I need not say to those engaged in commerce that this is not the time to correctly gauge the probable effects of the repeal of the treaty, as these returns run over only six months since that took place, and I will not ask the house to draw any general conclusions on that point at this time; but at the expiration of the present quarter, which will give us the returns for a year after the repeal, I will lay on the table a supplementary statement which will enable us to arrive at more satisfactory conclusions. I need not remind the house that, from fortuitous circumstances, Nova Scotia has been able to steer through the year without any serious disaster; and I know nothing giving us greater cause for congratulation than the fact that a crisis of so serious a character, in a pressure so great as not to be exceeded at any former period, and in disturbed state of commercial relations with the neighboring Republic, our trade relations were proved to rest on so firm a basis that our people have been able to meet their engagements abroad, proving to the world that in no country is commerce conducted on sounder principles than here. In view of these circumstances, it is desirable to compare the state of our trade in 1865 and 1866 with other countries, and for this purpose I will take the table of importations. The importations from Great Britain decreased \$422,392, but the principal increase from other places was as follows:

From New Brunswick an increase of.....	£126,655
From Canada an increase of.....	217,329
From P. E. Island an increase of.....	143,098
From B. W. Indies an increase of.....	346,267

It will be found on coming to the table of exports that the exports to the United States have largely fallen off in comparison with our whole trade, the article of sugar being the principle article of decrease. It would appear that our merchants have imported from the West Indies more than they could dispose of—the practice for years being to import from these islands at a time when produce was low, to supply the American market, which to a certain extent had last year failed them. That was an explanation of the comparatively large imports and small exports to the United States. The importations from the United States decreased by \$284,000; the decrease of exports being \$391,247. From the Spanish West Indies the decrease in importations was \$181,791.

As to the exports the total amount for 1866 was \$8,043,095, the decrease being larger proportionally than the decrease in the imports, but these returns are subject to the explanation always made with reference to the returns of exports, that they are defective and do not present a reliable return of the exports of the country. This is admitted to be the case to some extent in every country. In Canada

there is an allowance made of 12½ per cent. for short entries of exports, and in all countries a similar experience exists. It is evident that the difference between the imports and exports cannot be so great as would thus appear from the returns, because the country is in a healthy condition financially, and our business men are able to meet their engagements. If the excess of imports over exports arose from over-trading that fact would be made very apparent by the derangement in business which it would necessarily create. The importations being about \$14,000,000, the exportations \$8,000,000, leaving \$6,000,000 to be accounted for. Several items ought in fairness to be deducted from this deficiency; the shipping built this year was valued at \$2,729,839,—that is at the rate of \$30 per ton, which I do not think a fair average value. Our gold returns represent the value of \$505,726, which is 24.162 oz., at the rate of \$18.50 per oz. These two items will give \$3,305,563, which, added to the exports shown by the returns, gives \$11,339,000, leaving about \$3,000,000 of a deficit. This may be accounted for by taking into consideration the large amount of shipping not included in the amount given, which only included that added to the register during the year. The balance of trade is therefore not so largely against us as it would appear. With these remarks I come to the decrease of trade to the countries to which we have been exporting. The principal items are as follows:—

	Decrease.	Increase
Exports to Great Britain.....	\$467,568	
Do to Canada.....		\$126,574
Do to New Brunswick.....		187,538
Do to Newfoundland.....		36,525
Do to Span. W. Indies.....		167,872
Do to French do.....		
Do to United States.....		
Do to B. W. Indies.....		

It will be seen from this that while there is a decrease in the importations from the Spanish West Indies our exports to them have increased, shewing that our trade with them is becoming of a more profitable nature. Instead of taking specie from the other islands for our exports and going to the Spanish Islands for produce, it would now appear that we reverse the order of things or at any rate do not deplete them of their gold to the same extent. To the French West Indies there does not appear to have been any trade during the year, excepting, perhaps, to the extent of one cargo.

Here I may mention one fact which confirms my remarks with respect to the present not being the time at which we can judge of the effects of the repeal of the treaty. I see that, in our dealings with the United States, the decrease in exports is not in the articles of native production, but in articles imported, which are usually re-shipped here for that country, such as sugar and spirits. We lose the carrying trade on these articles, it is true, but it would not seem from this that we are not to be so seriously affected by the repeal as we suppose.

I will now turn to the articles of merchandise in which the decrease of exports has principally taken place. It will be found that in the trade in horned cattle, beef, pork, sheep and lambs there is the large decrease of \$120,000,

that trade being only temporary and accidental, coming into existence with blockade-running business, and dying out with its cause.

	Decrease.	Increase.
Horned cattle, beef, pork, sheep, &c.	\$128,000	
Coal	180,000	
Herring		\$91,793
Mackarel, shad and halibut	8,536	
Shell fish	29,919	
Apples, pears and plums		19,824
Gypsum		18,261
Hardware		\$9,417
Woodware—board plank and deal		128,195
Firewood		28,442
Vegetables		27,377
Firewood and lathwood		29,442

Thus it appears that in all the native productions of the country there has been a considerable increase up to the date of these returns. The increase, compared with the whole amount of the same articles exported last year, showed a large per centage, also that in woodenware being equal to twenty per cent.

The following is a comparative statement of the exports of the principal articles of trade with the United States for the years 1865 and 1866, showing the exports for the latter year for the six months before and after the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty separately:—

In 1865	\$1,085,745	
In first half year 1866	\$224,307	
Second do do	633,457	859,963
Decrease		\$227,891
Fish exported in 1865	\$1,362,699	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$1,190,960	
Do. do. second half do	224,363	1,355,323
Decrease		\$17,376
Fish oil exported in 1865	\$117,962	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$73,909	
Do. do. second half do	10,636	84,595
Decrease		\$83,266
Sugar exported in 1865	\$309,459	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$63,716	
Do. do. second half do	8,738	62,454
Decrease		\$247,005
Molasses exported in 1865	\$139,011	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$49,845	
Do. do. second half do	50,108	99,953
Decrease		\$39,056
Wood exported in 1865	160,424	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$125,002	
Do. do. second half do	140,708	265,710
Increase		\$105,286
Gypsum exported in 1865	\$40,580	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$16,139	
Do. do. second half do	43,508	59,647
Increase		\$18,067
Vegetables exported in 1865	148,734	
Do. do. first half year 1866	\$149,979	
Do. do. second half do	12,592	162,571
Increase		\$13,837

It will be seen from these figures that during the half year after the repeal of the treaty

the export of some articles of native production was larger than during the half year when no tax was imposed on these articles in United States markets.

The British West Indies are the next countries on our list of imports. As I have already explained, the trade in cattle, beef, &c., wholly ceased, and our exports of fish were, without doubt, diverted to the Spanish West Indies to a great extent. The comparative statement for the British West Indies shows:

Exports of fish in 1865	\$1,150,692	
Do. do. first half of 1866	\$547,578	
Do. do. second half do	426,164	973,742
Decrease		\$176,950
Horses and Cattle in 1865	\$151,892	
Do. do. first half of 1866	\$4,507	
Do. do. second half do	2,988	7,495
Decrease		\$144,397
Wood in 1865	\$357,794	
Do. first half of 1866	\$225,937	
Do. second half do	213,462	444,399
Increase		\$86,606

I now proceed to place before the House a statement of the sources from which the revenue is made up. First as to the casual revenue:

Coal Mines, including royalty on coal	\$58,199
Gold Mines	18,201
Insane Asylum	17,062
Post Office	62,992
Railways	192,739
The total receipts from customs and excise duties were, as I have stated, \$1,231,992. Of this—	
The Advalorem Duties gave	\$565,069
Specific duties	660,422
Excise on Ale	3,178
" " Tobacco	2,324
	\$1,231,992

It will also be seen from the returns that the specific duties were nearly all yielded by a very few articles, thus:—

Duty on Spirits and Wines	\$316,182
Flour	28,685
Molasses	62,755
Sugar	90,289
Tea	82,068
Tobacco	26,000
Ale and Porter	5,818
	\$571,543

Spirits and wines therefore yielded about one-fourth of the entire revenue; and gentlemen may here permit me to refer to a fact which would seem to show that the action of the Legislature, at its last session, in raising the duty on rum, had operated prejudicially on the revenue, for the whole increase of revenue from that article was but \$9,000. I think, however, that we cannot fairly arrive at such a conclusion, because the large quantity in warehouse on the 31st March last has gone into consumption.

As far as I can ascertain there was rum enough on hand at the change of the tariff to supply the country until within a month or two of the financial year. One enquiry which here suggests itself is, what effect has the duty of 25 cents per barrel on American flour had on our trade in that article with the United States?

I am informed by those well acquainted with the trade, that with the existing facilities for transit that Canadian flour could be landed here more cheaply than that from the United States. The fact that there has been an increase of importation of flour from the latter country of 112,000 barrels would seem to show that the trifling duty imposed had not interfered seriously with the trade, but I do not think the figures can be relied on as showing the extent of flour trade between this Province and the United States and Canada, for it would appear by them that the importation of flour from Canada was

in 1866	72,000 bbls.
in 1865	58,000 bbls.
Increase.	14,000 bbls.

But this must be erroneous, and may perhaps be accounted for on the ground that Canadian flour has been entered at the outports as American. I have no means of verifying this opinion, but it appears to be a reasonable one, for we know that there has been during the season increased trade in flour with Canada, and the increase must be far larger than the figures would represent.

I will now call attention to the returns of revenue and expenditure. The total receipts of the year as per the Receiver General's account,

2,080,180 68

Expenditure

1,961,348 28

Leaving a balance of \$118,832 40

In this amount is not included the account with the Pictou Railway extension, which has been kept distinct by the Receiver General.

I will now give a statement of the expenditure of the year in the principal services as compared with the estimates for these various services. I may here say, however, that in many of the services there were liabilities standing over from last year, which go in this year's account, so that the fact of the payment as per the Receiver General's account exceeding the estimate, does not prove that there was an actual over expenditure. The public necessities in some cases in some cases, however, required that the amounts should be largely overdrawn, but in none of these could retrenchment have been exercised with due regard to the public interests.

	Estimated.	Paid.
Agriculture.....	\$ 2,000	\$28,000
Board of Works.....	180,420	219,606
Board of Statistics.....	4,000	2,488
Criminal Prosecutions.....	1,500	2,714
Crown Lands.....	19,500	29,600
Education.....	133,593	167,780
Immigration.....	5,800	2,600
Militia.....	88,000	143,652
Postal Communication.....	65,000	48,177
Public Building..... (not estimated)		32,666
Public Printing.....	8,000	10,412
Interest on debt.....	328,640	300,135
Roads & Bridges.....	274,000	215,898
Steamboats & Ferries.....	22,170	11,997

The largest item in excess is that of the Board of Works, the excess being \$99,000. Of that, however, there was a grant, included among Navigation Securities of \$30,000 to St. Peter's Canal, that expenditure being transferred to the Board. This, added to the \$160,000 estimated, will give \$190,000; then there is \$50,000 under miscellaneous services for pro-

tection of fisheries, likewise transferred to the extent of \$22,000, the "Druid" being under control of the chairman. That will reduce the over expenditure to about \$50,000. Of that \$16,000 was required to provide hospital accommodation in consequence of the arrival of the cholera ship in the spring, and the threatened visitation of pestilence during the summer; then a large additional sum was required for St. Peter's Canal and also for the Insane Asylum, which it was desirable to complete as rapidly as possible. The over expenditure in education was under the Act authorizing an advance from the treasury to enable the counties to meet the first half year's obligations to the teachers. Loans had been made to nearly all the counties, but as these were repaid after the close of the financial year, the expenditure for this department was really in accordance with the vote. The Report on Immigration, which will be shortly placed on this table, will show an account of the expenditure in that department. The number of immigrants was 912, the cost being at the rate of \$20 per head. The accounts of the Militia Department will likewise show the cause of the excess there, and I will here say that a very largely increased grant is considered essential for the maintenance of the militia system. The ordinary expense of the department, for 1866 was \$70,126 while the extraordinary amounted to \$44,133, and there is in addition an amount due for clothing. There was no allowance in the estimate for the public building. The balance to the credit of the Road and Bridges service has been since overdrawn.

It will be interesting to note the progress which has been made in so important a branch of provincial industry as our coal mines. In 1827 there were raised only 11,000 tons, while in 1866 there were raised 600,000 tons.

There is one item of the accounts which may cause some discussion, viz.: a charge of \$95,000 for treasury notes. It will be remembered that the alarm occasioned by the threatened invasion caused a run upon the Savings' Bank to the extent of \$62,000, of which there has been replaced only \$38,000. Notes had to be issued for the balance, and also for the construction of the Asylum and public building. These issues were required as well for the commercial convenience of the country as for discharging the demands of the treasury.

The following is a statement in reference to our marine:—

Vessels entered inwards:			
	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.
1866.....	6,552	978,070	49,037.
1865.....	6,894	929,929	49,083.
Decrease	232	Increase 48,141	
Outwards.			
	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.
1866.....	6,130	869,022	46,015.
1865.....	6,815	946,331	49,932.
Decrease	165	Increase 22,690	

Vessels Registered in this Province:			
	No.	Tons.	Value.
3,899		400,896	\$13,719,547
Added last year.			
38		65,834	2,629,837

One additional explanation I desire to make. The hon. Provincial Secretary is charged in the warrants drawn with \$400 for the expenses

as a delegate to Washington; the duties were discharged by the Attorney General, and the amount should be debited to him

BILLS.

Mr. KAWLBACK introduced a bill to vest in the Crown certain public lands in the town of Lunenburg.

Mr. TOBIN introduced a bill to increase the capital stock of the Halifax Gas Light Company.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON presented a petition and introduced a bill relative to the Wellington Mining Company. Also a bill relative to Palmerston Mining Company.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

Hon. PROV. SECRETARY laid on the table copies of correspondence relative to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. He explained that owing to the financial difficulties in England during the course of the past year, the persons who had taken the contract for the building of the road had been unable to fulfil their engagements. The Government, however, determined to use their best exertions to redeem the promise which they made when they adopted the policy of extending the railway to Pictou, that they would give railway facilities to the counties to the westward. Owing to the financial embarrassments in the mother country, the delegates experienced great difficulties in carrying out their intentions, and he had no hesitation in saying that it was only when British capitalists found that Confederation would soon become an accomplished fact, that they came forward willingly to contract for the work—Encouraged by the prospects offered by Confederation, parties entered into a contract for the construction of this railway which was so anxiously desired by the people of the western counties. The new contractors bound themselves, under a heavy penalty, to commence the work after the first of this year, and to finish it at the end of 1863. In order, however, to ensure the construction of the work, the Government were obliged to agree to capitalize the amount instead of paying the annual subvention, as originally intended. As respects the route, he would state that the Government had instructed Mr. Fleming, when Chief Engineer, to survey the line of railway for their information. Mr. Fleming made a survey on both sides of the Cornwallis river, and presented in his report, the relative advantages and disadvantages of each route. The Government were obliged, in making the contract, to leave it optional with the company which line to take. They felt they were quite safe in doing so, because the parties who were expending their capital in the construction of the road, would naturally locate it where it would best subserve the business of the country and promote their own interests. Previous to the departure of the delegates from England, the parties with whom they had made the contract organized the company, and associated with themselves the eminent contractor Mr. Brassey, thereby placing it beyond the possibility of a doubt that the work

would be immediately commenced and efficiently constructed. The spring would see the work vigorously proceeded with. It was intended, the Provincial Secretary added, to build the railway bridge of iron.

The House then adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 21.

The House met at 3 P. M.

Hon. PROV. SEC. presented a report from the committee appointed to nominate standing committees. The report was adopted.

HOSPITAL FOR INSANE.

HON. PROV. SEC., by command, laid on the table papers connected with the complaints against the Medical Superintendent of the Hospital for Insane, in the case of Richard Harley, deceased. He regretted that the unpleasant duty should have devolved upon him of submitting these papers to the house for reference to the Committee on Humane institutions. It was necessary for the information of the country, for the satisfaction of parties more directly interested in the institution and for the vindication of the character of the Superintendent, that an investigation should take place by a tribunal in whom the public would have confidence. The Government did not desire to throw any portion of their own responsibility upon the committee; but the management of the institution having been made the subject of heated discussion, it was desirable that any person having a complaint to make should be heard by a disinterested body of gentlemen. When the hospital was organized, the party now in power were entrusted with its management, and an act was passed providing that, while great responsibility should devolve upon the Superintendent, there should be a steward and matron not responsible to him, but appointed by the Government. The commissioners also appointed under that act experienced great difficulty, subsequently, in consequence of a disagreement between the officers, and the succeeding Government considered it necessary to dispense with the services of the steward and matron. He (Prov. Sec.) had taken great exception to this course, believing that such a responsibility as was thrown on the Superintendent should not rest on any living man. On coming back to power he and his friends had given great attention to the institution, and found that the management had been carried on in a very efficient manner, so much so that the Government did not feel called upon to carry out the views they had previously expressed. The large and influential committee of the house reported favourably year after year, and it was only recently that the public mind had been agitated on the subject. A young man a patient, had lately been removed to his home from the asylum, and had died shortly afterwards. Some of his friends believed that his condition in relation to cleanliness was not such as it should have been, and having made a complaint to the Board of Works, laborious investigation. That investigation, which had been declared by parties on all sides as highly satisfactory, had received the attention of the Govern-

ment, and a board of medical gentlemen, of high character had been appointed to examine the state of the institution, and their report together with Dr. De Wolfe's reply, would be found among the papers. While the investigation had satisfied the Government that the condition of the patient was not what it should have been, the evidence as to the present efficiency of the institution was such as not to warrant them in taking such a step as the removal of the Medical Superintendent. It was, however, proposed to revert to the system of appointing an independent officer as steward, and to establish a board of three gentlemen—one of them a consulting physician—not exactly charged with the functions of the business management, but to visit the Asylum regularly and to satisfy themselves to its condition. This, it was believed, would give to the friends of persons afflicted with the dreadful malady of insanity the assurance that it would be almost impossible for a want of care to exist. The duties of the Medical Superintendent had been very extensive onerous and laborious; and he would by such a change be relieved from those not properly belonging to his department, and would have more time to bestow upon the matters coming more immediately under his care. He desired to state that the medical superintendent was anxious to have the most thorough investigation made not only of this complaint, but of any others that could be preferred.

The papers were referred to the committee on Humane Institutions.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The House on motion of the Hon. Fin. Sec. went into committee of Ways and Means.

Hon. FIN. SEC moved that the customs, excise, and light house duties remain the same as last year.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL proposed that the duty on American flour be remitted. Canadian flour came in free, and he did not see the propriety of the distinction.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that the Government would be obliged to resist the proposal. Under the Reciprocity Treaty American flour came in free, and by the repeal, an act of this Province, previously existing, which imposed the duty, was brought into operation. While it was unfortunate that the commercial relations which had grown up between the Province and the United States had been disturbed, it was quite certain that the government of that country had no claim upon our consideration. The imposition of the duty was their own act; it was not retaliatory legislation upon our part. If there was one class of people to whom the treaty was especially valuable it was the fishing class, and nothing more detrimental to their interests could be done than to let the American government see that the treaty could be repealed, and the direct consequences at the same time avoided. The experience of the past year showed that the result of the tax was not to place an additional burden on the people in reference to the price of bread, for flour can be obtained from Canada of as good a qual ity and as low a price. It had thus incre-

sed the trade between this Province and Canada, and in the States an influential body had attacked the government on the ground that the abrogation of the treaty had inflicted a severe blow upon their commerce. Very soon he believed, a renewal of the treaty would be the result, and it would be most unwise to part with one of the means which were operating with powerful effect in that direction.

Mr. LOCKE said that if the imposition were to produce such a result as was anticipated no complaint could be made, but it had no such effect. That which could be used to bring about a renewal—the right of our fisheries—had been taken from us. Flour was a necessary article of importation, and it could not be got as well from Canada. The Western counties did not trade with Canada—the tax was therefore burdensome to them. The amount paid in six months was \$28,000, and this burden fell principally upon the fishing population. The price of flour was enormous, and the tax was not needed for the purposes of revenue, because the treasury was overflowing. The country required free trade as far as it could be got, while this provision operated as a protection to Canada. He believed that the tax was imposed for the purpose of advancing Canadian interests. It was now in the power of the government to repeal the tax, and he called upon the government to do so.

Hon. FINANCIAL SECRETARY concurred in the opinion respecting the advantages of free trade, but he asked was it consistent with the dignity of the Legislature, in view of the position assumed by the United States, to relieve that government of the consequences of their own hostile acts? Their own officers had condemned the policy of abrogating the treaty as a suicidal one on the very ground that this tax had been revived thereby, because it threw the flour market of this Province into the hands of those who are competing with them in their own markets. He would undertake to say that the imposition of the duty had not raised the price of flour, during the past year, for Canadian flour could be procured more cheaply and of a better quality. It was true that the fishermen of the Western counties did not trade with Canada to any great extent, but they could procure Canadian flour in the States as readily. The great difficulty had been in distinguishing between the two kinds of flour, and Boston merchants had in many cases brought the American flour to Canada, and transported it from there to here in order to avoid the duty. If that could be done, and the article still be sold cheaper than if imported direct, it was evident that the duty was not oppressive upon us. The mode of ascertaining whether the exporter or the consumer paid the duty was to ascertain which species of flour controlled the market, and the fact was that the Canadian flour controlled the market, and everything which came into competition with it had to abate in price. The tax, therefore, fell upon the exporter; but even supposing it to be otherwise, it only amounted to a cent a head upon our population, and the result was highly favorable in reference to the desired renewal of the treaty.

Mr. COFFIN enquired whether it was the intention to tax the Canadian flour coming through New Brunswick?

Hon. FIN. SEC. replied that the origin of the flour had to be well vouched for. American flour was allowed to enter New Brunswick duty free and it was hard to make the distinction afterwards. The rule adopted was that where the flour was Canadian beyond doubt the duty was not imposed,—otherwise it was.

Mr. COFFIN said that as to Canadian flour being available in the United States, many, of our traders only wish to obtain a small supply, and when they had to pay \$5 for a consul's certificate it amounted to more than the duty. Notwithstanding the arguments used to the contrary, it was clear that the consumer paid the tax. The fishermen having to seek a market in the United States, the protection to Canadian flour drove them to a cash trade. This was the more hard from the fact that American fishermen were allowed to fish on our coast for a paltry fee while our fish was heavily taxed in their markets. Thus there was a double tax upon the fishing industry.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the question was not one of revenue but of public policy. He thought that even a retaliatory policy would be wise, and that it would be well to say to the American people, "every ton of coal you ship shall be subject to a tax." The preference given to Canadian flour would be the strongest argument we could offer to those with whom we are about to unite to induce them to adopt our policy.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that cutting off one's nose to spite the face was a case precisely in point. It would not be well to anticipate the day of taxation, but on the contrary the food of the people should be kept clear as far as possible of such burthens as these. In New Brunswick such policy was adopted,—the tax was not required for the purposes of revenue, and where could be the ordinary common sense by which it could be supported? The argument that the exporter was the party affected by the duty was one that was not to be expected from the Finl. Secretary.

Mr. TOBIN said that last year he voted against the duty, and as far as purposes of revenue were concerned he thought it would be sound policy to admit flour free and raise the amount upon some other article if necessary, but in view of the present aspect of the question he felt disposed to favor the continuation of the tax. The duty had always been enacted, but the operations of the treaty suspended the imposition. Beef and pork had likewise been charged \$1 per bbl., and this had caused a remonstrance from the British Government. That, however, did not affect an alteration in the law, and these duties were brought into operation by the recent action of the American Legislature. American flour was so much higher than Canadian that not a barrel more would be imported by the duty being taken off. He, however, differed from the Financial Sec'y as to the payment of the duty, being of opinion that the amount of

tax was imposed by the seller here and that the consumer had to pay eventually. He believed it to be of little consequence whether the charge remained in the tariff or not.

Mr. DERBY, who had recently been on an official visit to this Province had discussed with some of our merchants the present trade relations between the United States and these Colonies and had taken a very liberal view of the subject, stating his belief that matters could not be put on a permanent and satisfactory footing without a Treaty. But in view of the present temper of Congress and of the burdens of the United States a renewal was considered impracticable. He, (Mr. T.) had said to Mr. Derby that while Americans were licensed to fish in our waters for 50 cents per ton, making say \$50 for a vessel of 100 tons, a Nova Scotian vessel fishing alongside and taking the same quantity had to pay \$2000 on its cargo in an American port. Then again as to pork, a barrel of that article was charged \$1 duty, its value being \$25 gold, while on a barrel of herring worth \$2.50, a tax of \$1 was charged. As to flour, a barrel worth \$7, paid a duty of 25 cents, while on our codfish, worth from \$3 to \$4, there was a duty of 56 cents. Mr. Derby's table appeared in the tariff submitted to Congress by Mr. Welles, but the proposals made in the amendment were rejected. He did not think it was worth while to change the tariff.

Mr. TOWNSEND remarked that the Consul's charge of \$5 for a certificate was very burthensome, and such a certificate, he thought, was not required. The bond and attestation, which always accompanied the flour, gave all the guarantee against fraud that was needed.

Hon. FIN. SEC'Y. said that as to flour coming from Portland there was no difficulty, for the bill of lading on the Grand Trunk Railway was the best guard, but in Boston it was much more difficult to distinguish the origin. He did not see how the necessity for the Consul's certificate could be obviated.

Mr. TOWNSEND replied that the Consul, in giving his certificate, did not see the flour, or know anything about it, excepting from the bond and attestation.

Mr. McLELAN that the best way of obviating the difficulty and of simplifying matters would be to abolish the tax. He believed that it was quite possible that after the next harvest American flour might be cheaper than Canadian flour. In that case our merchants might import the American article, and our people would be very largely taxed. It was very hard that the poor people should have been obliged to pay a tax of \$28,000 during six months on flour at a time when it was up to the exorbitant price of \$8 or \$9 a barrel. Canada had not pursued the same policy with regard to American coal, which was allowed to come in free. Coal was as much a necessity to the Canadians as flour to us.

Mr. KILLAM disapproved of the policy of imposing a tax upon flour. It was the interest of the Province to obtain the flour where they

could obtain it the cheapest. Our people now consumed at least 500,000 barrels yearly. It was most unjust to increase the price of flour at a time when it was already extravagantly high. The fact was there was a determination in certain quarters to favor the Canadians, even if in doing so, our own people were burthened; The Government of New Brunswick had not pursued the same course that the Government of this province had in respect to this indispensable article of food.

Mr. LOCKE referred to the claims of the fishermen to consideration, and to the burthens that this duty imposed on them. It should be remembered that the people to the westward were obliged to take their produce to the United States and get back flour and other articles they required. He argued that the tax ought in justice to all classes of the people be removed.

Mr. MCKAY believed that under existing circumstances it would be unwise to repeal the duty, which was, after all, a very insignificant affair.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that it ought to be sufficient for gentlemen opposite to know that the gentleman authorized by the American Government to enquire into the question of trade relations with British America, had reported to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, that this very tax on American flour, which had been so largely used in these Provinces, was one of the results of the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty. When it was seen that the existence of this duty was used as one of the arguments in favor of a return to the treaty, it is certainly most inadvisable to do away with it. The argument might be fallacious or sound, but all that we required to know was that it was being advanced with good effect. It would be an act of injustice to every miner, fisherman and farmer, therefore, to do anything that might interfere with the re-establishment of reciprocal trade relations between this country and the United States. It must be remembered that when the Americans repealed the treaty this duty actually revived. The re-imposition of this duty was, therefore, virtually their own act.

Mr. TOWNSEND was opposed to the continuance of the duty, which did not exist in New Brunswick.

Hon. PROV. SEC'Y.—It did not exist there formerly.

Mr. TOWNSEND said that, in all probability, when the Provinces were confederated, the duty would be raised to half a dollar or even one dollar.

Hon. PROV. SEC'Y read from Mr. Derby's report, to bear out his previous remarks that that gentleman adduced the existence of this duty as an argument in favour of a return to reciprocity.

Mr. McLELAN did not believe that a return to reciprocity was now probable since Confederation was the order of the day. There would be so many interests arrayed against the Americans in the Confederate Parliament that it was hardly probable a Reciprocity Treaty would

ever be agreed to. The fact that the Canadians had imposed no duty on American coal entering their country proved, he considered, that they cared nothing for the interests of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CHURCHILL expressed himself opposed to the imposition of a duty on flour. Large numbers of our people were obliged to buy in the American market, and he thought it unfair to cripple them in any way.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL expressed himself as an advocate of protective principles. He thought that it was quite possible for the people of this country to raise a large portion of the flour they required for their own consumption. He was even induced to believe that it might yet be advisable to raise the duty on American flour still higher.

Mr. PLACKWOOD considered the tax unjust, because it bore hardly upon the poorer classes of the people of this country. It was the duty of the Legislature to impose as few burthens as possible upon the masses.

Mr. KAULBACK spoke of the excellence of Canadian flour, and of the large consumption of the article in his own county. He would not be willing to adopt any policy which he thought would be really burthensome to the country. The true policy was to get the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty as soon as possible.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL moved that American flour be put on the list of exemptions

On a division, the motion was lost.

The committee then adjourned, and Mr. Campbell moved against the duty on flour.

The House divided, and the motion was lost by 17 to 28.

Yeas—Killam, Townsend, Balcum, Hebb, Robertson, Churchill, McLelan, Locke, S. Campbell, Ross, Ray, Annand, Robicheau, Brown, Coffin, Caldwell.

Nays—Hill, Shannon, D. Fraser, Archibald, John Campbell, Allison, Whitman, Pryor, C. J. Campbell, Cowie, More, Parker, Bill, Longley, Hamilton, Tobin, Jost, Donkin, J. Fraser, McKinnon, Kaulback, Fin. Secretary, Prov. Secretary, McKay, Blanchard, Smyth, Colin Campbell, McFarlane.

Hon. FIN. SEC'Y then introduced the Revenue Bills.

Hon. PROV. SEC'Y laid on the table the report of the Commissioner of Crown Lands; report of Chairman of Board of Works; report of Commissioner of Mines; report on Indian Affairs; report of Railway Commissioner; report relative to the public health.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR TRADE.

Mr. TOBIN stated that at the last session of the Legislature an act had been passed prohibiting the export of merchandize from this province to any place except a port of entry. This act, which had been passed at a time when he was absent from the House, had interfered seriously with a considerable trade that had been carried on with certain portions of the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. Merchants were now obliged to visit a port of entry, and there

pay duties upon the goods that were exported from this Province and then go to a district which had no representation in the Legislature of the island, where the government of Newfoundland, in fact, had no jurisdiction whatever. The only excuse for the law was the allegation that certain parties had been in the habit of carrying on an illicit trade. Goods were exported in bond ostensibly for the trade, and were subsequently brought back here without payment of any duty. He believed that there was only one way of preventing such proceedings, and that was, the imposition of an extremely high penalty upon the guilty parties. Mr. Tobin also took occasion to allude to the Consular fees, which were considered a great nuisance to trade. He then presented a petition, signed by 56 leading merchants of the city of Halifax, relative to the act in question. He also presented two certificates from masters of vessels, in illustration of the subject he had brought to the notice of the House.

The papers in connection with the subject were referred, on motion of Mr. Tobin, to the committee on Trade and Manufactures.

The House then adjourned.

FRIDAY, March 22nd.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

HON. FIN. SECY. laid on the table the Receiver General's account with the Pictou Railway extension. Referred to Committee on Public Accounts.

HON. FIN. SECY. also laid on the table the Report of the Secretary of Board of Statistics.

The House then went into Committee on bills and passed the Revenue bills, which were subsequently read a third time and sent to the Legislative Council for their concurrence.

MR. BILL introduced a bill to legalize assessment rolls for King's County.

MR. BOURINOT introduced a bill to amend Chap. 17 of the Acts of 1865 relative to the Elective franchise.—Also an act to legalize assessment rolls for the County of Cape Breton.—Also a bill to legalize the Grand Jury at Sydney. These bills were all read a first time.

HON. MR. SHANNON introduced a bill for the appointment of a Stipendiary Magistrate for the City of Halifax. Read a first time.

HON. PROV. SECY. laid on the table copy of the Report of the Union Delegates to England, which was read by the clerk for the information of the House.

HON. FIN. SECY. introduced a bill to amend chap. 70 of Provincial Government Railway.

MR. BOURINOT introduced a bill in amendment of the Act of the Incorporation of the International Coal Company in the County of Cape Breton.

The House then went into committee on bills, and passed the Railway bill previously introduced.

HON. PROV. SECY. laid on the table a communication from a number of military officials in this garrison relative to certain taxes imposed

upon them, which they state they have not to bear in other dependencies of the empire. For instance, they are taxed for the support of schools, though they have some of their own. The memorial was accompanied by letters from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor and from General Doyle in support of the prayer of the petitioners.

The papers were referred to the committee on City Bills.

HON. PROV. SECY. laid on the table the Report of the Postmaster General for 1866. Also the Immigration Report.

SATURDAY, March 23.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MR. BILL presented a petition from farmers and others in King's County complaining of a system pursued by certain persons of forestalling them in the Halifax Country Markets. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

MR. TOWNSEND introduced a bill to incorporate the Exchange Bank of Yarmouth.

ROAD COMMUNICATION.

MR. LOCKE called the attention of the Government to the fact that he had for several years urged upon the Government the construction of a road between Shelburne and Annapolis. Last year they had promised to survey the road, which would be indispensable to Shelburne when the railway to Annapolis was finished. He took it for granted that the Government intended surveying the road with a view to its immediate construction; and though he did not rise to present any petition on the subject, he would hand to the Financial Secretary an application from the members of Shelburne in reference to the proposed road—an application in which he was sure the members for Annapolis and Digby would also concur.

MISCELLANEOUS.

MR. PRYOR, as chairman of committee on Private Bills, reported the following bills without amendment:—To revert in the Crown certain public lands in Lunenburg; to incorporate the Palmerston Mining Company; to incorporate the Wellington Mining Company; to increase the capital stock of the Halifax Gas Company.

MR. LONGLEY presented a petition praying for drawback of duties exacted on Canadian flour. In answer to an enquiry of the hon. member, the Financial Secretary stated he would give some information on the subject in a few days.

THE FISHERIES.

HON. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY said:—I beg leave to lay on the table copies of correspondence relative to the fisheries and, in doing so, I may express my satisfaction that the time has at last arrived when it is the power of the government to vindicate themselves from the misrepresentation to which their action on this important question has been subject during the past year. For many months the charge has been circulated all over this Province by a considerable portion of the press that the Government had ignored the rights and in-

terests of the fishermen of this country. I can only say that I think that the course pursued by the Government at the last session of the Legislature—the great interest which they evinced in the protection of the fisheries, ought to have been sufficient to show the fallacy of the charges which have been brought against them. It will be in the recollection of the house that I moved for a special committee to inquire into the question of the fisheries. That committee was composed of the Attorney General, and a large number of leading men on both sides, and I had the honor, as chairman, of bringing in its report, which asserted, in the clearest and most emphatic manner, the rights of this Province to the fisheries, and recommended that every possible means should be taken for the purpose of protecting them from the encroachments of the American fishermen. The American Government had, by their own act, and without reference to their own fishermen, deprived them of the rights which for ten years they had enjoyed in our waters. The Government of this Province, therefore, emphatically committed themselves to the policy of excluding American fishermen at once from the waters belonging to this country. That report, submitted by myself, was adopted unanimously by the Legislature, and the Government immediately took action upon the subject, and addressed a despatch to the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governors of the other Provinces inviting their co-operation—a co-operation which appeared to be most essential in dealing with this question, inasmuch as the fishing grounds resorted to by the Americans do not exclusively belong to Nova Scotia, but are also within the territorial domain of Canada and New Brunswick. Our object in addressing this despatch, with which was enclosed the report of the committee of the Legislature, was for the purpose of devising with the other Provinces a system of protection by which American fishermen might be excluded from the fishing grounds of British North America. In order that no time might be lost in dealing with this question, the Government proposed that a member of the Canadian Cabinet should meet one of ourselves at Fredericton during the last Session of the Legislature there, for the purpose of taking such measures as would effectually accomplish the object which we had in view. I mention these facts to the house to show how far we were from being indifferent to the fishing interests of this country.

A perusal of the papers which I am about to lay on the table will show that the Imperial Government, at an early stage of this question formed the opinion that if the American fishermen were suddenly excluded from the privileges which they had enjoyed for so long a time, difficulties of a very serious character might arise between the United States and Great Britain, which would operate against the renewal of a treaty. This view was presented in a very strong manner, as will be seen by a Minute of Council from their Government in reply, embodied in these papers. It is impossible, I must

state, to bring the whole of this correspondence here, because certain portions of it were of a confidential character that precluded their being presented to the house. I will, however, call attention to a statement in the Canadian Minute of Council which shows that the Imperial Government had applied to the Canadian Ministry to allow American fishermen to fish in British American waters for the past year:

“It now has become necessary to consider the further steps to be taken, and the committee have given their best consideration to the suggestion in Mr. Cardwell's despatch—that for the current year no interference with American fishermen should take place—in view of the hope of a change of policy in the U. States on the question of Reciprocal Trade.”

The Imperial Government were led to believe, from whatever source they got the information, that the peremptory exclusion of American fishermen from our waters would lead to such unpleasantness between the two countries as would prevent the accomplishment of a renewal of reciprocal trade between British America and the United States. This policy, it will be seen, did not originate with the Canadians, but was pressed upon them by the Imperial authorities, as is clearly shewn by the clause that I have read. The Canadian Government went on to show the great interest that British America had in these fisheries, and the great importance of protecting them, and the inconvenience that would arise from any step that would seem an apparent concession to American fishermen, or would raise a doubt as to the entire right of British America to exclude the citizens of any other country from resorting to their fishing grounds. Yielding finally to the policy pressed upon them, they proposed as a compromise that, for one year only, a system of licensing American fishermen should be pursued. The Government of Canada drew up this Minute of Council, and sent it to the Imperial authorities, as embodying their views, and to show how far they were prepared to meet the wishes of the latter in relation to this question. The answer sent by the Government of Nova Scotia will show that so far from their at once yielding to the proposal thus made, they drew up a Minute of Council expressing in the strongest terms their great objection to any such policy being pursued. They pointed out, as will be seen, at considerable length, the serious objections they had to a system of licensing American fishermen. The same despatch which they had sent to the Governor General and the Lieut. Governors, was transmitted to her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies. We therefore placed the Imperial Government in a position to learn the views of this Legislature, and also the fact that we had called upon the other colonies to join us in carrying out these views. The answer of the Governor General contained the despatch of the Imperial Government on this subject, and in transmitting it he said that it was forwarded for the information of this Government, and that they would not reply to our previous proposal until they ascertained what were our own views on the question as it was then presented to us.

Having given that despatch of the Governor General and the Minute of the Canadian Government the fullest consideration, we felt bound to adhere to the policy which we had previously expressed; and we drew up a strong remonstrance to the proposal which the Canadian Cabinet, in deference to the wishes of the Imperial authorities, had agreed to. We addressed this remonstrance to the British Government, and we urged by every argument we could devise the adoption of our own policy. In the meantime the House will perceive that the Government of Canada had yielded the point, and had agreed, as far as they were concerned, to adopt the system for a year. We were placed in a very difficult position, but, nevertheless, we persevered in it until the very last extremity. We stood out until we received a despatch from her Majesty's Government expressing the strongest dissatisfaction with the refusal on our part, on a question of Imperial import, to be guided by their wishes, and even going further, and intimating in pretty strong language that if we continued to disregard their wishes we would not be in a position to claim their assistance in the event of our fishing grounds being encroached upon. The Colonial Minister stated in a despatch which is among these papers, that they urged the adoption of this system for a single year, under the belief that such a concession on our part would lead to the renewal of reciprocal trade between the United States and the British American Provinces. If we had continued to resist the wishes of the Imperial Government, we would therefore not only have given the deepest offence, but have laid ourselves open to a charge of having prevented the re-establishment of satisfactory commercial relations with the United States.

It is to me a matter of intense pride that I am able to stand here and vindicate the course which the Government have pursued, and prove to the Legislature that everything that was possible was done to carry out the scheme of this House, and the views of gentlemen on both sides. It will be seen that that Government only yielded to the wishes of the Imperial Government when expressed with a vigor and terseness that are not usual in the despatches of the Imperial authorities, and when it was urged that the policy which we had adopted as the true one would be detrimental to the best interests of this country. It may be said that the Government of Canada yielded a much more ready deference to the Imperial authorities than did the Government of this Province. That may be offered as one reason why it is not advisable that Nova Scotia should unite her interests more closely with those of Canada. I receive, however, an entirely different impression from the history of this question. In this instance the Canadian authorities have given weight and force to other more important and pressing interests, and have not exhibited that deep anxiety in these fisheries which they must do when they are immediately interested in them under the scheme of union. When the Provinces are

united, then the Canadians will have the same direct interest in the British American fisheries that this Province has. Then you will have brought to bear on Canada the same influences that prevail with us; but I go a step further, and I call the attention of hon. members and of the intelligent people of this country to the fact that the government of Nova Scotia is here proved to have been unable to oppose a policy which was concurred in by Canada. That province, on account of her immense territorial area, of her large population compared with that of Nova Scotia, now possesses an influence which overshadows that of all the other provinces. The moment, however, that union is consummated, the interests of Canada becomes identical with those of Nova Scotia. Connected with her sister province, Nova Scotia will possess an amount of power and influence that, now isolated, she can never expect to have. We shall have the means, in the Parliament of a united British America, of making the influence of this province felt in reference to a question in which so large a proportion of the people have the deepest interest.

This tax was simply imposed for a single year for the purpose of establishing in the most unequivocal manner the right of British Americans to exclude the citizens of any foreign power from their fishing grounds. I may be asked what shall be the course during the present year. I must frankly state to you that the same policy must probably be pursued, simply for the reason that the delay which has taken place in accomplishing the union of the colonies, would prevent the question receiving the only decisive consideration that it would have been possible to give it. As far as I have been able to learn by communication with the members of the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick, the policy of the present year will be to double the charge upon every ton of shipping which is allowed to fish in our waters—thus again re-establishing the entire right of British America to exclude foreigners from its fishing grounds, and to admit them on whatever terms it may deem proper. The object of Canada, let me say in conclusion, was to defer to the Imperial Government until we were united and able to devise such a policy as the United Parliament may think proper to pursue. If the United States will not agree to liberal commercial arrangements, then I entertain no doubt that the policy of the Government of British America will be immediately to exclude the fishermen of that country from any anticipation in our fishing grounds. When I had an opportunity of conferring with the Canadian Government at Ottawa on this subject, it was decided that the Canadians should only receive such portion of the duty collected as was required to meet the expenses of issuing the licenses. The amount received by the authorities in this Province for licenses was \$9871.69. The amount taken by the Canadian Government must have been very much larger, and when ascertained, it will be divided between the Governments of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, with the exception

of the sum required to meet such incidental expenses as those just mentioned.

Mr. LOCKE was not prepared to say that the Government could have acted differently in the position in which they were placed. It was exceedingly humiliating to think that the Government of the Province should have been so perfectly powerless. He had very strong opinions on the subject of the tonnage duty, and regretted deeply that it should ever have been agreed to. He could not help seeing in the action of Canada in reference to this question conclusive evidence of the manner in which this Province would be treated hereafter under Confederation. It was very obvious that our fisheries would no longer be protected, now that we were to become a part of Canada. He thought that the Government might have made even stronger remonstrances than they actually did, and not permitted the Canadians to place them in such a position.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL looked upon this matter in the same light that his hon. friend viewed it. He looked upon the action of the Canadian Government and the British Government combined as the first step towards the entire deprivation of our people's rights in the fisheries. At no time hereafter would we have the same rights that we have hitherto enjoyed. Gentlemen looked at the question in a *couleur de rose* aspect when they stated that this Province would be better situated under Confederation. If the British Government, which we had always regarded as the mightiest power in the world, did not feel itself able to assert the rights of the people of this country, what could we expect from that feeble "Donizian" which was about being formed? The impression made on his mind by hearing the despatches read was that the Canadians were at the bottom of this arrangement.

Mr. TOBIN believed that if the Maritime Provinces had been represented in the Canadian Government, this system of licensing American vessels would never have been agreed to. When Canada and New Brunswick admitted the system it was impossible for Nova Scotia to take any other course than she did. This was a forcible illustration of the detrimental effects of the system of isolation that now prevailed among the Provinces of British America. He disapproved entirely of the license system, and trusted it would not be continued. The American Government had not made a single concession to these Provinces. For instance, when an attempt was made in Congress to reduce the duty on coal, it was defeated. Such a fact was certainly surprising in view of the large interest Americans had in the collieries of this country. He was not prepared to grant a single license whether for one or for five dollars. Mr. Tobin then went on to refer to the manner in which the fisheries were carried on in the Gulf by American fishermen. Our most valuable shore fisheries had been almost entirely destroyed by the system pursued for some years by the Americans. He believed that under Confederation this question of the fisheries would re-

ceive the most ample consideration, and our interests would be better protected than they could be under existing circumstances.

Mr. COFFIN did not attribute any blame to the government for the course they had taken, for apparently they had done all in their power to protect the fisheries. He looked with much astonishment and regret upon the action of the Imperial government, and he was much afraid that our fisheries might now be considered virtually taken from us. He did not expect that when we were confederated with Canada, our rights and interests would be any better considered than they are now.

Mr. ROSS could not be persuaded that this great Confederation, from which hon. Gentlemen opposite appeared to expect so much, would ever be able to protect our fisheries. He did not believe that the large majority of Canadian representatives who would control the Confederate Parliament would take the same view of the fishery question that our representatives would. The large agricultural interest of Canada would be predominant and would drown the voice of Nova Scotia, which is so deeply interested in these fisheries. There were certain gentlemen even in this house who regarded the interests of the fishermen as inferior in importance to other interests.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that he had lived for very many years in the centre of the great herring and mackerel fishery. His opinion, derived from observation and experience, was that the protection of the fishermen of this Province is utterly valueless. It should not be forgotten that Canada, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island possess ten miles of valuable fishery ground for every one belonging to Nova Scotia. Our mackerel fishery really extended from Port Hood to Cheticamp; as respects that between Scatarie and Cape North, it was comparatively valueless. No one, however, would be better pleased than himself if the question of the fisheries could be used successfully to bring back the Americans to reciprocity. He thought the Government had done their duty in remonstrating as they did against the adoption of the license system. The history of the whole question showed the necessity of Confederation. As at present situated, we could not influence the action of Canada and the other Provinces, which had large territorial rights in the fisheries of British America.

Mr. TOBIN said that it was the abuse of the fisheries by the Americans that had so largely injured some of the fishing grounds, which years ago had been very valuable to our people. For many years the mackerel fishery of this country had declined, in consequence of the system pursued by the Americans. St. Margaret's Bay, where fish had formerly been so plentiful, was a case in point; the fishermen of that bay were now obliged to go to the Labrador and the North Shore to catch fish. The system of feeding the fish, pursued by the Americans to so large an extent, was among the causes that had tended to injure the fishery ground close to our own shores.

Mr BLANCHARD said that if the hon member would come down to his county next summer, he would show him more fish than the Americans could catch. It was an exploded idea that the Americans drew off the fish by feeding them. He believed that our own vessels caught as much fish as the same number of American vessels that came into our bays. One sudden gale of wind, he knew, did more damage to the fisheries, did more to drive them off, than any system pursued by the Americans.

Hon. Prov. Sec. said that no one could presume to say that it was not of the most vital consequence to the interests of the Province that our fishing grounds should be protected, and that we should exclude from them the American fishermen, unless we received from them such concessions as would be equivalent to the privileges they would obtain. He contended that the present position of the fisheries arose altogether from the disunion of the Provinces. As it was now, the voice of the Legislature was unable to influence Provinces which were not now bound to us by those social, political and commercial ties that would exist when British America was one Confederacy, animated by a common sympathy and interest. When gentlemen who now so forcibly expressed their views in reference to the fisheries were able to make themselves heard in a Confederate Parliament, no doubt their voice would have the effect it ought to have. The papers on the table proved conclusively that the Canadian Government was fully alive to the great value of these fishery grounds, and of the indisputable right of British America to enjoy them exclusively. So far as the policy of Canada went, it was to modify the proposal of the Imperial Government. The course pursued by the Government of this Province, he was glad to find, was heartily approved by gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Ross said that it was well known to the members from Cape Breton that from Cape North to Scattarie there was hardly a creek or harbour where valuable fisheries did not exist. During the year 1855 American vessels got fares off the harbor of Sydney, and indeed within it. He only called attention to this fact for the purpose of correcting a misapprehension of the hon member for Inverness.

The papers presented by the Provincial Secretary were then referred to the Committee on the Fisheries.

THE LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY then asked permission to introduce an Act to amend Chapter 3 R. S., "of the duration of and representation in the General Assembly." He

explained that in consequence of the great change which was about being made in the government of British America, a very large portion of the duties which had hitherto devolved upon the Local Legislature of this Province would be transferred to the Parliament of the "Dominion of Canada." Under these circumstances it was necessary to remodel our local constitution, and accordingly in the present act it was proposed to diminish the number of representatives in the House of Assembly. It was proposed to give each county in the Province two members. To Pictou and Halifax respectfully, however, there would be given an additional member, in consequence of their large population compared with other counties. Of course it would be at once apparent that the bill did not provide an equal representation according to population for the several counties. The government of which he was a member had in 1859 introduced a bill—which was now law—by which the representation was placed on a far more equitable basis than it had ever been before, but, nevertheless, some considerable inequalities still remained. Such inequalities, however, existed in all countries, but nowhere less than in Nova Scotia. It did not seem practicable to reduce the representation from two members to a single one for the smallest counties. It was deemed most advisable to place every county on the same footing, with the exception of those two counties, whose population was so largely in excess of that of the others. As respects the Legislative Council, it was proposed to ask the house to agree to a resolution requesting the Crown to reduce the number of that body to 18 or 19 members: that is to say, one for every county, and one additional for the metropolitan county, if it should be deemed advisable. The House would see that henceforth the electors of the Province would possess larger electoral powers than ever before. They would have to elect two members for the Local Legislature, and one for the General Parliament, except, of course, in Halifax and Pictou, to which additional members were given; but in no case would the number of votes given at the poll be less than three. He believed that the policy proposed would recommend itself to the intelligence of the house and country.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that the introduction of the bill was tantamount to a declaration that Confederation was finally passed in Parliament. Under these circumstances he thought it was the duty of every member of the house on both sides to give his

assistance to the furtherance of a bill having in view the perfection of the Local Constitution of this country. It was unnecessary to discuss the features of the measure at this stage, but he would ask whether it was intended to alter the duration of the Local Legislature to five years—the duration of the Federal Parliament under the Act of Union?

Hon. PRO. SEC. replied that no such change was proposed in the bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD enquired if district representation was abolished:

Hon. PRO. SEC. replied in the affirmative.

Mr. ANNAND stated that in the Confederacy there would be a variety of electoral arrangements. In Canada there would be district representation, whereas, in this province it would be all county representation. Again, whilst the majority of the counties would have three votes, others would have four and five.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that the present arrangement was as fair as could be devised under existing circumstances. It would be in the power of the new house, he added, to make any changes they deemed advisable.

Mr. LOCKE thought that perhaps it would be as well to do away with the Legislative Council altogether, in pursuance of the course adopted by Ontario.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that the hon. member would have an opportunity of dealing with the question when the resolution was introduced. He need hardly say that the Government believed it would be best for the interest of the country to have two houses.

Mr. KILLAM thought it questionable policy to reduce the house down to 38 members at the present time. The matter ought to be fully considered. He doubted the propriety of the present house at all touching so important a question: it ought to be left to the new legislature.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said it was certainly surprising to hear any one oppose a reduction of the house, when it was well known that a large portion of the duties it had hitherto discharged would be transferred elsewhere. He remembered reading, many years ago, the debates of the house, and was struck with the tactics pursued by the hon. member for Yarmouth in respect to railways in this country. When he was unable to prevent their construction, he proposed a road vote of an enormous amount, with the object of making the country bankrupt as rapidly as possible, and unable to build railways or anything else. Following a simi-

lar policy he would make Confederation as expensive as possible, since he could not prevent its consummation. He (Mr. Killam) had, obviously, concluded that his whole efforts should be directed towards substantiating the arguments of himself and friends, that we would not have money enough, under Confederation, to carry on the Local Government.

The bill having been read a first time,

Hon. PRO. SEC. then laid on the table a bill in reference to the departmental officers and their salaries. It was obvious to the house, he stated, that the same reasons which would require a reduction in the Legislature would exist in respect to the public departments. It was therefore proposed to abolish the office of Financial Secretary, and devolve his duties upon the Provincial Secretary, whose salary would be reduced to £600 a year. The office of Deputy Secretary would also be abolished, but there would be a chief clerk in the office with a salary of \$1200 a year. It was also intended to abolish the office of Solicitor General, whilst the salary of the Attorney General would be reduced to £400 a year. As the larger portion of the duties now devolving on the Board of Works would be transferred to the General Government, it was proposed to abolish that office. In order to provide for the efficient discharge of the public business, it was intended to appoint a Treasurer, with a salary of £500, instead of a Receiver General, and who must have a seat in the Legislature. To this officer will be given a clerk with a salary of \$1000 a year. It was also proposed to have a Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, with a salary of £500 a year, as is now paid to the head of the Mines Department, who will have a Clerk of Works and a Clerk of Mines, each at \$1000 a year. In view of the great importance of this department, its head would be required to have a seat in the Legislature. He had no doubt that the house and country would accept the measure as an evidence of the desire and intention of the Government to make our local constitution under Confederation economical, and at the same time fully equal to all the duties which would have to be performed under it.

The bill having been read a first time the house adjourned.

MONDAY, March 25th.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill to legalize assessment rolls for the County of Richmond

Mr. ROSS introduced a general bill to legalize assessment rolls for the present year.

HON. PROV. SEC'Y, laid on the table the report of the Post Master General and papers connected therewith. Referred to Post Office Committee.

Mr. MILLER presented a petition from a large number of the inhabitants of Richmond County asking a division of the County into two ridings for sessional purposes.

LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

HON. PRO. SEC'Y, introduced a bill to amend Chap. 2 of Revised Statutes relative to Executive and Legislative disabilities. He said that the object was to prevent parties who held seats in either branch of the local Parliament holding seats in the Senate or House of Commons of the Confederated Provinces. The government were of opinion that the effect of a party thus holding two seats and discharging responsibilities to more than one constituency would be unfavorable to the public interests.

The bills relating to the Local Constitution were made the order of the day for Friday next.

BILLS.

The House then went into committee on bills and passed the bill to increase the stock of the Halifax Gas Light Company, the bill to vest in the Crown certain lands in the town of Lunenburg, the bill to incorporate the Wellington Mining Company, and the bill to incorporate the Palmerston Mining Company. The Committee adjourned and reported.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE BILL.

HON. Mr. SHANNON moved the second reading of the bill for the appointment of a Stipendiary Magistrate for the city of Halifax.

Mr. TOBIN said that the bill would establish a new principle,—it provided that the City Council should appoint for life a Judge at a salary of £500 per year. He believed the time had arrived when such an officer should be appointed, but this proposal was in opposition to the principles which had hitherto been recognized.

HON. PROV. SEC. said he had no hesitation in expressing his opposition to the principle of a judge being elected by the Council. He had yet to learn that the practice of allowing the Executive to nominate the Judges and of holding them responsible for the character and attainments of those officers should be altered. He preferred the British system to the republican system of election. If ever there was a time when the Legislature should hesitate in entrusting the City Council with such a power it was the present, when that body had so recently set at defiance the law of the land and treated it with contempt. The House should hesitate before authorizing such a body to elect a judge who would receive a salary little inferior to that of the judges of the Supreme Court and would discharge functions of the highest character. He quite agreed that such an appointment was necessary for the proper administration of law in the city, but the features to which he referred he considered most anomalous and in addition to that, if the bill

were passed the magistrate would go to the discharge of his duties with the consciousness that if he did not succeed in pleasing a few individuals in the Council he would be liable to have his office wrested from him and bestowed on some one who would be more pliant.

HON. Mr. SHANNON said that such an appointment had been long desired. A great many citizens would not take seats in the City Council because of the unpleasant duties of the Police Court. It should be remembered that the principle of electing judges had been already sanctioned in the case of the Mayor and Recorder.

Mr. TOBIN remarked that the magistrate would be invested with greater powers than those possessed by any judge of the Supreme Court, having the right to imprison without trial by jury. The greatest care should therefore be exercised. Another point to be considered was the salary,—he thought there should be a corresponding reduction in other departments. The taxation was already burdensome and was falling on the industrious part of our citizens entirely, for those who had large investments of money in securities escaped taxation to a great extent. One individual whose taxes had been \$2000, under the new assessment only paid \$240. He thought it would be well for the House to appoint a commission to examine into these subjects with the object of regulating taxation as far as possible. The school tax was collected from the same persons who had been burthened with the previous assessment for general purposes and both were levied in a very unsatisfactory manner. It was a question whether eighteen Aldermen and a Mayor were necessary for the city government, the number might be reduced to twelve and he did not see any objection to paying these. Any one visiting the cities of Europe not under municipal management could not fail to be struck with the fact that our system was not the most judicious. The various and conflicting views of the Aldermen had the effect of impeding improvement and of preventing any general and comprehensive system from being carried out.

HON. Mr. McFARLANE said that one or two sessions ago a great part of the time of the House had been occupied in passing laws for the city, and it seemed the more were passed the worse matters became.

The bill passed a second reading with the understanding that the clause in reference to the appointment being vested in the City Council would be moved against in committee.

MISCELLANEOUS.

HON. PROV. SEC. laid on the table a communication from the Commissariat Department complaining of exorbitant charges for ferrage by the Halifax and Dartmouth Steamboat Company.

Mr. DONALD FRASER introduced a bill to amend chap. 63, of the Revised Statutes relating to Commissioners of Streets.

Also a bill to provide for the settlement of certain cases pending in the Supreme Court at Pictou. He explained in reference to this bill that there had been forty or fifty appeals to the

Supreme Court in reference to railway damages, and as this would greatly impede the business of the Court, the Sessions had agreed to a bill enabling the parties to settle by arbitration provided a majority of them were willing to do so.

Mr. S. McDONNELL thought the difficulty might be obviated by enlarging the powers of the Judges to refer cases to arbitration.

Hon. FIN SEC'Y introduced a bill to amend chap. 62 of the Revised Statutes, concerning Commissioners of Streets.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill for the appointment of Commissioners of Streets for the town of Arichat.

The House then adjourned.

TUESDAY, March 25

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table a despatch relative to the appointment of the Duke of Buckingham as Colonial Secretary. Also, copies of correspondence relative to the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty.

Mr. RAY introduced a bill to legalize the proceedings of the Sessions of the County of Annapolis.

Hon. Prov. Sec. said that if the information he had on the subject of the bill was correct, it would be his duty to resist its passage. He had been informed that the grand jury—upon whom devolved the appointment of assessors, and thereby the working out of the franchise law—had not been drawn in open court and was composed of 22 opponents to 2 friends of the government. If such were the case the whole matter required investigation.

Mr. RAY stated that the grand jury were drawn, as far as he could learn, in the same manner they had been in other years. The present Judge in Equity ordered the magistrates to retire to the grand jury room and draw the grand jury. The Judge was perfectly satisfied with the proceedings. Grand jurors had frequently been drawn with a large majority of the friends of a particular party.

Hon. Prov. Sec. said that it was certainly remarkable that such a complexion should have been given to the grand jury at a time when it had such an important connection with the operation of the franchise of the country.

Mr. RAY said he was quite content to leave the matter in the hands of the House; all that he desired was to have the assessment of the county carried into effect.

Mr. LONGLEY said that he had understood the Government had called for the papers connected with the question.

Mr. TOBIN saw in the present case an illustration of the workings of the present Franchise Law. He knew that much dissatisfaction existed in his own county with the operations of the law. A large number of men, thoroughly qualified to exercise the suffrage, were now denuded of their rights. He was convinced that the time had come for enquiring into the question of the franchise.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that for every session during many years similar difficulties had arisen,

and similar bills had been passed time and again. He did not believe that any persons entitled to vote were unfairly left off the rolls. If anybody were left off, in all probability it arose from the fact that he was unwilling to contribute his just proportion to the general burdens of the community.

The bill was allowed to lie on the table for the present.

PETITION AGAINST THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

Mr. PRYOR asked leave to present the petition of T. J. Wallace, attorney at law. In doing so he stated that the petition contained charges of a very serious character against the Chief Justice. For the truthfulness of the statements therein he did not in any wise make himself responsible. He simply presented the petition as a matter of duty he owed to one of his constituents. The petitioner asked that a committee be appointed to investigate the charges contained in it.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL thought that the Speaker should look into the petition before it was read to the House.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the member who presented a petition was of course expected to read it to see there was nothing unparliamentary in it. As respects the present petition, it was only proper that it should lie on the table in the absence of the gentleman whose conduct was impugned. He knew enough of the Chief Justice to be conscious that that gentleman would always willingly come forward to meet any charge that might be made against him.

Hon. Prov. Sec'Y said that it was the right of everybody to approach the House by petition. The hon. member had simply presented the petition in the discharge of his public duty, and at the same time had carefully guarded himself from any connection with the statements contained in it. As far as the language of the petition went it was quite parliamentary. He must state, however, that he must resist any reference of the subject to a committee, in the absence of the Chief Justice, whose conduct was assailed.

The petition was allowed to lie on the table.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. PRYOR presented the petition of James Scott and others, of Blind Bay, Western Division of Halifax, praying that they may be assessed in No. 10 instead of No. 11 District.

Mr. JAMES FRASER presented the petition of the Congregational Union of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, praying that no public money be granted to sectarian institutions.

Mr. LONGLEY presented a petition for additional mail accommodation.

THE HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

Hon. PROV. SECRETARY asked leave to introduce an act to amend chapter 152 R. S., respecting the Lunatic Asylum. On a former day he had stated the course that the Government had determined to pursue in relation to the management of the Hospital for the Insane. It was proposed in the bill to have three Commissioners, one of whom would have to visit

the institution weekly, and thereby give the additional guarantee of an independent supervision that the institution was in such a condition as the country had a right to expect. He thought that the best course would be that one of these Commissioners should be a physician, whose opinion it would be the duty of the Medical Superintendent to take in relation to any person who might go out. As he had stated on a former occasion, the Government did not wish to relieve themselves from any responsibility in the matter, or to devolve upon a committee any portion of that responsibility. All that the Government desired was to give an opportunity to every person who had any knowledge of the past management of the institution to come before an independent and impartial tribunal, and make any statements they might deem proper. At the same time, the parties whose conduct might be impugned would be able to vindicate themselves from any charges made against them. It was proposed, he went on to say, to pay these Commissioners for their services in accordance with the system pursued in the case of bank directors, and thereby ensure their regular attendance. The bill also provided for the appointment of a Steward and Matron by the Government. These persons would be independent, and yet at the same time subordinate to the Medical Superintendent. An additional guarantee would thus be given of the satisfactory management of the institution. It was also provided that the Governor in Council might make rules and regulations for the management of the institution.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL was much surprised to hear the admission of the Provincial Secretary that three gentlemen could not be found in the city of Halifax willing to give their services gratuitously for so philanthropic an object as supervising the condition of those persons who were afflicted with the awful blight of insanity. He believed that the gentlemen who now acted as Commissioners to the Poor's Asylum performed their duties without receiving any remuneration whatever.

Mr. TOBIN said that the insignificant sum now paid to bank directors was merely for the purpose of ensuring their regular attendance. He was quite sure that many gentlemen could be found in the community who would give their services gratuitously, but the question was whether it would be fair to ask those persons who were perhaps most qualified to perform the duties to give up their time for nothing. He inclined to the opinion that the Commissioners ought to visit the institution daily—ought to be able to go in and out as often as they might think proper.

Mr. ANNAND questioned the propriety of the Legislature at that particular time, when it was about expiring, increasing the burdens of the local government. It would be best, he believed, to await the report of the committee before proceeding further with this matter. The committee might report adversely to the head of the institution, against whom certain charges had been preferred. He was also of opinion that when these charges were brought against the Superintendent he ought to have been suspended whilst the proper enquiry was being made. The responsibility of dealing with this question ought not to be thrown upon the house.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that in one moment the hon member blamed the Government for not having taken the responsibility of dealing with this question, and, in the next breath asserted that they should have waited for the report of the committee of the house—in fact have devolved the responsibility upon the committee. Nothing could better evince the desire of the hon gentlemen to find fault with the Government under all circumstances. The Government had taken the action which they were bound to take. The moment the charge was made against the Superintendent, they had an investigation which was held in a manner satisfactory to all concerned, including those who had preferred the charges. The papers containing the testimony were brought to the notice of the Government, and so far from attempting to shirk any responsibility in the matter, they came forward at the first opportunity and stated the decision that they had arrived at. It was, that in view of all the facts brought under their notice, they did not feel themselves justified in removing an officer holding so high and responsible a position, and whose character would be blasted by his dismissal. At the same time they felt that it was advisable that the country should have an additional guarantee as to the mode in which the institution was carried on, and they therefore came forward and proposed a change in the management. They brought all the papers connected with the matters and referred them to a committee of the house with the desire that an independent tribunal should give the whole question the most thorough and impartial investigation. The Government felt that the course they had pursued was one that would be perfectly justified by the circumstances of the case. Although the condition of the patient whose case had been a subject of complaint, was not such as it ought to have been, yet in view of the report of the Medical Board, who was sent to examine the institution, and whose testimony was in favor of its general management, the Government felt that they could not justly pursue any other course than they had.

Mr. ANNAND was not aware that the Government had assumed the entire responsibility on this question, as he had not been present when the Provincial Secretary addressed the house on a former occasion. His reference had been made chiefly as to the future; he had doubted the propriety of the present house touching one of the few measures which the new Local Legislature would have to deal with.

Mr. COFFIN felt, as a member of the committee, that he was entirely absolved from any responsibility since the Government had already decided what course to take.

The bill was read a second time.

Hon. PROV. SEC. alluded to the delay which had occurred on previous sessions in bringing in City Bills, and hoped that the business of the country would not be retarded during the present session by the same cause.

The house then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, March 27.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

BILLS, PETITIONS, &c.

Mr. BOURINOT introduced a bill to incor-

porate the Dominion Gold Mining Company. Also a bill to incorporate the Blue Lead Gold Mining Company. Also a bill to incorporate the Union Gold Mining Company. Also a bill to incorporate the Provincial Gold Mining Company. Also a bill to incorporate the Eldorado Gold Mining Company. These bills were read a first and second time and referred to the Committee on Private and Local bills.

Hon. FIN. SECY. presented a petition from W. S. Copeland, and others, respecting licenses in New Glasgow. He also submitted a report of the Commissioners appointed relative to trade with the West Indies and Brazil.

Mr. LOCKE presented a petition from Trustees of a school in Shelburne, in reference to the sale of school lands.

Hon. FIN. SECY. remarked that the act authorising the sale of school lands was found not to be as comprehensive as it was intended. It only authorised the sale of school houses and the Trustees were unable to give a title to the lands connected therewith.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Education.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE presented a petition from D. B. Munro and others for additional mail accommodation.

Mr. MILLER presented a petition from J. H. Ryder and others to have the provisions of the recent act in reference to Statute law extended to Richmond County.

The Legislative Council announced by message that they had agreed to the bill to increase the capital stock of the Halifax Gas Company.

Hon. PROV. SECY. laid on the table copies of correspondence relating to passports of British naturalized subjects.

Also copies of correspondence relating to an increase of the reward for the apprehension of deserters.

Also a communication from the Board of School Commissioners for the city of Halifax.

Mr. PRYOR as chairman of the committee on private and local bills, reported from that committee the bill to legalize proceedings of the Sessions of Cape Breton county. Also the bill to incorporate the Exchange Bank of Yarmouth.

HOSPITAL FOR INSANE.

Hon. PROV. SECY. moved the second reading of the bill concerning the Hospital for the Insane.

Mr. ROSS thought it premature to take action on the bill until the report from the committee was made.

Hon. PROV. SECY. repeated the explanation which he had given on a former day respecting the object of the bill. It was the intention to appoint a board of three commissioners to visit the establishment weekly, one of them to be a physician who should be consulted before the removal of any patient, and also to appoint a matron and steward. He thought it was the general opinion that some such change should be made, and it was not probable that any report would be made which would relieve the House from the responsibility resting upon it in connection with the subject.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that having turned his attention to the subject, he concurred with

the Government as to the appointment of commissioners. The report on such institutions, which was transmitted from the Colonial Office two or three years ago, was in favor of such an arrangement. As to the appointment of subordinate officers, who would be independent of the medical superintendent, he was not of so strong an opinion.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said there was no question but some alteration should be made. It was desirable that public confidence in the institution should be restored. The appointment of the board would secure that object; but to establish two independent authorities in the one institution would be to introduce the elements of discord. He thought that the person at the head of the asylum should be entrusted with such authority as would be necessary for efficiency.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that the great object of the measure was to secure the public confidence and harmonious operation. The Government were of opinion that the proposed change did not involve any conflict of authority, the duties being defined. The same policy was pursued in reference to other departments—the customs department, for instance. It was very desirable that the public should feel that whatever occurred in the institution should secure publicity.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the appointment of the board would tend to restore public confidence. He did not believe in the propriety of having inferior officers in any department responsible to the Government. The management of some other public departments was an illustration of his views. He believed in responsibility, but thought that that responsibility should be vested in the head of the institution, who would then be held accountable for the character of his subordinates.

Mr. BLANCHARD read an extract from the report to which he previously referred, in which an opinion was expressed favourable to the vesting of the whole authority in the medical chief, subject only to the supervision of the board of commissioners.

Hon. PROV. SECY. remarked that the matron and steward were not such subordinate officers as those referred to in the report.

The bill passed a second reading.

BILLS.

Mr. ARCHIBALD introduced a bill to amend the act relating to Absent or Absconding Debtors. The object of the bill was to authorize prothonotaries to give the ratification which must now be given by a judge.

Mr. MILLER remarked that there were other matters in connection with the practice of the Supreme Court that required consideration. In the settlement of estates in the Court of Probate, if an order of insolvency were made, that was a complete bar to an action in the Supreme Court. There should, in such cases, be a discretionary power in the judges of the Supreme Court.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that he intended also to propose a clause giving the Judge a discretionary power as to interrogatories. These amendments could all be embodied in one bill.

The house then went into committee on bills and took up the bill to incorporate the Halifax Steamboat Company.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said he had found that

there was no ground for the complaint made, on account of exorbitant charges, by the Commissariat Department. The entire charge in connection with the department last year had only been the amount that two families resident in Dartmouth would have to pay; and this was notwithstanding the extensive operations being carried on at the other side of the harbour.

Mr. PRYOR, in answer to some enquiries, stated that the bill did not ask for a renewal of the monopoly hitherto enjoyed by the company, but only for the mere incorporation, the old act having expired.

Hon. FIN. SEC. remarked that this was a practical monopoly for one year, as the company had the plant on the ground ready for operation, and thereby were more favourably situated than any other company.

The bill passed.

The bill to legalize proceedings of the Sessions of Cape Breton and the bill to incorporate the Exchange Bank of Yarmouth also passed.

The committee adjourned.

The house adjourned to the following day at 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY, March 28.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER asked leave to introduce a bill to change the name of Grand Ruisseau to Port Royal.

Mr. BOURINOT introduced an act to incorporate the Glasgow and Cape Breton Railway Company.

Dr. BROWN presented a petition from certain farmers relative to the Halifax Country Markets.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced an act to incorporate the Intercolonial Railway Company.

Mr. BLACKWOOD presented a petition for additional remuneration for postal services.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL presented a petition in reference to the construction of a bridge across the St. Mary's River, in the neighbourhood of the village of Sherbrooke, in order to connect the mainland with the gold district. He strongly urged the favourable consideration of the petition upon the Government. He pointed out the great necessity that there existed for such a bridge, and its impertance to one of the most important gold districts of the Province. As an illustration of the richness of the gold field, he stated that one of the mines during the past three months yielded a return to the proprietors of nearly \$20,000 clear of all expenses. He also pointed out that this work was of importance to the neighbouring counties, and that the value of the royalty annually derived from the gold district gave the inhabitants a claim to its construction.

Hon. FIN. SECY said he had some knowledge of the locality in question, and had no doubt the bridge would be of great benefit to that part of the country. The Government, he added, had always endeavored in the distribution of the public moneys to look at the interests of all sections, with as little regard as possible to merely political and party considerations.

Hon. FIN. SECY introduced an act in reference to the appropriation of fines in Pictou.

Also, an act to amend an act in reference to a Masonic Lodge.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced a bill to amend the act concerning the city of Halifax.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL presented a petition from Angus McKay, an aged schoolmaster, for a grant of land.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill to amend chapter 33, R. S., in reference to Highway Labor.

Mr. PRYOR reported up a number of Incorporation bills without any amendment.

Hon. PROV. SECY laid on the table report of the Superintendent of the Hospital for the Insane. Also returns of Pooors' Asylum. Also a petition from a number of the military relative for relief from certain taxes.

The memorial was referred to the committee on city bills.

The house went into committee on Bills and passed the following:

To incorporate the	Blue Lead	Gold Min	Co.
Do	Union	do	do.
Do	Provincial	do	do.
Do	El Dorado	do	do.
Do	Dominion	do	do.

The Committee adjourned.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced an act to amend chapter 81 in reference to the Assessment in Halifax; an act in reference to the sale of grain and coal; an act in amendment of the act incorporating the City Railway Company, all city bills.

Dr. HAMILTON introduced an act to amend Chap. 19, R. S., in reference to the sale of Intoxicating Liquors.

Mr. BALCAM presented a petition from Charles Smith, a ferryman in East Halifax, asking for relief.

The house adjourned.

FRIDAY, March 29.

The house met 3 P. M.

BILLS.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill to incorporate Welsford Lodge of Freemasons.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill respecting the village dyke at Falmouth.

Mr. BOURINOT introduced a bill to authorize a loan for the erection of a jail at Sydney.

Dr. BROWN introduced a bill to incorporate Grand Pre Lodge of British Templars, Wolfville.

Mr. DONKIN introduced a bill to amend chap. 103 Revised Statutes, concerning river obstructions.

The bills to incorporate the Provincial Gold Mining Company, the Blue Lead Gold Mining Company, the Dominion Gold Mining Company, the Eldorado Gold Mining Company, and the Union Gold Mining Company, and the bill relating to the Halifax Steamboat Company, were read a third time.

Dr. HAMILTON introduced a bill to amend chap 13 of the Acts of 1865, in relation to licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor having commanded the attendance of the house in the Council Chamber, the members proceeded thither. On their return, the Speaker announced that his Excellency had been pleased to give his assent to five bills.

The bill to legalize the proceedings of the

sessions of Cape Breton county was read a third time.

Mr. D. FRAZER introduced a bill to incorporate the Pictou Mechanics' Institute Savings' Bank.

Mr. TOBIN introduced a bill to increase the capital stock of the Peoples' Bank.

PETITIONS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table a list of the petitions which had been handed to him from time to time, asking for money votes.

Navigation Securities.

Residents of Arichat, &c.—Presented by Mr. Miller.
Mr. Coffin et al., Co. Shelburne—Mr. Coffin.
Inhabitants Co. Antigonish—Mr. McKinnon.

Do. Co. Kings—Mr. Moore.
Do. Co. Yarmouth—Mr. Killam.
Do. Co. Digby—Mr. Robicheau.
Do. Co. Kings.

B. Comeau, Digby.

Inhabitants Saunierville—Mr. Robicheau.

Do. Kempville—Mr. Churchill.
Do. Barrington—Mr. Robertson.
Do. St. Ann's, &c.—Mr. Campbell.
Do. Roseway River—Mr. Locke.
Do. Maxwellton—Mr. McDonald.
Do. St. Mary's Bay—Mr. Campbell.

Wm. Walsh, Sand Point.

Wm. Armstrong, Patridge Island—Mr. Churchill.

Inhabitants Clare—Mr. Robicheau.
Do. Co. Antigonish—Mr. McKinnon.
Do. Walton—Mr. Churchill.

Pictou Gull Rock Light—Mr. D. Fraser.

Inhabitants Maitland—Mr. Churchill.

Do. Pictou—Mr. D. Fraser.
Do. Clements—Mr. Whitman.
Do. Weymouth—Mr. Campbell.

Henry Orde, Mifford—Mr. Whitman.

Inhabitants Lower Clare—Mr. Campbell.

Do. Weymouth—Mr. Campbell.
Do. Co. Lunenburg—Mr. Jost.
Do. Yarmouth—Mr. Townsend.
Do. Broad Cove—Mr. Blanchard.
Do. Cape Breton—Mr. Bourinot.

Archibald & Co., Cow Bay—Mr. Bourinot.

Residents of Liverpool—Mr. Campbell.
Do. Co. Lunenburg, (Moses Island light)—Mr. Kaulback.

Do. Co. Kings—Dr. Brown.
Do. Co. Pictou—Mr. D. Fraser.
Do. Hillsburg—Mr. C. Campbell.
Do. Peggy's Point—Mr. Pryor.
Do. Clare—Mr. Robicheau.
Do. Co. Shelburne—Mr. Coffin.
Do. Cape Canso—Mr. Heffernan.
Do. Co. Kings—Dr. Hamilton.
Do. Meteghan River—Mr. Robicheau.

P. Jacques' wharf, (Brown's Brook, Kings Co.)—Mr. Hamilton.

Steamboats, Packets and Ferries.

Residents, Cape Negro, &c.—presented by Mr. Coffin.

Residents Co. Colchester—by Mr. Archibald.

Ed. McLeod, Great Bras d'Or—by Mr. Campbell.

Halifax and Yarmouth—by Mr. Killam.
N. K. Clements, et al, Boston to Yarmouth—by Mr. Killam.

Ed. Forrestal, Co. Inverness—by Mr. Blanchard.

R. Carter and J. Purcell, Halifax.

Wm. Morall, Co. Digby—by C. Campbell.

D. Fraser, et al., Co. Richmond—by Mr. Miller.

Inhabitants, Yarmouth,

Do. Cape Breton—by Mr. Bourinot.

Chas. Smith, Necum Cheugh—by Mr. Balcum.

Distressed

C. E. Leonard, Jr., of Sydney.

Fort Hood—Fin. Secretary.

Transient Poor.

J. P.'s of Annapolis—presented by Mr. Ray.

Overseers Poor, Cornwallis—Fin. Secretary.

Do. Truro Do.
Do. Co. Pictou Do

Overseers Poor—Aylesford—Fin. Secretary.

Do. Salmon River, Robichau.

Co. Kings—Fin. Secretary.

Do. Do. Do.

Do. Co. Annapolis Do.

Do. Do Do.

Do. Upper Stewiacke Do.

Do. Cornwallis Do.

Do. Clare Do.

Do. Halifax Do.

Do. Pictou Do.

Do. Do. Do.

Do. West Branch Do.

Do. Pugwash Do.

Do. Co. Lunenburg—Jost.

Road Compensation.

Rev. Mr. Stewart, Black River—presented by Mr. Miller.

Railways.

John Lowe, Grand Lake.

J. J. Smith, et al., Amherst—Fin. Secretary.

A. S. McGillivray, Antigonish do.

Angus Cameron, Cornwallis do.

Education.

John Thomas, Gold River—presented by H. A. N.

Kaulback.

Don. Grant, New Glasgow—Mr. Fraser.

Mary Harley, Bridgewater—

Inhabitants of Pubnico.

Post Communication.

W. O. Keeper, Mainadiou—Financial Sec'y.

J. Bowler, Parrsboro' do.

W. O. Keeper, Catalone, C. B. do.

Messenger P. O., Halifax, do.

Postmaster, Walton, do.

Do. Baddeck, do.

Do. Tracadie, do.

J. Southall, P. O. Halifax, do.

Mail Carrier, Maitland, do.

W. O. Keeper, Louisburg—Mr. Bourinot.

A. Harrington Antigonish.

Mrs. Baxter, Annapolis.

G. L. Purdy, Westchester.

H. Hyde, Truro.

Joseph Murray, Barney's River.

Inhabitants Barrington.

Petitioners, Halifax Co.

Inhabitants Gold River—Mr. Kaulback.

Do. New Canada do.

Don. Ross, St. Peter's—Mr. Miller.

John Malcolm, Cariboo Cove—Mr. Miller.

Inhabitants New Germany—Mr. Kaulback.

Joseph Lantz, St. Mary's Bay—Mr. Tobin.

Inhabitants Falkland Settlement—Fin. Secy.

William Penkeny, Yarmouth—Mr. Townsend.

Michael Cody, Walton—Mr. Hill.

Wargt. McDonald, West River—Mr. McKay.

Jer. Murphy, Waugh's River—Mr. Blackwood.

Archibald & Purdy, Truro—Fin. Secy.

A. Beckwith, Cornwallis—Mr. Hamilton.

Postmaster at Forks—Mr. Blanchard.

Inhabitants Port George—Mr. Longley.

J. D. Tremain, Port Hood Mr. Blanchard.

Inhabitants Cokings—Mr. Hamilton.

T. Eaton, Co. Guysboro'—Mr. Heffernan.

Residents Westchester—Mr. Donkin.

Postmaster Guysboro'—Mr. Heffernan.

James Stewart, Melrose, do

Residents Bigelow—Mr. Bourinot.

W. Young, Langan, do

John Tobin, Sydney, do

E. Martin, Sydney, do

S. Moffatt, N. Sydney, do

Inhabitants Big Lorraine, do

J. H. Timpany, Digby—Mr. C. Campbell.

Inhabitants Big Island—Hon. J. McDonald.

Do. Sydney, C. B.—Mr. Bourinot.

Do. N. Sydney, do

Do. Canning—Mr. Hamilton.

Do. Salmon River—Mr. S. Campbell.

Do. Grant's Lake—Mr. J. Campbell.

Do. Big Brook—Mr. Miller.

Jas. Blair, Co. Cumberland—Mr. McFarlane.

Messengers, Halifax—Mr. Pryor.

Postmaster, Milton—Mr J Campbell.
Inhabitants Co. Shelburne—Mr. Locke.
Do. Argyle.

Miscellaneous.

Inhabitants of Ingonish, &c.—Presented by Mr. Campbell.
Conlon Bros, Halifax—Mr. Pryor.
Fruit Grower's Association, Co. Kings—Mr. Hamilton.
Wm. Twining, Halifax—
H. Oldright, do.
A. D. Denham, New Glasgow—J. Fraser.
Do. do. do.
Hy. Davenport, Sydney, C. B.—Mr. Bourinot.
D. Ferguson, et. al., Co. Pictou—Mr. McKay.
John Spidell, Co. Lunenburg—Mr. Jost.
Residents of Halifax, &c.
do. do.
Residents St. Mary's, Gnyaborough Co., for Bridge on St. Mary's River—S. Campbell

Revenue Expenses.

Residents of Amherst,
A. Thomas, Windsor—Mr. Hill.
Inhabitants Port Giibbert—Mr. C. Campbell.
W. Bryden, Liverpool.
R. B. Darling, et. al., Bridgetown.
T. A. S. DeWolfe, Halifax.
Peter Morrissey do —Mr. Pryor.

Indians.

S. Dadge, M. D., Kentville.
Parker & Cowie, Halifax—Hon. Fin. Secy.
J. M. Barnaby, Mill Village—
Dr. McLatohy, Falmouth—

Militia.

Naval Brigade, Halifax.
A. Clarke, and A. McLellan—Mr. D. Fraser.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SECY. laid on the table a return of Provincial notes issued.

Also, a report of the council for the protection of inland fisheries and game.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE introduced a bill in reference to Ragged Reef school section, in the County of Cumberland.

Also, a bill to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Bay of Fundy Canal Company. He stated that the object of this company was to unite the waters of the St. Lawrence and Bay of Fundy, a work of great importance.

LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

The order of the day was moved.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that in rising to move the second reading of the bill to amend Chapter 3 R. S., in reference to the duration of and representation in the General Assembly, he did not feel it necessary to occupy the time of the House, having explained the objects of the bill before. The bill was introduced to adapt our legislation to the changed relations which we were called to meet under the Act of the Imperial Parliament for the Union of the Provinces. As the House had been relieved by that act from a large amount of the duties devolving on it, it would be necessary deliberately to review the constitution. He was glad to hear from the observations of the gentleman who had led the opposition on the question of Confederation, that that hon. member

would feel it his duty to give the most dispassionate consideration to any measure that would enable us to meet the new condition of affairs. It would have been unreasonable to suppose that on so great a proposition as that of the Union of the Provinces, effecting so great a change in our institutions, a great diversity of opinion would not exist, but it had now become necessary for every one interested in the prosperity of this part of Her Majesty's dominions to look with a single eye to the interests and advantages of the country. It was only to be expected that such a sentiment would find expression on all sides, and would be re-echoed back from every part of the Province. Taking into consideration the important questions of which the Legislature would be relieved, he thought this would be regarded as a necessary measure, leaving, as it would, a fair and efficient representation for every county, and at the same time striking off a very considerable portion of the expenditure. The bill proposed that in the Local Legislature every county should be represented by two members, excepting Halifax and Pictou, which should have three each. This would be in addition to the members to be sent to the General Parliament. It had been asked, "would it not be better to allow the Legislature now shortly to be elected to arrange the local constitution," but he believed that the common sense of every member, as well as past experience, would convince every one that no time could be so appropriate and convenient for dealing with the question as the present. The duty of legislation devolved as much upon the House up to the last day as at the first hour of its existence, and there should be no disposition to shrink from this responsibility.

If the bill would put it out of the power of any future Parliament to deal with the question there would be something in the argument, but it was a fact that the people at the polls would have a full opportunity of instructing the incoming members, and while it was very easy to increase the representation it was not so easy to decrease it. The reduction could now be made without creating the impression that any actual reduction was being made, for our relations with the General Parliament caused an actual increase to the representation of some of the counties. On the same day the people would poll their votes for general and local representatives, exercising a larger franchise than at present. He did not consider it necessary to occupy the time of the House in the advocacy of a measure which

commended itself to the judgment, not only of the friends of union, but even of those who having opposed Confederation felt they owed it to the country to adapt the legislation to the existing state of affairs.

Mr. LOCKE said he supposed that any arguments urged against the bill would be futile, but he felt bound to object to the manner in which the bill was brought forward. The Prov. Sec. had almost assumed the position of an autocrat. It was true that the matter would be open to future legislation even if the bill passed, but the Legislative Council might interfere against any such attempt, and whether or not, the incoming Parliament should not be put in the position of being obliged to reverse the action previously taken. He attacked the bill on the ground that it was an interference with the rights of the people, and he believed that this would be the opinion of the country. It should be remembered that the Local Legislature might require to protect the local interests against the encroachments of the General Parliament, and in that case a House of thirty-eight would have comparatively small weight. At any rate the people themselves should deal with the question.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL said he had felt that if the present Parliament ceased its functions without arranging the local constitution it would fail in an important part of its duty. He had pressed this view on his colleagues for several reasons, one of which was that the whole scheme of union would be frustrated and left imperfect if such a change were not made. In order to give efficiency to the scheme of Confederation every portion of it should be carried out. If members were able to show that the principle of the bill was wrong or that any county had been neglected their position could be appreciated, but he could not value the statement that this, the most appropriate time for action, should be allowed to pass and a future period selected. He could easily imagine the storm of objection that would have been raised had the government failed to bring this measure forward before the elections were held. It would be said, "these gentlemen went to Canada and framed a scheme, afterwards going to England to mature it, and were unable subsequently to carry out one of its most important provisions." The government would therefore be wanting in the discharge of their duty if they did not press this matter upon the attention of the House and they would have been open to the charge of deception in leading the people to suppose that a large

reduction would be made in the legislative expenses and then in failing to make that reduction when the opportunity arrived. The only question remaining was whether the whole number of representatives and the distribution of the seats was commendable, and as these points had not been challenged he would ask only was it wrong to do then what might be done twelve months afterwards?

Mr. KILLAM approved of the principle, laid down by the Provincial Secretary, that the House should make the best of the situation of affairs; but he entirely disagreed with the last speaker as to this being the proper time to pass such a measure; nor did he believe that it would interfere with the arrangements of Confederation to leave the House with its present complement. He did not see on what principle the distribution of seats was founded. The bill would make a most important change in obliging candidates to run their election over the whole county, instead of being elected for ridings, as at present. The difficulty of this plan would appear when such a county as Halifax was taken into consideration. This was contrary to the Canadian principle, which gave to every district its representative; and he read from an English authority to show that district representation was the only mode of securing the representation of minorities. The same objection, he thought, did not apply to the election of members for the General Parliament, because the representatives would go there as Nova Scotians, and without any sectional feeling. The bill, he thought, would in fact disfranchise some of the districts, because a political feeling which might prevail in one section would be controlled by the feeling in another section. In New Brunswick the policy had been to retain the whole Legislature and he thought Nova Scotia would require all the talent of which she could avail herself to remodel her constitution. The local Parliament would have important matters to deal with; it was not improbable that our most able men would leave the House, and there would be a better selection to be made out of 55 members than out of 38. It was well known that a great deal of influence was brought to bear by departmental officers who had seats in Parliament; that was a reason why the number of members should be large. The object of the measure, he believed, was to crush Nova Scotia down and repress her influence. Another view of the matter was that the general Parliament might at some period re-

quire the assistance of the local Legislature, and it would be a great object, in that case, to have the popular branch large and effective. There was not much force in the argument about economy, for the additional number of members might not cost a dollar more, and could not cost more than \$3000. Under Confederation there would still probably be an upper House consisting of eighteen members, appointed by the Crown, to check the lower branch, and, in addition to that, a Lieut.-Governor appointed by the Governor-General, so that there would be every necessity for maintaining the influence of the Assembly. He did not see the slightest necessity for continuing the Legislative Council, when there were so many guards and checks as the Union Bill proposed. Twelve of its members could receive seats in the Senate; the remainder could receive attention from the Government in some other way, and thus a large saving could be effected without curtailing the members of the House. There would be so little left for the Council to do, that its members would probably be soon ashamed to sit in session doing nothing. Upper Canada had resolved to abolish the upper branch, and her course in that respect had met with much commendation. He did not think the Union Bill intended that the existing Legislature should deal with the local constitution, for it said that the local Parliaments should continue until altered under the authority of that Act. This alteration was not being made under the authority of the Act, because the Act had not yet been passed. He was in favor of letting the people decide the question.

Mr. ANNAND said that as only two members of the Government had spoken on the question he presumed that the passage of the bill was a foregone conclusion. He was of opinion that if ever there was a time in the history of this country when the principle of local representation should be recognized, it was when such important powers had been conferred upon the Parliament at Ottawa, and the subjects left at the disposal of our successors were of a strictly local character. That principle was ignored by the bill. He had taken up the list of counties and found that eight of them enjoyed district representation at present, and these counties, besides having the number of members reduced, would be to a great extent disfranchised as far as local representation was concerned. There seemed to him to be no principle running through the bill,—the principle of representation by population or any other principle. The Attorney General in 1859 had introduced a bill to equalize the representation, but what step had he taken now? The present bill elevated all the smaller counties to the level of the larger ones. He had always been and still was in favor of district representation. He did not

oppose the bill from personal interest, but it was a fact that East Halifax would be to a large extent disfranchised, for the vote of its electors would be swamped by the addition of the city and western population. Again, why should the city with its great interests be swayed by the votes of the outlying districts? It was an extraordinary fact that while in New Brunswick the city of St. Johns would send a representative to the General Parliament, the city of Halifax had been ignored. How could the members who now found it difficult enough to attend to the local wants of Western Halifax, represent and advocate the claims of the whole county? The bill gave the same representation to Queens, with a population of 9365 people, as to Colchester with 20,000. He contended that the numbers and weight and influence of the house should not be reduced, and concurred in the remark that the time might come when the General Parliament might need the assistance of the Local Legislature. What position would it be in then if it were reduced, to use Mr. Adderley's language, to a mere municipality? He opposed the bill also on the same ground as that which he took in reference to the larger measure, believing that though the Legislature might increase the number of representatives by two or three, that it had no right to make such a fundamental change as the one proposed—to reduce the number of members from 55 to 38—to disfranchise at least one third of the electors, without the sanction of the people. Could not the members who would soon be elected be trusted to deal with this matter? He thought the house should keep the power while it had it, for if the incoming Legislature should attempt to increase the representation, they might find even if the measure was not rejected by the Legislative Council, that it would be voted by the Canadian Government.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY said that he was glad to hear the tone in which the hon. member for Yarmouth had approached the question under consideration. No doubt it was the duty of every member to endeavour to make the local constitution as perfect as possible: but there was one remark made by the hon. gentleman which would be very gratifying to the house and country, and that was that he entirely approved of the principle of county representation as regards the General Parliament. The hon. member also intimated that whoever went from this Province to the General Parliament should be animated by one impulse—that whatever might be the local antagonisms that now divided gentlemen, all should go to the General Parliament with the desire of representing the true interests of Nova Scotia. Now he did not see why a different principle of representation should be applied to the Local Legislature. What diversity of class, interest or position would there be to prevent the members of the Local Legislature uniting in the same manner? Education was a subject in which everybody was equally interested. Similiar feelings should prevail in the Local Legislature as should animate the representatives in the General Parliament. We were now assimilating our legislation to the system of our sister Maritime Province, New Brunswick, where, with the exception of the city, county representation was the rule. The present House of Assembly of the neigh-

boring Province, with its large population and extensive area, only contained 41 members, or three more than the number that would compose the popular branch in this Province when Confederation was in operation. It was absurd to talk of departmental influence in the Local Legislature. It could be shown, by reference to the existing House of Assembly, that departmental influence did not prevent gentlemen from giving the most determined opposition to the Government. For instance, notwithstanding the manner in which an important public department had been filled, the hon. member for South Kings (Dr. Brown) had opposed the Administration for years past. To such an extent, indeed, had the opposition of that hon. member been carried that he would have been quite willing to prevent his own county having the advantages of railway communication with the capital. He (Dr. T.) had no hesitation in saying that, from his knowledge of the character of the men sent by the people to represent them, he was positive that the Government hereafter in the Local Legislature, would have no more power or influence than was absolutely necessary to carry on the public business of the country. The hon. member had stated that he would be willing to follow the example of Upper Canada, and abolish the Legislative Council altogether. It was certainly satisfactory to find that hon. member was at last able to point to the legislation of Canada—that much abused country—as worthy of our imitation. But it should be remembered that Upper Canada was very differently situated to Nova Scotia. That Province had no Local Legislature as we had; but, in addition to this, it should be remembered that it had a very perfect municipal system, under which a large amount of local business was now transacted. It was not desirable in this Province to give a sudden and unnecessary check to existing institutions. We had had for many years a Legislative Council, which had been largely composed of men of influence and position in the country, and it would be unwise to abolish it at one stroke. It was absurd to say that the Upper House would have nothing to do, when whatever business was transacted in the Lower House would have to pass through that branch, in accordance with the principle of our present constitution. But did not the hon. member see that there was an inconsistency in his argument? He had declared that the house ought not to be reduced—and in that case was it advisable to do away with the Legislative Council? The same reason that would exist for keeping the house as it was, would be found in the case of the Legislative Council. The best policy he (Dr. T.) believed, under existing circumstances, was to continue the Legislative Council, though with its number reduced.

The hon. member for East Halifax had at last taken his stand upon *principle*; but he ought to be able to state on what principle he advocated representation by population for the Local Legislature and opposed it for the General Parliament. The hon. gentleman had taken great exception to that principle, and had urged with all the eloquence in his power, that scarcely in any part of the world was such a principle recognized, and certainly not in countries enjoying British institutions.—

That was one of the arguments which the opponents of union pressed on all occasions. Now the gravamen of the hon. member's speech against the Government was that they had not observed the principle of population in the present bill. If he (Dr. T.) remembered aright, the hon. gentleman had been a member of a Government which brought in a representation bill giving Queen's and Shelburne the same number of representatives that Cape Breton and Inverness, with their far larger population, would have. Under such circumstances the hon. member would hardly be compromised in supporting the present measure. It was impossible, under existing circumstances, to carry out the principle of representation by population in all its entirety. It was impossible to cut down the representation of any county to merely a single member. All that could be done was to give such a representation as would be fair to the interests of all sections. The hon. member for East Halifax has also protested against the right of the present Legislature touching the question at all. Gentlemen must begin to feel a great deal of curiosity to know what the hon. member believed was the duty of the present Legislature; it certainly seemed as if he would deny that they had any right or power to do anything at all. The hon. member need not, however, be under any fears as to the effects of the present measure; it would be within the power of the next Legislature to alter its constitution if it should be thought necessary. He (Dr. T.) believed, however, that the people at large would accept the measure as one which deserved their support.

Mr. KILLAM hoped the men who might be sent to the General Parliament would not be those who had been instrumental in overturning the constitution of the country. The present bill was but a portion of the scheme which was intended to deprive them of their just rights and privileges. The object now with gentlemen opposite was to crush out Nova Scotia and merge her identity into that of Canada. He trusted, however, that Nova Scotians would triumph over those who were bartering away their rights, and that there would always be a Nova Scotian party to rule in the Legislature henceforth.

Mr. LOCKE said that the people had sent them to the Legislature under a constitution which was now to be legislated away. The Legislature had large powers, but he believed that it exceeded those powers when it changed the constitution under which it was elected without the consent of the people. The people had never elected them for such a purpose. He believed that it would be better to do away with the Legislative Council altogether. In previous years he had moved to abolish the Legislative Council. The business of the city of London was transacted by a single body. The Lunatic Asylum was one of the few important subjects that would come under the purview of the Local Legislature, and it was unnecessary to have too cumbersome a Legislature.

Mr. BLANCHARD was of opinion that if it were possible to do away with existing anomalies in the representation to a larger extent it would be better. In the island of Cape Breton there were two large and two small counties, yet the representation of each would

be the same. He had, however, thought the whole subject over, and had been unable to see what other measure was practicable. No county should be left with a single representative; no single person should have such a responsibility thrown upon him. It was true that the county of Pictou was somewhat favoured for its population was only 8000 more than Cape Breton whilst the population of the latter was more than double that of Queens, or Victoria, or Shelburne, or Richmond. He was amused, he added, at the hon. member for Shelburne having in previous years moved to abolish the Legislative Council. Did the people then authorize the hon. member to move in the matter? Yet the same hon. gentleman who would have laid violent hands upon the Council when the people did not authorize him, now objected to the Legislature reducing its numbers on the ground that the people had not consented or expressed their opinion on the subject.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that he would not believe that his hon. friend from Shelburne would contend that it was not competent for the Parliament to deal with any question touching the franchise of the electors who returned them. It was not long since they had passed an act to add to the number of the representatives of the county of Cape Breton. If they were allowed to add one, they could add two or three or four, or as many as they thought proper to the legislature. If they had the power to add, they had also the right to reduce. He did not pretend to say that the bill was perfect, but he must acknowledge that it would be difficult to devise a measure which, upon the whole, suited the circumstances of the country better.

It was quite certain that the first thing the Legislature had to do was to reduce the expense of its local constitution in proportion to the smaller amount of duties that would remain under Confederation. A very large proportion of the work now transacted by the Legislature would be taken away from it after this. The work that would remain could be easily transacted by a much smaller body. Nothing could be more reasonable than to take away from the Local Legislature about the same number of men who would be sent as representatives to Ottawa. He thought it wise to leave the lines of the counties as they are. The people of each county had certain interests and sympathies in common, and it would be inadvisable to disturb them. He believed it would be impossible to leave any county with only one representative. No other county except Pictou exceeded 20,000 in population to any extent. No doubt the same cause that had contributed to give such a superiority to Pictou would continue. It was, therefore, only fair that it should receive larger representation than other counties in the Province. It would be quite allowable for any Legislature hereafter to increase the number of the members if it should think proper; but it must be quite obvious that if the number were left as it is now, nobody elected hereafter would be likely to reduce it.

Hon. FIN. Sec. said that if any one would take the census of the several counties and divide the Province into two sections, east and west, it would be seen that the present measure was remarkably fair. The eastern division,

with a population of about 140,000, would have one-half the representation, whilst the western division with 132,000, would have the other half. Under these circumstances it must be acknowledged that the bill was very fair to all sections. It would be impossible to distribute the representation more equitably, except it would be determined to alter and rearrange the existing boundaries of counties. It would be very unwise, however, to disturb the present social and municipal arrangements that exist in the different counties. The superiority of Pictou in respect to population over all other counties naturally entitled it to an additional representative. It was certainly a curious spectacle to see the hon. members for Yarmouth and Shelburne, who pretended to be so desirous of retrenchment, now attempting to make our local system of government as expensive as possible.

If it was as stated by the hon. member for Shelburne, that the Local Legislature would have little to do, why advocate leaving the number of representatives as it was now? A large portion of the duties now performed by the Legislature would devolve upon the General Government, but still the Local Government would have many important matters in its care. Education, the roads and bridges, the mines and minerals, were all subjects of paramount importance. The amount of revenue for local distribution would be considerably larger than the whole revenue was ten or twelve years ago. Under these circumstances, it was absurd to say that the questions which would come under the consideration of the Local Legislature would be very insignificant. It was quite unnecessary, however, to refute the views of gentlemen opposite; there was no consistency in their arguments; what they asserted at one moment was contradicted by the statement they made in the very next breath.

Mr. COFFIN said that the Government, after having failed so long to carry out its retrenchment policy, would be able at last to lay claim to having redeemed its pledge. The manner in which it did so—the circumstances that influenced its action, would hardly be acceptable to the people.

Dr. BROWN was opposed to the measure before the House, because it made the representation more unequal than before. This House had for many years past been striving to equalize the representation according to the population of the different countries. This bill was a step backwards. Take, for instance, the County of Kings, which had more than double the population of Victoria and Queens, and a much larger proportion of wealth, the assessed value of property of Kings being in 1861, according to the census, over three times as great as that of Queens and Victoria together—their representation is to remain untouched, while that of Kings is to be reduced one-half, to two members instead of four. Nothing could be more unequal—nothing could be more unjust, than the operation of this bill.

Another reason why he must oppose it was because it had never been before the people, and he considered it a very arbitrary proceeding to reduce the number of representatives without the people's consent. There could be no excuse for passing the bill now, because an election must take place in a short time, when the people ought to be allowed to decide, and fix their representation to suit themselves.

The hon. and learned Provincial Secretary had alluded to his (Dr. B.'s) opposition to the Government while his brother held a subordinate office under Government. He was obliged to the hon. and learned gentleman for that allusion, as he considered it the highest praise that could be given to him. It was complimentary to himself, because it showed he had acted independently, and was alike creditable to the Government, who had not held their officer responsible for what was not his fault.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE said that there was no doubt the measure before the House was one of much importance, especially as it was one of the final acts which they had to discharge. Nobody would deny that the hon. member for South Kings had always opposed the Government with great consistency; in fact, there was never a measure introduced by the men now in power that appeared to meet with his approbation.

Dr. Brown had supported the Government on the Education Bill.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE went on to say that no more favorable or suitable occasion could offer than the present for dealing with the representation of the country in the local Legislature. Anomalies would exist under all circumstances, for it was impossible to prevent them entirely. The bill of 1859, no doubt, was a step in the right direction, for it did away with those little boroughs which received a representation they were not entitled to. Hants, with a population not equal to that of six or seven other counties, returned no less than five members to the House. He believed that the true principle was to establish county representation. It was not for the interest of any county to have representation allotted to some particular corner or section of it. The man representing a particular district did not feel any deep interest in the rest of the county. It was the best system to make a man responsible to the whole county. In that case, no section would receive an advantage over another, for it would be the duty as well as the interest of the representative to look at all alike. In his own county, for instance, they expended the public

money according to its particular wants, and not with a desire to benefit any particular section over another. By the proposed arrangement the smaller counties would be placed on the same footing as the large ones. No doubt, when Cape Breton had a population as large as that of Pictou, it would receive an additional member if it required it. It was the duty of the Legislature to so mould our institutions that the public business could be efficiently and, at the same time, economically transacted.

Dr. HAMILTON said he felt called upon to say a few words, inasmuch as the bill affected his own county. He remembered when Kings had six representatives in the house, and now it was proposed to reduce the number to two. It might be expected that he would advocate a larger representation for Kings, but when he looked at other counties and made a comparison in respect to population, he was unable to argue in favour of retaining the present number. Inverness, Cumberland, Cape Breton and Colchester had each a larger population than Kings, and yet would have no larger representation. It was true that several of the small counties would have two representatives also, but he felt it would be hardly fair to leave any county with only one member. The principle he would prefer adopting would be this: to leave the limits of the counties as they are now, and to allot additional representatives when counties exceeded 20,000 in population by 8 or 9,000. His desire now was to see the local Legislature so constituted that it would be able to transact all the public business allotted to it under Confederation economically and efficiently. He did not agree with the hon. member for Yarmouth, that there would be so little work to do, the necessity for a Legislative Council would cease. Whatever work would have to be performed by the Assembly would have to pass under the supervision of the Council. He believed in the principle of county representation; if it was applied to the General Parliament it should also be applied to the local Legislature.

Mr. HATFIELD looked upon the question before the House as one of great importance, in fact, as one of the most momentous questions that had ever been before the Legislature. He felt it his duty, as a member of the House and as a representative of the people, to rise and declare himself against the bill now under consideration. He felt it his duty to do so for many reasons; and one of them was, that the county he had the honour of representing was much larger than many others in the Province, and yet was only to receive a representation of two members—the number that was given to Queens and Shelburne, with half the population. But there were some other features connected with the question that he could not well pass by. It was true that Confederation was agreed to, but in what manner? Contrary to the wishes of the people—in a manner that, he felt bound to say, was discreditable. Delegates had gone to England, and there bartered away the rights of the people, without consulting them at all. He would tell the Provincial Secretary and his Government that they should have gone to the country two years ago—that

they ought to have pursued the manly course taken by Mr. Tilley in the neighbouring Province of New Brunswick. That was the course that the men around these benches should have pursued before pressing forward this measure of Union, contrary to the wishes of the people. He was quite content, however, to know that he had done his duty, and that he had the people at his back. He regretted to see such an attitude assumed by those who professed to represent the people. He felt, however, that remonstrance on this or any other subject was useless, for he and others had to submit to the Government and their majority. He felt an injustice was inflicted upon his country by the bill, but he presumed he was powerless to prevent it. The time would soon come, however, when the people would have an opportunity of expressing their opinions decisively and emphatically.

Mr. ANNAND said that as there was obviously a large majority in favor of the measure, he felt it was useless to divide the House.

The House then adjourned until the next day at 11 o'clock.

—
SATURDAY, March 30th.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

BILLS.

Mr. PRYOR as chairman of the Committee on private and local bills reported the bill to incorporate the New Glasgow and Cape Breton Railway Company, the bill to amend the act to incorporate the Intercolonial Coal Mining Company and the bill to change the name of Grand Ruisseau in the County of Richmond to Port Royal. The House then went into Committee on bills and passed these bills.

LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

Mr ANNAND asked that the bill which had been under consideration yesterday be not passed through Committee until Monday as Mr McLellan had been called away by illness in his family.

Hon PROV SEC replied that the bills could be passed through Committee but would not be brought up for a third reading before Monday.

The bill relating to the representation was then taken up.

Mr S CAMPBELL said he wished to address himself simply to one point: the propriety of the house at such a time dealing with a vital part of the constitution. The government insisted on a severe construction of constitutional authority and sought to effect a most important change without the people having had an opportunity of expressing their opinions upon it. He proposed, as an amendment, that the operation of the bill be deferred until after the ensuing election. At the concluding session of the previous parliament such an addition had been made to the franchise bill then brought forward, and he thought the proposition in this case well worthy of consideration. He could without difficulty conceive a reason why the Metropolitan County of Halifax should be treated as it had been by the government. In the Imperial Act justice had not been done to the city, and he therefore was not opposed to giving the county an additional member, but he

contended that the rural districts should be separately represented. He could not imagine, however, why Pictou should receive an extra member, population had been lost sight of in framing the bill and that therefore could not be the principle. If two members were considered sufficient for Cape Breton County, on what ground could an additional representation for Pictou be defended? He believed that the proposition for delay was one that no member could fairly take exception to.

Hon PROV SEC was glad to find that in view of his responsible position the hon member who had just spoken had risen superior to local and sectional feelings, as was testified by his ignoring the fact that the bill would give large additional privileges to his own constituents. When that member went on to advocate the claims of Halifax to exercise greater weight in the Legislature, he had given an additional evidence of the strictly provincial character which his views might hereafter be expected to assume. It had been shewn that the bill divided the Province into two halves—East and West—Halifax lying between, and the hon member, representing the Eastern constituency, had expressed the fear that the Eastern half would have too much weight. He could understand the member for Yarmouth, Mr Killam, who was entirely opposed to the change, but he could not understand why Mr Campbell, having assented to the principle, should oppose the change at the only time when it could be made. It would puzzle that gentleman to shew any statesman in the world who ever said that the first session of a new Parliament, and not the last session of an old one, was the time for remodeling the representation—on the contrary, it had been held that a material change in that respect was equivalent to the declaration that the people were not properly represented, and that a dissolution must follow. That gentleman had supported a Government which introduced a bill to change the representation at the last session of an Assembly, because that was the only time when it could appropriately be done.

Mr ANNAND said he was amused at the assertion that the last session was the time for such a change. Was it not a fact that the House was sitting under a franchise which did not then exist? He contended that when the new Legislature was elected it should not be obliged to stultify the action of the House in case it wished to review the policy of representation. Mr Campbell had been taunted with rising superior to local prejudices—it was to be hoped he always would—should the voice of Nova Scotia be stifled because Guysboro' would stand in a better position than heretofore? He contended that between East and West there should be no jealousy—the counties had one common interest. As to economy, his plan would be to abolish the Legislative Council, and keep the popular branch as efficient as possible. If Responsible Government was to be carried on at all there should be no diminution. The bill would throw the representation into a very extraordinary state: Halifax, at last census, had 49,000 inhabitants, and was to have 3 members or one for every 16,000, Queen's would have

a member for every 4682, Richmond for every 6303,—in some counties there would be a member for far less than 5000 people. The Prov Sec had said that he, Mr Annand, had not subscribed to the doctrine of representation by population, and therefore should not complain on that point, but he had always considered population as an important element; the agriculture, the fisheries, the education and the manufactures should all be represented, and population also. The bill, as was previously objected, would, he said, destroy in Halifax completely the principle of representation by population. The influence of East Halifax would be entirely extinguished,—its interests were distinct and separate, having manufacturing or mercantile engagements, and its votes would be swamped by the votes flowing in on them from the western division. In Ontario, in Lower Canada and in New Brunswick district representation was recognized, and the cities returned members,—why then should a distinction be made as to Halifax? The people outside should have their representatives and the citizens theirs. Mr Annand concluded by moving in amendment to the first clause of the bill that the representation for Halifax county be four, two for the city and two for the population outside.

Mr. TOWN considered the bill so fair in all its points that he thought no objection could be fairly made to it, and said that this was the opinion of some gentlemen in opposition whom he had consulted. As to the amendment just moved, if the principle of representation by population was to be recognised, the representation of the entire Province should be remodelled. Supposing such a rule to prevail in England, how many members would London send with a population of nearly three millions. The bill, he said, proposed that every county should have two members in the local Parliament in addition to the one in the House of Commons: Pictou was excepted on account of its size and population; and Halifax was to have three local and two general representatives. However much he might desire an additional member for Halifax, he did not think it would be fair to ask an alteration of the entire principle of the bill. The opposition on the previous day had been so feeble that he had been led to expect that in committee the bill would pass without a division. He believed that the governmental and legislative expenses of the Province were entirely too large for the country. The latter came to \$50,000, out of all proportion to our revenue and population. He believed also that that was the proper time for the change to be made, and he would have been prepared to advocate such a measure even if Union had not taken place.

Hon ATTY GEN said he was not unprepared for a more strenuous opposition than had been shown: the objections which had been raised answered each other effectually. One gentleman complained that the bill went too far; another that it did not go far enough; one said that the constitution should not be interfered with, and another said that the upper branch should be abolished. He would remind the House that they were not in the position of Upper Canada in deal-

ing with this question, for that country was principally governed by municipal institutions, and no Legislative Council was in existence. He did not think it wise to depart from the policy hitherto pursued in that respect. It was unnecessary to discuss the principle of representation by population, for it was impracticable now to alter the lines of the counties as would be necessary. Nothing, then, remained but to adapt the lower branch in such a way that all the interests of the country—farming, fishing, mercantile, and mining—would be represented.

Every county, it should be remembered, had an equal interest in all those branches of industry, and this rendered a special representation of any particular class unnecessary. No one had argued very strenuously that thirty-eight members were insufficient, but the great argument had been that the question should be left to the discretion of those coming after us. The delegates had not shown any fear in entrusting the constitution to the people, because they had provided that it should be in their hands for all time to come; but it was the duty of these gentlemen to put the scheme before the country as a whole. No right or privilege would be taken from the people. It was well known that to deal with the representation, when it was once permanently established, was a very difficult task, and if the measure were not carried now it might be fifteen or twenty years before the local legislators could be induced to vote away their own positions. The member for East Halifax, in arguing one moment on the assumption that the votes of his own district were to be swamped, and then on the assumption that West Halifax was to be affected by the Eastern section, showed how unsubstantial his objections were. As to the amendment, he asked was it worse that a person resident in the city should vote at the same poll as a constituent of East Halifax, than that a person living outside the city limits should do so? It might be said that the interest of the city was purely commercial, but did not the fishing interest operate on both? In the same way the fishing interest of Cape Breton was the same as that of Yarmouth, and so with the agricultural interests of Kings and other counties. The main object was to have all the interests of the Province represented, and that would be accomplished by giving three members to Halifax, three to Pictou, and two to each of the other counties. The main object of a change in the franchise and representation was to secure the best men, and this was the most effectual way of effecting it.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON expressed his surprise at the opposition exhibited. He had expected that the bill would pass without opposition until he heard Mr. Killam's remarks, and that gentleman had secured the co-operation of some of his friends by the magnetic influence which he seemed to exercise. If this change had not been proposed, the eloquence on the other side would have been of a far higher kind than that which had been heard. It was true that the measure was not perfect, but who ever heard of a perfect representation bill? The foundation of such a measure was always shifting, even where population

was taken as the guide. This fact was abundantly illustrated in English history. When Wilberforce represented Yorkshire it had but two members, and it was long before it was divided into ridings, each one of which had the number of representatives. He believed the bill to be so fair that no reasonable objection could be made to it. It was curious that the members representing the city could not be left to take care of their own constituency; many of the remarks made concerning the feeling in the city of Halifax in reference to Confederation were "largely inaccurate." By the amendment the votes of the Western district would be swamped by the votes of Eastern Halifax. He would not object to another representative being added to the city representation, but there was no prospect of such a proposal receiving the assent of the Legislature. Under the bill, every man East and West would have the same suffrage.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY said, in reference to his argument that the concluding Session of a Parliament was the proper time for a change in the representation, the answer of the member for East Halifax did not apply, because the change in the franchise was not at all a parallel case. When it had been proposed by Earl Russell's administration to extend the franchise to half a million additional electors, the statesmen of England had declared that the change would not involve an appeal to the people; but one of the reasons why the representation was not dealt with at the same time was that a dissolution must follow if an extensive change in that direction were made. Coming closer home, however, the party of the hon. member had made it part of the constitution that a change in the franchise did not involve a dissolution.

The franchise was at one time lowered to universal suffrage, and while the House was sitting under the old suffrage the departmental officers were elected under the new. Nor could any instance be produced in which any other course was considered necessary. The House did not approach the question as the Legislature of Canada did, because we had a number of councillors appointed by the Crown for the term of their lives; but even if it did, it would be unwise to do without the safeguard which a second branch always provided. It had been said that responsible government could not be carried on in a House of only 38 members; but he would turn attention to New Brunswick, which had a popular branch of only 41 members; again in Prince Edward Island, which had been so often referred to as having dealt so nobly with the question of Confederation, the House had a smaller number than would be left here after the change. He was surprised at the new-born zeal of the hon. member for East Halifax for the interests of the city, after that gentleman had gone out of the country and done all in his power to prevent the city from achieving that which every intelligent person regarded as her destiny, when she should become the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. That hon. member admitted that he had gone to England using every argument that he could to prevent three or four millions of British capital from

flowing into us, and to prevent us from having connection not only with Canada, but with 20,000 miles of railway in the United States. Could the hon. member expect, in a speech delivered to the committee, to wipe out the recollection of an act which would sink deep into the mind of every intelligent citizen? He much mistook the intelligence of the citizens if he supposed that a few idle words would work such a transformation as to place him forward as the champion of the city. The hon. member had arrayed himself not only against the interests of the city, but of the Province as well, for he had traduced his country by representing to the Parliament of England that the railway debt would be repudiated. What was the deplorable state of the city, that such championship was required? Halifax county returned five gentlemen, and nine members were residents of the city. Was there any danger of the city not having sufficient influence in Parliament? The hon. member came to the rescue of Halifax by proposing such a division that the city would be denuded of any influence in the election of representatives. He denied that the interests of the city and county differed; it was plain that there was ten times the fishing interest among the Halifax merchants to what was outside. The hon. member had not been very considerate to his constituents in his action in reference to the Intercolonial Railway, for one of the first things that would probably be done would be to extend a branch from the junction to Dartmouth, thus giving the most remote sections of the eastern district a direct interest in promoting that great work. The interests of city and county were one, or they were diverse; if they were one, then there could be no disadvantage in having the electors cast their votes for all the members; if they were distinct, the result of dividing the representation must be that the members would neutralize each other. He believed that their interests were identical—that which made the man who caught the fish prosper, made the man who dealt in mercantile interests prosper also.

Mr. ANNAND said that when the Prov. Secy. had a very bad case he always rose on the wings of declamation away from the question. The Intercolonial Railway had nothing to do with the bill under consideration; he had previously explained his action on that subject, and he felt that the liberties of the people should be preserved if twenty railways had to be sacrificed. He felt inclined to coincide in the opinion of Mr. Fleming as to that Railway, and to take the view of a member of the House of Commons who said that the road would not pay for the grease of its engines. (Hon. Pro Sec: He got those opinions from the people's delegates.) Mr. Annand said that he was not aware of the people's delegates having seen the face of that gentleman previous to the expression of that opinion. Mr. Fleming's report showed that the N. A. and European line could tap the road and divert the trade at Danville. (Hon. Pro Sec. Suppose that to be true, would the connection with thirty millions of people and the making Halifax the highway of communication between London and New York be nothing?) It was true that a large flow of

passengers would be a great advantage to the country but while the picture was beautiful the realisations were improbable. The bill on the table proposed to give to Halifax a member for every 18,000, to Pictou a member for every 9000, and to Queen's one for every 4,500, and in the face of these facts he felt it his duty to enter a protest against the measure. If the amendment were adopted there would be a representative for every 12,000 inhabitants and each district would be represented. According to the last census the city population was 25,000 and the county population outside the city limits 24,000, so that the amendment would equalise the representation. Was there anything unreasonable in asking that the mercantile community should be separated from the fishing and rural counties? It had been said that the electors of East Halifax would swamp those of West if a division were made, but were not their interests one? He denied that the city would be deprived of its influence by the change as had been alleged; on the contrary it would be placed in a most favorable position.

Mr. KAUSACK remarked that gentlemen of the opposition had been unable to agree among themselves. He regarded that measure as the only practicable one that could be proposed. If an increase were made to one county others would not be satisfied, and if the principle of population were to govern there would have to be a re-division of the counties. He believed that the general feeling was that the representation should be changed to suit the altered circumstances of the country, and the change proposed in the bill would, no doubt, accord with the expectations which prevailed. One important consideration which induced him to support the bill was that it would give to the counties possessing chiefly a fishing interest a larger proportion of representation and influence than they had hitherto enjoyed, and this must meet with general approval as an act of justice. He was in favor of the bill for another reason: he had always disapproved of the system which maintained little pocket boroughs and gave to little settlements the right to return representatives. There was no reason why 2000 people in one district should have the right to elect a member when other parts of the country were treated in a different manner. Again, it was a well known fact that the larger the area and population over which the election was run the less corruption would prevail. This measure he viewed as an important step towards the extension of the franchise. When the representation was extended the franchise should certainly come under consideration. The country had declared in an unmistakable manner that some change in that respect should be made, and that an Act, which struck off 20,000 electors, did not meet with the approval of the people. He knew numbers of worthy and intelligent men who would be deprived of a voice in the approaching election if the present Act were to remain in force. This matter had been forcibly urged upon him by his constituents and he felt it his duty to require that the subject should receive consideration—he would like to go back to be judged by the people who had returned him at the last election. H.

had recently received a letter from an officer in the volunteer force who said that, one of the inducements which had been held out to the volunteers to sacrifice their time and means in the patriotic work in which they were engaged, was that they had a stake in the country, and a voice in the management of its affairs, and yet these young men had been disfranchised in hundreds. In view of these facts he could hardly face his constituents if he did not urge the Government to bring forward a bill to repeal the present franchise law. As to the representation of Halifax there had always been a feeling that Halifax influence had predominated, to too great an extent, that feeling, he believed, originated in prejudice, but the amendment could only be sustained on the principle that population should give the representation, and if that were recognized some counties would be cut down to one member while others would be too largely represented. A separation of East Halifax from the Western section, he thought, would lead to jealousies and dissensions, which would interfere with the rights of both.

Mr. KILLAM said as to the proper time for making the change, it was hardly worth while to discuss that point, because the Provincial Secretary had the power to do almost anything. The government, it would appear, would stick at nothing, for they had carried Confederation when some of their supporters acknowledged, in conversation that not one in ten of their constituents were favorable to it. The opposition of the people on that question was no doubt one of the reasons why they were to be now disfranchised to a great extent, and there was no reason to suppose that the government would join two counties together and give them the representation of one, if it were necessary for their object. To suit their purposes counties which had long been divided, were to be amalgamated, as in Halifax. As to the plea of economy, it was well known what their policy had been in that respect—a more extravagant government never ruled the country. The subject of the railway had been mooted; the ends of a railway were not always in a position to reap the benefit of the line, and the support that Halifax could get from over 3000 miles of water would not be of much consequence. Holyhead was in a most advantageous situation, if the terminus of a line was of any great consequence, but it was a mere village like Dartmouth, and the passengers went right off in the ferry-boat in so short a time that the people of the place could just have time to run out and see them take their departure. It was well known that sheaves of pamphlets and papers were being sent to the country on the subject of Confederation, to influence the votes at the approaching election, but the statements they contained, like the fanciful representations concerning the railway, would be found to be mere idle wind. The change which had been made would take from the Province its revenues, and restrict local improvements. He believed that the bill was framed on a wrong principle, but could not sustain Mr. Annand's amendment because the counties must all share the same fate, and Halifax must suffer with the others.

Hon ATTY GEN in reference to Mr Annand's remarks concerning the small advantages to be derived from the railway, remarked that he had that day heard a prominent anti-Confederate say that since the Confederation bill had been promised as likely to pass, he had laid out £1000 on his property, and he would expend another £1000 if the guarantee bill were ratified.

Mr HATFIELD considered it the duty of every member to express his views on the measure before the House. He felt bound to oppose the bill as unfair and unjust. The change from district to county representation would take from the district of Argyle, which he represented, the privilege it had hitherto enjoyed, for Yarmouth had a population equal to two-thirds of the county, and the result would be that Yarmouth would return all the members. Nearly three-fifths of the inhabitants of Argyle were Catholics, and they thus would be deprived of a voice in the representation. Resistance, however, appeared useless, and the opposition must submit; but he could tell the Government that they would meet their reward, perhaps when they least expected it. He believed the bill to be wrong *in toto*, and that the representation which it would establish would be unfair.

The question was then taken, when Mr Annand's amendment was negatived. The clause passed.

Mr ANNAND then moved that the operation of bill be deferred until next session.

Hon PROV SEC'y asked if the hon member meant to stultify himself by making such a proposition in view of his action when in power a few years ago?

Mr ANNAND replied that he was following the tactics which had been pursued on that occasion by gentlemen opposite.

Mr ARCHIBALD spoke briefly in favour of the bill and said that he must in consistency oppose the amendment.

This amendment was also negatived. The bill passed

BILLS, PETITIONS, ETC.

The bill relative to certain public officers and their salaries was then taken up.

Mr. TOBIN asked if it would not be well to consider the question whether a man assuming office should be obliged to go back to his constituents.

Mr. ANNAND thought the hon member's suggestion worthy of attention.

Hon. PROV SEC said no doubt the question was one deserving of consideration. At present, however, he felt reluctant, as one member of the Legislature, to do anything that would seem to take away from the privileges of the people.

Mr. TOBIN would be sorry to see the principle of re-election removed as regards the general Government, but it seemed to him unnecessary to apply it in connection with the local Government.

The bill passed; also the bill relative to disabilities of members of the local Legislature and general Parliament.

The committee rose and reported.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced a bill in connection with the license law; and presented a number of petitions from members of various religious denominations in the city in connection therewith. They ask that the sale of groceries be separated from that of liquors in the same establishment.

Mr. ANNAND presented a petition from J. Hodgson in reference to a sidewalk at Bedford.

Mr. PRYOR introduced a bill to incorporate the Grand Lodge of Good Templars.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL introduced a bill to amend chap. 13, Acts of 1865, providing for the construction of two other sections of the Provincial Railway. The object of the act, he stated, was to authorize the Government to issue debentures to the extent of £188,600 sterling, being the capitalization of the amount of the subvention granted for the purpose of constructing the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. The negotiations during the past year required that the amount given by the Province should be capitalized.

Mr. TOBIN presented the following petitions: From James Keefe, for aid to complete a road round Northwest Arm; from William Smith, for compensation for school house; from the people of Portuguese Cove, for aid to deepen the harbour.

The House then adjourned until 3 o'clock on Monday

MONDAY, April 1.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

BILLS AND PETITIONS.

Mr. BOURNOT introduced an act to amend the act relative to the terms of the Supreme Court in the island of Cape Breton—merely a verbal alteration.

Mr. MILLER presented a largely signed petition asking for the establishment of a shipping office at Arichat; also, a bill in accordance with the prayer thereof.

Mr ANNAND presented a petition and bill relative to the Prince of Wales Lodge of Odd Fellows.

Mr. BILL, a petition of a number of the inhabitants of West Cornwallis, in reference to postal accommodation.

Mr. KAULBACK, a petition from 70 inhabitants of Bridgewater, in reference to the unsatisfactory state of mail conveyance.

THE HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

Mr. ANNAND asked permission to be relieved from attendance on the committee on Humane Institutions. He had not been on the committee, he stated, inasmuch as the paper with which he was connected had expressed very strong opinions during his absence, and since his return, on the subject of the Hospital for the Insane. He had not written any of the articles in question, but he felt it right, in justice to himself and the gentleman whose conduct was impugned, that he should not serve on the committee.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said the hon. gentleman wished to establish a novel precedent when he

asked that a member should be allowed to retire from a committee, and not exercise his duties as a representative of the people; because he was connected with a public journal. Perhaps it would be inadvisable to agree to the hon. member's request. The House might be curious to know whether he, as a member of the committee in the discharge of his high parliamentary duties, would be able to sustain the course which his journal had taken. It would certainly place the hon. member in a very unpleasant position if he felt compelled, by a sense of public duty, after hearing all the circumstances of the case, to come to the conclusion that the paper of which he was the manager had asserted opinions which could not be borne out by the facts. He (Dr. T.) must certainly express his surprise that the hon. member had not felt the delicacy which he now laid claim to, elsewhere than in the house. It hardly seemed compatible with justice to attack the Medical Superintendent in the way he had been in the journal with which the hon. gentleman was connected. It ought to be remembered that it was quite possible for a public officer holding a highly responsible position not to be entirely exempt from blame—to be open to the imputation of not having exercised that strict surveillance over subordinates he might have done, and at the same time, for his general management, to be such as would prevent him from being treated with any degree of severity. There were few parties called upon to discharge high public duties—whether in the government or otherwise—who could say that their conduct had been always entirely blameless. As respects the Medical Superintendent, it would have been manifestly unfair, in view of all the circumstances of the case—in view of the facts that he had held his position for many years to the satisfaction of several governments, that his general management had been approved of by a committee of medical gentlemen, who had investigated thoroughly the condition of the institution—to dismiss him, and oblige him, with tarnished reputation, to return to a profession which he had given up when he took charge of the Asylum. All the government could justly do was to make such changes in the institution as would give the public an additional guarantee that it was conducted in the manner it ought to be. Under all the circumstances, he thought the hon. member ought to remain on the committee, though if he refused to do so, of course the House would have to yield to his request.

Mr. ANNAND said that he must still ask to be excused from serving on the committee, for he felt he would be occupying a very equivocal position in the eyes of the public if he remained on it, especially if a report adverse to the Superintendent was brought in.

Mr. ANNAND was excused from serving on the committee.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced a bill for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table, by command, a petition from trustees of Cumberland

Academy for increased allowance—referred to the Committee on Education. Also petition of H. Lawlor, of Cape Breton, in reference to postal service—referred to P. O. Committee.

LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

Hon. PROV. SEC. moved the third reading of the bill in reference to duration of and representation in the General Assembly.

Mr. ANNAND moved that four members be given to Halifax county, two to the city, and two to the county outside the city. Negatived.

Mr. ANNAND again moved that the bill be re-committed for the purpose of giving four members to the county of Halifax. He did so, because during the debate the principle of representation by population had been recognized as the true one. In fact, it had been to a certain extent recognized in the case of Halifax and Pictou, but he did not think the bill went far enough.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON would be glad if the House would entertain the proposition.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said he did not look upon this motion as in the slightest degree affecting the principle of the bill, and the House was at liberty to pass or reject it. He would, however, vote against the resolution, for he felt that Halifax would have fully as much influence as she ought to have in the Legislature. Indeed, Halifax now had an amount of weight in the Legislature beyond that of any other part of the Province.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that if the resolution passed then Halifax would have a representation equal to that of half of the Island of Cape Breton.

Mr. TOBIN said that he would vote for the resolution in entire deference to the hon. member for East Halifax. That hon. member had no doubt made the motion with the hope of placing the representatives of the city, if possible, in a wrong position, but he would find himself mistaken. He (Mr. T.) would be very happy if the House would grant the additional representation to Halifax.

Mr. PRYOR would also be happy to vote for the resolution, particularly as he appreciated the motives of the hon. member who moved it.

Mr. LOCKE said that he believed his hon. friend, the member for East Halifax, would have to sit alone on his side of the House.

On a division the resolution was lost by 5 to 36.

Yeas—Tobin, Pryor, Annand, Shannon, Balcarn.

Nays—Killam, D. Fraser, Allison, J. Fraser, Bill, Hill, Longley, Heffernan, Hatfield, Hebb, Townsend, Whitman, Parker, Kaulback, Jost, Bourinot, Donkin, Miller, McFarlane, Prov. Secy., Stewart (Campbell), Locke, Fin. Secy., Robertson, Blanchard, Smvth, Cowie, Brown, J. Campbell, McKinnon, Ross, Coffin, Blackwood, Colin Campbell, Caldwell, Ray.

Mr. ANNAND then moved that the bill be deferred until the next session of the Legislature. Negatived by 18 to 30.

Yeas—Killam, Hebb, Hatfield, Balcarn, Ross, Locke, S. Campbell, Robertson, Annand, Ray, Coffin, Brown, Blackwood.

Nays—J. Fraser, McDonnell, Heffernan, Allison, Shannon, Pryor, Townsend, Whitman, Parker, Kaulback, Jost, Bourinot, Donkin, Hill, Tobin, Miller, McFarlane, Longley, Prov. Sec., Fin. Sec., Blanchard, Archibald, Colin Campbell, P. Smyth, McKinnon, J. Campbell, Caldwell, Attorney General.

The bill to amend chap. 2 R. S. of Executive and Legislative Disabilities was next taken up.

Mr. ANNAND said that it was certainly noteworthy that a different system was pursued in Canada, and would probably also prevail in New Brunswick. It would be interesting for the House to know why a different rule was followed in this Province.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that the Act of Union which was now the law of the realm, having received Her Majesty's assent, left it in the power of the local Legislatures to form their own constitution. It was therefore the privilege of this house to arrange that constitution as it might deem most advisable for the public interests. When the Legislature of New Brunswick met, no doubt the subject would be considered and arranged as might seem best to the Representatives of that Province. He believed that the members of the local Legislature should be able to approach the discharge of their public duties entirely untrammelled by any duties irrespective of their local position. If a gentleman should sit in both the local Legislature and the general Parliament, the duties of one would probably come into conflict with those of the other. The great object should be to have a representative go to the local Legislature or general Parliament with his judgment unbiassed. Again, if there was a member of the general Government sitting in the local Legislature, he would be placed in a very embarrassing position; for he might be questioned as to matters of public policy when separated from his colleagues, and without the means of communicating with them. Such considerations had induced the Government to bring forward the present bill.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL gave it as his opinion that it was quite competent, under the terms of the bill, for any person, at the first election, appearing as a candidate for both the local Legislature and general Parliament.

Some discussion then took place as to the interpretation that might be put on the bill.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that it was impossible to prevent any person being nominated for both houses.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that a candidate would have to select the house he would sit in.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that in England there was no law to prevent a person being nominated and returned for half a dozen constituencies, but he must make his election of one of them before he could take his seat. All that was intended was not to take away the right of the people to choose any person they might think proper. He had looked over the bill, and believed it to be as carefully drawn as it was possible under the circumstances. He appreciated the arguments of hon. members, but he did not see any necessity for alteration or addition of words. It was not advisable to make any conditions that would trammel the people or lead to difficulties hereafter. It was proposed, for instance, to put in

the words "with his consent;" but it might happen that a person might consent to his return, and it would not be so easy to prove it. The best the house could do was to prevent any individual taking his seat both in the general Parliament and in the local Legislature.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that no person ought to be in a position to choose between the seats.

Mr. LOCKE said that "with his consent" would not answer, for a person might be nominated in his absence.

The bill was left over until the next day, that the Attorney General might see whether any alteration in the bill was necessary.

The bill in reference to the departmental officers and their salaries was then taken up and passed.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty the Queen, requesting that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to establish the number of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia at eighteen members, and to provide that absence for two sessions consecutively shall vacate the seat of a Councillor, and that the Legislative Council be invited to join this house in such Address.

"Resolved, That a conference be requested with the Legislative Council, by committee, on the general state of the Province, and that the committee of this house be requested to communicate to the committee of the Council the foregoing resolution."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. PRYOR reported up several bills, without any amendment, from the Committee on Private Bills.

Hon. FINANCIAL SECRETARY introduced a bill to incorporate the Gas Consumers' Company.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced an act to incorporate the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. He explained that in consequence of the financial difficulties that prevailed in England last year the original contractors for the work were obliged to give up the contract. He was glad, however, to be able to say that the government had been able to enter on a new contract for the accomplishment of the work. The name of Thomas Brassey would be sufficient guarantee that the work would be substantially and expeditiously completed. He pointed out the great advantages that would result to the Province from the capitalization of the subvention, in reference to which he had introduced a bill on a previous day.

TUESDAY, April 2.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table correspondence relating to the removal of James Tweedell from the Hospital for Insane. Referred to committee on humane institutions.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill to amend chap. 16, Acts of 1866 relating to partition of real estate.

Mr. ARCHIBALD presented a petition from J. McKay and 100 others of Charlottetown, asking an alteration in the line of a polling district, and introduced a bill in accordance therewith.

Mr. CALDWELL presented a petition from Sydney, asking that the provisions of chap. 69 R. S. be extended to that place, in order to authorize the appointment of commissioners of streets.

Mr. McLELAN presented a petition from Chas. Taylor and others relative to loss of goods on railway.

Mr. PRYOR reported two bills from the committee on private and local bills.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced two bills respecting markets and the market house in the city of Halifax.

LOCAL CONSTITUTIONS.

Hon. PRO. SEC'Y moved the resolution of which he had given notice on the previous day with respect to the number of members of which the Legislative Council should in future be composed.

Mr. ANNAND asked whether it would be wise to limit the number of Legislative Councillors for all time to come?

Hon. PRO. SEC'Y answered that it was only intended to limit the number to 18, as it was now limited to 21, it being still the prerogative of the Crown to add to the number.

Mr. ROSS said that one of the grounds on which the reduction had been made in the members of the House was that the work would be largely diminished; and another was, that a saving would be effected. He did not see why the same arguments would not apply to the upper branch, and why the reduction should not be in the same proportion, which would make the number of Councillors 13 or 14. If the government, at the eleventh hour, were so favourable to retrenchment they should avail themselves of this opportunity.

(The Legislative Council announced by message that they had passed a bill to incorporate the Amherst boot and shoe manufacturing company, and agreed to the bills to legalize the proceedings of the Sessions of Cape Breton county, and the bills to incorporate the Wellington Mining Company, the Palmerston, Dominion, Blue Lead, Union, Provincial and Eldorado Gold Mining Companies.)

Hon. PRO. SEC'Y, in answer to Mr. ROSS, said he thought it would be a doubtful policy to make a branch of the legislature so small as had been suggested. The number of the Councils of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick bore a greater disproportion to the lower branches in those Provinces than that which would exist if the resolution passed. He felt he need hardly say that the government would only have been too glad to have effected a further saving in that particular if it had been consistent with the public interests to do so. While they could claim credit for an almost lavish expenditure on the two great services of the country—education and roads and bridges—they had taken the earliest opportunity to bring forward a measure which would largely reduce the legisla-

tive expenses, and were therefore deserving of the compliments passed upon their economy.—The difficulty which had met him on a previous occasion when he moved a reduction of the public expenditure was that the civil list was beyond the control of the House—and the Imperial Government had testified its dissent to any such reduction, in a strong despatch. Although his opponents were right in their prediction that the financial condition of the country would be such as not to demand so extensive a system of retrenchment, yet the government from the first day they had obtained power had strenuously endeavoured to obtain the power for the legislature to deal with the subject, and this had been accomplished by the recent action in connection with Confederation. The government had no sooner secured that right for the legislature than they brought forward a measure which would largely diminish the public expenditure, and had succeeded in passing it notwithstanding the opposition from the other side. The alterations effected by the civil list bill were far more extensive than any scheme of retrenchment which he had ever submitted to the legislature.

Mr. KILLAM said that the greater part of the salaries referred to had always been under the control of the Legislature, and it should be remembered that while the reduction had been made, the government had taken away the means of paying these salaries. The economy was very trifling, and the whole scope of the alterations in the Legislature evidently was to increase the influence of the Crown and to diminish that of the people. If ever there was a time when the Council could be dispensed with, it was now.

Hon. ATTY. GENL. asked how such a proposition as that with which Mr. Killam had concluded agreed with the statement that no change should be made in the constitution at this time?

Mr. LOCKE expressed himself favorable to the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Hon. PRO. SEC'Y asked how it was that the hon. gentleman always lost sight of that proposition when in power?

Mr. LOCKE said that it might have been owing to a difference of opinion on the part of his friends.

Mr. McLELAN said that although he had hitherto regarded the upper branch as of value, yet under the many guards and checks which would be applied under Confederation, he thought it might very well be dispensed with. The PRO. SEC'Y had expressed his willingness to economize as soon as the opportunity offered, and here was an opportunity for retrenchment. It was very strange that that gentleman was not aware when he proposed his retrenchment scheme in 1863, of the difficulties that laid in the way. It was pleasing to be informed that Confederation would be the means of effecting retrenchment, for the general belief was that it would impose large additional burdens on the country. Whatever small saving could be effected in local matters would be far outweighed by the burthen of the general government, and the policy was therefore "penny wise and pound foolish." He thought that the Legislative Councillors could

be easily provided for: twelve of them could get seats in the Senate, and their services could be very well dispensed with, while on the other hand the popular branch should have been kept as large as possible.

The resolution passed.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. COWIE introduced a bill relative to a new bridge at Liverpool.

Mr. KAULBACK introduced a bill to revert in the Crown certain lands in the town plot of Chester.

Mr. KAULBACK presented a petition from E. D. DAVIDSON complaining of a grievance. He said that the petitioner had erected a large mill on the Lohave River, and for that purpose had constructed a dam. The Sessions had ordered a large break in the dam, and a serious loss was feared on the petitioner. The petition was referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. ARCHIBALD introduced a bill to authorize the sale of a school house and land at Brookfield.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill to amend the Act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop of Arichat. He said that the object of the bill was to restore certain powers bestowed by a section in the Revised Statutes, which had been unintentionally repealed last session.

The resolution introduced by the hon. Prov. Secy. respecting the Legislative Council having contained a provision for a joint address of both Houses to Her Majesty, the Council announced by message that they had agreed to the proposed conference on the subject of the resolution. Hon. Atty. Gen., hon. Prov. Secy. and Mr. Archibald were appointed a committee of conference, and subsequently reported that they had discharged their duties.

THE LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY moved the third reading of the bill relative to executive and legislative disabilities. He said that on consideration the Government had decided not to alter the bill, as the difficulty mentioned on the previous day could not be readily obviated, and it was so improbable that any such should arise, that it might safely be left to take care of itself.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL thought the bill did not express what the Government intended it should—it did not prevent a person offering for seats in both the Local and Federal Legislatures.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. thought the bill contained all the provisions that should be inserted. When a man was once elected for the House of Commons, or appointed to the Senate, his seat in the lower Parliament would be vacated, but there was nothing to prevent a man being simultaneously elected for both Houses. This was all that could be done, for if the bill provided that the seat should be forfeited if a member were elected to the other Parliament with his consent, great difficulties would arise in proving his consent. It was very improbable that any man would offer for a seat which he was ineligible to fill.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that there did not seem to be any means of preventing a candidate from offering for both Houses,—all that could be done was to vacate his seat in the lower House elected to the House of Commons.

Hon. FINANCIAL SECRETARY said that would be easy to prevent the double nomination in one county, but a man might be nominated for the local Parliament in one county and for the House of Commons in another.

Mr. COFFIN thought the difficulty could be obviated easily.

Mr. ROBERTSON said that the difficulty would not occur in the case of gentlemen on the Government side, for they would have difficulty enough in securing seats in either House.

Mr. McLELAN thought that a man should not be allowed to be nominated for two seats. The ineligibility caused by his election to both would cause the trouble of a second election.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the difficulty could only arise in the first election, and could not be well met because if a provision was inserted that election by the assent of the candidate to both seats would vacate one, then a man elected without his assent could sit in both.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the seat should not be vacated by the mere nomination; the incompatibility arose only from his accepting the two positions.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL thought that the bill was ineffectual to accomplish what the Government had expressed as their intention. It was admitted that some difficulty might arise from the framing of the bill, and he did not see why the language should not be adapted to meet the requirements of the case.

Mr. ROSS expressed his approval of the system followed in some of the other Colonies, of allowing gentlemen to sit in both Parliaments. He also advocated as an improvement the election of the local Governor by the people.

Mr. McLELAN remarked that the Province was being dealt with in this respect differently from the other Provinces, and the history of the past few months showed that the case of Nova Scotia was peculiar. Some gentlemen professed more respect for a few old volumes than for the opinions of the people. A measure should be passed which would prevent those gentlemen who had effected Confederation from coming into both Legislatures, and thus leaving the people practically unrepresented. If Mr. Archibald ran for both Houses and carried both seats, the country would be unrepresented, because that gentleman would not hesitate to hold up a book and say that he valued more highly the author's opinions than those of the backwoodsmen of Colchester.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. admitted that Nova Scotia was in a peculiar position, for it presented the first instance in parliamentary history in which a minority of one-third of the Legislature undertook to represent the people. It had been said that the people of this Province were opposed to Confederation, and the delegates had heard across the water that petitions from an overwhelming majority of the electors were to be pre-

sented to the British Parliament against the scheme. He had a right to ask what had become of those petitions? The delegates had expected a monstrous petition to be presented to the House of Lords, but were disappointed when not a signature appeared, and thought that the battle had been postponed, to be fought on the floors of the House of Commons; their surprise could be imagined when the debate passed over without any such demonstration. Was then the assertion about the feelings of the people warranted? The opposition offered to the bill showed a fear that the majority really represented the people, for gentlemen seemed afraid that members on the Government side would secure two seats.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said he did not see much danger of Colchester being unrepresented. He had not much opportunity of hearing how popular opinion ran in his county on the subject of Confederation, but he believed the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLelan) had lost no opportunity of fostering feelings of opposition to the measure, and had not thought it beneath his position to convene his (Mr. A.'s) constituents and personal friends, in order to create feelings of animosity against him. It would have been more manly to have waited until the matter could be discussed face to face. The time was at hand when it would be seen whether all these efforts were to be successful, but he would recommend gentlemen not to speak too confidently before the verdict was given. He would have no fear of the result, even though he had to meet a gentleman who had availed himself of such ungenerous means as he had described.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that he only opposed the bill from a desire that the legislation should be perfectly matured, and he could not therefore be charged with giving factious opposition. If the other bills had been allowed to pass as introduced, the alterations which he had suggested would probably have been made in the Upper House, and that would have thrown discredit on the Assembly.

Hon. FINAN. SECY. said there was no objection to the hon. member taking credit for the slight verbal alterations which had been made in courtesy at his suggestion. He would not go into the question whether the majority truly represented the people or whether all the boasting that had been heard rested on as firm a basis as the authority of the people's delegates. He thought that these declarations would prove as baseless as the assertions of the men representing themselves as delegates by virtue of petitions which they never had the boldness to exhibit. He thought the time had come when these gentlemen should state whether it was a fact or not that the petitions of two-thirds of the electors had never seen the light of day.

Mr. ANKAND said that after such a challenge it would not be consistent with his duty to the people to remain silent. He was not in London at the time when the petitions could have been presented,—before the bill was read a second time in the House of Lords he had taken passage for Nova Scotia. The petitions were, however, addressed to the House of Commons, and as he

had previously stated, the bill had been read there, contrary to precedent, before the printed papers stating the whole case were laid on the table. There was, therefore, not time to present them at the time when they would appropriately have come under consideration. As to the number of petitioners, the signatures were about 40,000. A few years ago a petition was considered of so much weight as that it should have turned out a government when it had only received 24,000 names. The petitions on the subject of Confederation were signed as those were. It was well known that every man in the country could not write his name, some of the names were therefore in the hand writing of one person,—in one case in his own county, a public meeting had been convened and one person appended the names of such as assented to the petition against Confederation. There was no rule of that House to prevent the reception of a petition to which any other than *bona fide* signatures were attached, but in the House of Commons there was such a rule and it was difficult to bring many of the petitions within the rule. The delegates were recommended to put them into the hands of an eminent member of that House, but he declined to present them as he would be held responsible for every signature. Another gentleman was applied to, but he, being a warm friend of the late Colonial Secretary, was persuaded not to present them after he had promised to do so. The inference to be drawn from these facts was that the leading men on both sides were anxious to confederate the Provinces, that they were averse to our being heard by petition, and wished to take advantage of the position in which our legislature had placed us.—Under these circumstances the people's delegates had abandoned the idea of presenting the petitions, more especially because of the unprecedented haste in reading the bill a second time and from the fact that Confederation was a foregone conclusion and because the feeling all around the house evidently was to get rid of the Colonies and prepare us for independence. What other explanation could be given of the intelligence from Canada that a nucleus of a standing army was to be formed by drafting 5000 men who should be paid by the Confederation? The meaning of this was that we were being educated up to independence and the Provinces were rapidly approaching that point.

Mr. McLELAN did not see why there should be so much ado about the matter when so early an opportunity would be afforded of testing the feelings of the people. Mr. Archibald had been absent from the country for eight months, and was it to be supposed that those differing from him should not utter a word during all the time that he chose to absent himself? It was not true that he had called meetings to discuss the question in Mr. A.'s constituency, for he had more than once declined to attend such meetings in that gentleman's absence, but he was now ready to meet him at any meeting that might be called. As to a meeting of Mr. Archibald's personal friends, he presumed the allusion was to a purely business meeting which certain leading men

had thought it desirable to hold at a time when action was required. That was not a meeting for discussion at all.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that, speaking as *one of the people* of Nova Scotia, he must express his strong disapproval of the manner in which one of his delegates had discharged his duty as explained to the House. The Legislature had not given the hon. member any authority to go across the water; in fact, his action had been condemned as a gross assumption, as entirely incompatible with the system of government which we enjoy. Selected by some irresponsible persons, in defiance of the principles of the British constitution, the hon. member undertook to present himself before the British Government and Parliament as one of the "people's delegates."—Having spent a great deal of time and money, the hon. gentleman now volunteered an explanation of the way in which he had discharged his trust to the members of the Legislature, as a portion of the people whom he undertook to represent. The House was aware that the hon. member spent some seven months in England pretending to be a people's delegate. In common with two other gentlemen, he undertook to teach the people of England how to deal with an important question, and had given the people of this country an enormous amount of trouble, and had expended a great deal of money, in sending perambulators through the Province for the purpose of getting up petitions.—Now, after all he had done, the hon. member had condescended to give the House and country some explanations. These explanations reminded one of the story of the person who had been called upon to pay for a newspaper which had been sent to him; he put in a variety of pleas; he said he never subscribed to it, that he never took it, that it was never sent to him, and if it was sent to him, he never took it out of the post office, and that he had paid for it already. It now appeared that, notwithstanding all the time and money spent, the petitions were of a character that precluded their being presented to the British Parliament. From want of information on his own part, he had misled the people. Had not he (Dr. T.) as *one of the people*, then, a right to complain of the hon. member? The hon. member had acknowledged that the petitions had been treated with contempt—that no member of the British Parliament could be induced to present them. Having presented himself in England without any authority, having volunteered his services to the people of this country, he now confessed that the moment the battle was commenced in England he ran away. When he had spent seven months in England, the moment any thing was to be done he took his passage and returned home. Did the hon. member mean to say that the people of this country would consider such action on his part as a proper mode of discharging his duties? Any person who knew anything about public life, about the usages and practices of Parliament, ought to have known that the petitions the hon. member took with him—signed as they were in numerous cases by a single person, scores of names having been put

on the petitions without the knowledge of the individuals—could never have been presented to the House of Commons. If the hon. member and his friends had ventured to bring their petitions from the dust bin into which they had obviously been consigned, he (Dr. T.) had been fully prepared to show their character. They found the moment they put themselves into communication with English gentlemen, that these petitions were as worthless as the paper on which they were written, and yet the hon. member complained that the petitions were treated with contempt.

The hon. member for East Halifax had also presumed to say that the feeling prevalent in England was to get rid of the Colonies, but he never made a more unjustifiable statement in his life. Take the discussion that took place in both the Lords and Commons and it would be found that the two great governing parties of the country, the Liberals and Conservatives, alike regarded this Union as strengthening the connection with the Crown. From the very inception of this Union, from the first despatch written on the subject, the same opinion was entertained by the statesmen of England. In fact, the argument which recommended itself particularly to the British Parliament, was that it increased and strengthened the tie that now binds these Colonies to the Empire. Such was the idea that exhibited itself on every page of the despatches of Mr. Cardwell, and an abler statesman was never entrusted with the Colonies. From the commencement of this question down to the time he attempted to prevent one of his political friends taking up a position, which he considered injurious to British subjects on this side of the Atlantic, he had not hesitated to express his deep conviction that the interests of the Empire required that these Colonies should be bound and cemented to it more closely than ever before, and that he regarded this union favourably on the ground that it would increase our power to cooperate with the parent state in sustaining our present connection.

The late Colonial Secretary, the Earl of Carnarvon, united with his predecessor, and declared that the Union would assure and perpetuate the connection between the Crown and the Colonies. When the question was discussed in Parliament, although an insignificant opposition was raised by the friends of the self-constituted delegates of the people, every man who had a single word to say in favour of the Union did it on the ground,—and this was a fact that could not too deeply sink into the minds of the people of the country,—that it was the duty of England to stand by the Colonies, to regard any encroachment upon these Colonies as one upon the mother country. What did you find on the other side? Why, the friends of the "peoples' delegates,"—the feeble echo they were able to get in the British Parliament,—declared that the Colonies were a burthen upon the Empire, and that they were hostile to the measure of the Union, because it bound the Colonial dependencies to England more closely than ever, and obliged her to assist in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway.

He would ask the House, with these facts standing indelibly recorded before them—with the debates of the House of Commons and Lords, proving that the few men who wished to sever the colonial connection and to prevent the construction of the Intercolonial Railway were the opponents of Union, whilst, on the other hand, the great majority of each of the two governing parties declared that they approved of Union because it drew these Colonies nearer to the Empire,—was there any one then prepared to repeat the libel upon the sentiments of the Imperial Parliament which the hon. member had invented? When Mr. Bright declared that he regarded these Colonies as a burthen, what did Mr. Watkins say? The hon. member ought certainly to have refrained from uttering a single word against Mr. Watkins. When Mr. Howe went to England, a few years ago, to advocate the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, he was taken by the hand by Mr. Watkins, who then, as now, was true to our interests. That gentleman took Mr. Howe from platform to platform, and introduced him to the people of England. Mr. Howe appreciated at that time the manner in which he had been treated by Mr. Watkins, and put his sentiments upon record when he returned. In 1867 Mr. Watkins, true to the advocacy of British American interests, advocated the claims of the Colonies in a most eloquent manner; and was now held up to the Legislature as a person influenced by interested motives. A feeling of shame should have prevented the hon. member from turning upon that gentleman, because he was true to the principles he had always professed.

He was certainly amused to hear the hon. member refer to a story about a standing army that was being got up in Canada. The hon. gentleman knew that he was only attempting to mislead the country—that there had been no standing army arranged; but he had taken up some idle newspaper rumor and given it currency. Suppose the Government of the Confederacy concluded that it would be wise and fair to the interests of the country to have a standing army, what then? The hon. member's statement was on record that he was willing to pay pound for pound with the Canadians, and he had committed himself to the scheme for the organization of the Empire—The hon. member talked about taxation and yet he had himself admitted, as an act of justice to the people of England, that we should support the army and navy, just as they do, and pay as much as the people of Kent or Surrey. If the people of this Province, therefore, escaped a tax larger than their entire revenue, for defence alone, it was because the hon. member was powerless to carry it.

Mr. ANNAND said that as reference had been made to the feeling in England, he would invite attention to what had occurred in the House of Lords—to the speech of the Marquis of Normanby—who said that these Provinces were to choose their own future, either by separation in this way from the mother country, or by annexation to the United States, if they preferred that. Not a single Lord rose to rebuke the sen-

timent. When such an expression could be used in such a place, what might be inferred of the feelings of the governing classes in England. Only one gentleman had spoken warmly in favor of connection with the mother country, in the House of Commons, and that was Mr. Watkins. He did not wish to attribute improper motives, but it was well known that that gentleman was identified with the railways of Canada, was interested in enhancing the value of Grand Trunk stock, and promoting the interests of the Hudson's Bay Company. He had a pecuniary interest in this connection; that gentleman spoke warmly, but there was no response to his sentiments. The House manifested the most chilling indifference, and the feeling out of doors was that these Colonies being the weak point of the Empire, England could not, while she was bound to defend them, speak brave words to the United States, and that we should therefore be put in a position in which a separation could be easily effected. Under Confederation the only connecting link between England and the Colonies would be the appointment by the Crown of the Governor General,—in case of difficulty between the mother country and the Dominion, it would be easy to withdraw that officer. Some members of the Federal Government might then aspire to the position of President, and they would then only have to reach the sentiments of Lord Normanby and Earl Derby to accomplish independence. Nothing would drive from his mind that the feeling which he had described was the prevailing one among the governing classes of England, although among the masses of the people the sentiment was largely in favor of the retention of the Colonies. The Prov. Secretary's remark about the guarantee for the railway reminded him of a conversation he had had with a gentleman holding a high and influential position in the great metropolis. When he had represented to that gentleman that in addition to the railway there would be demands for enlarging canals, for erecting fortifications, for opening up the North West Territory, and that sixteen millions of pounds might be required before all was over, the answer was, that that sum and double the amount should, in his opinion, be given to get rid of the indefensible Colony of Canada. Confederation was more popular in England from that view than from any other. At the first discussion on Confederation the people had been assured by the delegates at Temperance Hall that the entire sum to be required for defence would be a million of dollars, but what had been seen since? Canada alone had expended two millions on that service,—Nova Scotia had made a handsome contribution, and so had New Brunswick,—and now we were advised that, in addition there was to be a standing army of five thousand men, the nucleus of an army which would cost two and a half millions. This was no idle rumor, as had been stated, it came authoritatively. When the Volunteer and Militia organizations were provided for the sum would be near ten millions. Any man must see that the Colonies were drifting

into independence, and the question which would then arise would be how could that independence be maintained?

Mr C J CAMPBELL thought that the Anti-Confederates had been unfortunate in their selection of men to represent them. The disloyal sentiments propounded by the member for East Halifax in the streets, in the House, and in the press, were well known. The hon. member had seemed afraid of annexation, but he should remember that that was what he had been advocating although it was not what the people desired, and he might be pleased at getting back from England without being committed to close quarters. If the paper under the management of the hon gentleman had been sent to England during his absence that would explain the contemptuous treatment of which complaint had been made. He thought members might be more profitably employed than in answering the observations of the member East Halifax.

Hon. PROV. SEC. remarked that there was a bold line of demarcation between a desire to get rid of the colonies, and the desire expressed by the Marquis of Normanby and other speakers, that the connecting tie should be one of affection and not of force. While members of the Imperial Parliament had said that if we desired independence no compulsion would be used to retain us, they had coupled the expression with the assurance that so long as we desired to remain in the present connection we should have all the aid that our position entitled us to.—Little by little the difficulties which the friends of union had to surmount were coming to light—it was being made apparent that not only had the member for East Halifax and his associates told the Imperial Government that they should rather spend their money upon iron-clads and Spencer rifles than upon a railway which they had been for twenty-five years endeavoring to accomplish, and for which they had induced the House at one time to vote £66,000 per annum for forty years, but they had told influential gentlemen that the guarantee instead of being for twelve millions would be in reality for sixteen millions, and still the guarantee was given. He thanked the hon member for the additional credit which would devolve upon the friends of union by its being shown that they had to meet not only the statements which their opponents had ventured to make, but also those which they had, without regard to truth, poured into the ears of persons in England whom they had button-holed.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the petitions must have been got up for some other purpose than that of presenting them to Parliament. He, as one of the people, had a right to complain that these gentlemen had not obtained the necessary information before presuming to instruct the people as to the course to be pursued. It could not, however, be believed that they were ignorant of the rule of the British House of Commons; and there was this additional complaint that during their stay of five or six months in London they must have ascertained that the

petitions were useless if they had devoted themselves to the object of their mission, and they could afterwards have procured proper signatures. The hon member had however given too many reasons why the petitions had not been presented—one was that there was no opportunity before the second reading of the bill; but the bill had been for days before the House of Lords, the day for its discussion was announced, and they could have been presented to the Commons the moment the bill went down. The excuse, therefore, that no time was allowed was totally insufficient; and as to the statement that the petitions were not fit to be presented, the people had a right to know the actual state of things, instead of being deceived as they were by false intelligence from time to time. Up to the last moment the people's delegates had represented that there was no possibility of the bill passing the Commons, and the Government delegates were charged with hypocrisy in holding out promises of success. If the member for East Halifax left England before the contest came on, how could he speak as he had done about the way in which the bill was received and passed in the Commons? Up to the last hour, the gentleman opposing the bill in London had ventured the assertion that he had not met the first man in England favorable to the bill, and that its passage was out of the question, and the public mind throughout the province was agitated by such representations. How did the facts contrast with those statements? Not a man out of 600 members of the House could be found to present the petitions. That was the admission that those gentlemen were obliged to make, and the time would come when they would be held answerable by the people for the delusion they had created. The friends of Union, looked round anxiously to see from what quarter opposition was to come, but they looked in vain, for those best acquainted with the Colonies supported the bill, and expressed the most friendly feeling for the Colonies, while they intimated that if our people should desire independence, no constraint would be used to prevent them, though they hoped that day would be far distant. The scene in the house of Commons when the leaders of the two great parties, in speaking the same sentiments on this question, were cheered by their opponents, was one that would not be easily effaced. Where any faint opposition was offered, the member would disavow hostility to the bill, and say that opposition would be useless, for the House was unanimous. That unanimity was the result of the conviction that union would contribute to the stability of the whole Empire. The hon. member for East Halifax had admitted the whole question in saying that the masses of the people were in favor of continuing the connection with the Colonies; our security, then, lay in the broad feeling of the people of England, and that feeling would be sure to find expression when the time of necessity came. The feeling in England was, that while the Colonies were disunited a few restless spirits, securing a majority in the smaller provinces, might destroy

the tie between them and the mother country, but the danger was diminished by Union. It was not to be wondered at that such a feeling should exist, and that there should be a desire to restrain such individuals when one gentleman professing to represent Nova Scotia declared that we were indefensible, and that he could raise a body of men in New York sufficient to wrest the Colonies from the grasp of England.

The bill passed the third reading.

The house adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 8.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

EDUCATION REPORT.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table the Education Report for 1866. He stated that the Report afforded very gratifying evidence of the progress of the new school system in this Province. In 1866 the number of public schools in operation was: during the winter term 907, or an increase of 144 over 1865; during the summer term 1170, or an increase of 181 over 1865. The pupils registered during the summer term of 1866 were 56,017, or an increase of 12,246 over 1865; during the winter term, 45,131, or an increase 9980 over 1865. The estimated number of different pupils attending the Public Schools during 1866 is 71,059. The total number of teachers employed during the winter term of 1866 was 929, and in the summer 1,190, showing an increase for the respective terms of 223 and 337 over those of last year. The amount expended in the Province for teachers' salaries during the school year was \$235,825 67, an increase of \$45,730 28 over the previous year. The sources whence these salaries were derived, and the amount from each source, were as follows:—Province, \$95,339 27; Counties, \$55,258 64; Sections, \$85,227 76! The total amount paid by the Province towards buildings, books, and apparatus, &c., in 1866, was \$7,731 01; in 1865, \$8,185 16; shewing a decrease of \$444.15. The total amount paid by the various sections for buildings, furniture, apparatus and miscellaneous was \$91,024 31. The increase in the salaries of teachers had been one of the most gratifying and significant features in connection with the recent educational reform. We might now reasonably expect that much talent of a good order will seek employment in the work of teaching, and that an increasing number of those who engage in this, one of the noblest of callings, will do so for life. For the term ended April 30th, there were 70 schools which competed for the superior grant, and for the term ended October 31st, 71. Of the former, 54 were successful: and of the latter, 52

Much has also been done towards organizing County Academies. Every county, except Inverness entitled under the act to an Academy will soon be in a position to receive the benefits which a thoroughly equipped institution must confer. Inverness does not, for the present, propose to establish an Academy. The Superintendent, referring to the state of education in the city, says—"The efforts of the Board under

the difficulties created by the action of a majority of the City Council in refusing for a time, to levy the required assessment, happily prevented the public schools from being closed. But for the prompt response made by the Government to their representations, the capital of the Province would have presented the shameful and disheartening spectacle of thousands of children roaming its streets in worse than idleness while almost every other section of the country was liberally devoting its means and energies to the work of public education."

The Provincial Secretary, having run over the principal facts given in the Report, concluded by expressing his conviction that the people at large would appreciate the action of the Legislature in having taken the great responsibility upon it of dealing energetically with the educational system of the country.

The Report was referred to the Committee on Education.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table correspondence with the Vice Admiral relative to the formation of a Naval Brigade.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL introduced a bill to add a polling place in the county of Victoria.

Mr. PRYOR, Chairman of Committee on Private and Local Bills, reported up the bill relative to the People's Bank.

Mr. ANNAND, in the discharge of his duty as a member of the Legislature, asked leave to present a petition numerously signed by residents of the town of Arichat praying that the bill now before the House, to appoint commissioners of streets for that place, should not be allowed to pass.

Mr. MILLER said that those who had ever visited Arichat would confess that few towns in the Province stood in greater want of commissioners of streets. As a rule, the streets were in a perfectly disgraceful condition, and consequently when he was recently in the town a number of the most influential residents asked him to introduce just such a bill as was before the House. On looking over the petition just presented, he found that it was contemptibly signed as regards numbers. There were not more than half a dozen names to this petition to whom he felt disposed to pay any regard. At any rate, it was not such a petition as would induce him to hesitate in the discharge of a public duty. He was confident, in fact he knew that the bill was desired by the very great majority of the residents of Arichat. It was a matter of notoriety that in some cases the statute labour money had been collected and pocketed, without having been expended on the streets at all. In consequence of this fact, and the shameful condition of the streets, he had been induced to bring in the bill before the House. The manner in which the petition came before the House was sufficient evidence to him of the quarter whence it emanated. He believed it was not usual for any member to present a petition from another county than his own without having, in the first place, shown it to one of the representatives of that county.

Mr. ANNAND might perhaps agree with the hon. member that the streets of Arichat could be improved. He knew nothing of the local disputes of the country. The petition was simply entrusted to him at the wish of a number of influential gentlemen of the town. The relations between himself and the hon. member, the House was aware, precluded him from having any communication with the hon. member on the subject. He had simply discharged his duty in presenting the petition, which appeared to him most respectably signed—by justices of the peace, shipowners, merchants, and clerk of the peace.

Mr. CHURCHILL presented a petition from the inhabitants of Mount Uniacke, asking for a way office.

The bill introduced by Mr. Ray to legalize certain proceedings of the Grand Jury in Annapolis was read a second time.

The house then went into committee on bills, and passed the following—

To incorporate the Welsford Lodge of Freemasons, Windsor.

To regulate the terms of the Supreme Court, Cape Breton.

To authorize a loan for the erection of a court house and jail in the town of Sydney.

To incorporate the Grand Fre Lodge of Templars, Wolfville.

Some remarks were made relative to the bill incorporating the St. Lawrence and Bay of Fundy Canal Company.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that it was only necessary to look at the geographical nature of the country—to the narrow neck of land that separated the two provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—to see the feasibility of the canal. When the work was completed, it would be of great inter-provincial importance, since it would afford easy access to the Bays of Fundy and St. Lawrence, and enable vessels to make three voyages where they now only made one.

Mr. ANNAND alluded to the practicability of the canal, and the great accommodation it would be to commerce. He remembered some years ago being the chairman of a committee which had reported on the very subject of this canal to the house.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE pointed out the extremely feasible character of the enterprise. The land was extremely level, there not being raise above fifteen feet over the whole distance. The canal would be of great importance not only to this Province, but to all parties navigating the St. Lawrence. The intention of the company was to make a ship canal, so that vessels of all sizes could pass through it.

Mr. ARCHIBALD also expressed his satisfaction to hear that there was a prospect of having so desirable a public work carried out.

Hon. ATTY. GENL. expressed the opinion that companies of this character should not have been required to pay the usual fee of \$20 asked from companies incorporated for private objects.

Mr. BOURINOT and other gentlemen approved of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and thought

the same principle should be applied to coal companies.

Some discussion took place in reference to the clause which exempts the company from the payment of taxes until they are able to pay six per cent on their expenditure. Some gentlemen thought that the same principle ought to be also applied to coal companies, if it was carried out in the case of the company in question. The clause finally passed.

The bill to increase the capital stock of the People's Bank, and the bill relative to Ragged Reef School, Cumberland, passed.

The committee rose and reported.

Mr. CHURCHILL presented to the Government a petition relative to a light house in the Bay of Fundy.

The House then adjourned until the next day at 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 4.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

BILLS.

Mr. MILLER moved the second reading of the bill relative to the appointment of Commissioners of Streets for the township of Arichat. He said he believed there was not a town in the Province that was more in need of such a measure. As far as he was personally concerned, it was a matter of indifference to him, but the bill was introduced at the request of a large number of the most respectable inhabitants of the town. The fact that the petition against the bill had been presented by the hon member for East Halifax was a sufficient indication of its general character; with the exception of about half a dozen names, it was insignificantly signed, and the fact that only a very few signatures had been obtained in a town of 2000 or 3000 inhabitants was an evidence that the general sense of the community did not run with the prayer of the petition. A summary report which appeared recently in the *Chronicle* had conveyed a very untrue impression as to what he (Mr. M.) had said with respect to the petition on a previous day, and although fair play was not to be expected from that journal, and although it was out of the power of the *Chronicle* to injure him with his constituents, he felt bound to repeat the qualification which he had made in referring to the signatures. The *Chronicle* had said that the petition was signed by the Clerk of the Peace and six or seven magistrates; the former gentleman and some of the latter were intended to be included in the exception which he had made as to the respect due to those who had signed, but he was assured that the Clerk of the Peace would be the last man to sign a petition to be presented, as that was, by the member for East Halifax. Another statement which should have been qualified was that the public moneys had been misappropriated by the officers hitherto entrusted with their expenditure. He had intended the observation to apply to the individual who got up the petition, and who was open to the same charge in reference to other trusts. He had made these

explanations in order to put himself right with one or two personal friends, and not from any fear that the misstatements made would affect his position, because the journal to which he alluded had already gone too far to render that possible.

Mr. ANNAND said that he was not particularly interested in the bill; he had merely discharged his duty as a member of the house in presenting the petition. It was nothing unusual for one member to present a petition from the constituents of another member. The hon. gentleman's remarks on the previous day had fallen very differently on his ears from those just uttered.

The bill passed.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill further to amend Chap. 70 R. S., relating to Provincial Government Railways. He said that some difficulty had arisen in counties where there were two Custoses and Clerks of Peace as to which of them should do the acts required by law.

The bill to incorporate the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company passed a second reading.

A number of private bills were read a third time, and sent to the Legislative Council for concurrence.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill to incorporate the Pictou Mining Company.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill to transfer the new Creek, Windsor, from the Commissioners of Sewers to the Commissioners of Streets.

Mr. HEBB presented a petition from James Wambolt and others relative to the fisheries.

Legislative Council announced, by message, that they had agreed to the bill to vest in the Crown certain lands in Lunenburg; also, the bill relative to representation in the General Assembly; also, the bill relative to certain public officers and their salaries. In the latter they inserted an amendment requiring that the Treasurer's chief clerk should give bonds to the amount of \$2000. The amendment was agreed to. The Council also transmitted a bill to incorporate the Cumberland Coal Mining Company.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE, in reference to the last mentioned bill, said that two companies which had been spending a large amount of capital had agreed to unite their means and operate in concert. He presented a petition in favor of the bill.

PETITIONS.

Mr. TOBIN presented four petitions from inhabitants of St. Margaret's Bay in reference to the inspection of Pickled Fish, and against the system of licensing American fishermen. He said that there was formerly a law under which an inspector was appointed for each county, but a change was made, and the matter was left in the hands of the Sessions—that the petitions were in favor of the old law, and asked also that the classification of fish be assimilated to that of the United States.

Hon. FIN. SEC., by command, laid on the table a petition from John F McCurdy asking compensation for loss sustained in connection with the landing of the sick from the cholera ship

CITY RAILWAY.

Hon. PROV. SEC., by command, laid on the table a communication from the Manager of

the Halifax Street Railway, in opposition to the bill for the amendment of the Company's Act of incorporation. He said that the house, 1863, passed a bill which became the charter of the company,—however much inconvenience may have arisen from its provisions; it was important that the good faith should be preserved with a company coming into the country and investing a large amount of capital under the security of the law which was enacted. He moved that the communication be referred to the committee on City of Halifax Bills.

Mr. MILLER said he supposed there was not any intention of interfering with the fair and legitimate exercise of the company's rights, but it should be remembered that the public had rights also, and if the Legislature had given away those rights it was only fair that they should be restored, or else that compensation should be made to the injured parties. He felt every desire to give the strongest encouragement to the company, but he thought they did not come before the Legislature free from all blame. The whole track, as laid down by the company, was in violation of the act; it had been provided that the track should be of the most approved quality, and laid flush with the street,—he was not in a position to speak of the quality of the rail, but parties, whose opinion was of value, had stated it to be a cheap description of rail, for which Mr. O'Brien had obtained a patent. In other places the rail had a groove in which the wheels ran, and that kind did not interfere with the wheels of vehicles. There was not a foot of the track from one terminus to the other that was not a violation of that important feature of the charter. The only way to remedy the inconvenience at present existing, would be to pave the street at each side of the rail. Not only citizens but farmers from the country had suffered great loss and trouble from the present arrangement by having the wheels of their waggons knocked off by contact with the track. The company having thus violated a fundamental provision of their charter, were not in a position to oppose legislation, intended to remedy the evils they had inflicted. As to the use of the snow plough and salt, he did not think it was intended, when the act was passed, to authorize the company to leave our streets in the state in which they were after their operations. In other cities, situated like Halifax, the use of the plough was not permitted, and in Toronto, merchants of first character turned out and blocked up the streets in defiance of the company. A large class of persons, truckmen and cabmen, were dependent on the street traffic for their daily bread, and when Water Street was cleared of snow, wheeled vehicles had to be used there and runners on other streets, so that the business of these men was seriously interfered with. Merchants also had been unable, in some cases, during the winter to make shipments, except at a heavy expense, in consequence of the state of the streets. He was willing to give the company a fair and even partial consideration of their claims, but he considered some legislation necessary to protect the rights of citizens. He did not wish to be understood that he expressed these views merely because he had been retained by some of the citizens in some proceedings which had taken place,—on the contrary, he had told his

clients that his action in the house should not be in the least degree affected by that circumstance.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that he would not vote when the matter came before the committee on city bills, because he had been the retained counsel of the company, and it was not easy for him to divest himself of his feelings in that relation, however able the member for Richmond might be to do so. He would merely ask the house to suspend its judgment until an investigation could take place.

Mr. BOURINOT said that he had heard upon all sides universal condemnation of the conduct of some individuals who had given a helping hand to violate the law and oppose the company in the exercise of the rights which the Legislature had given them. The company had a right to demand that faith should be kept with them, and an investigation would show that a gross injustice had been done them.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL remarked that the discussion was premature.

Hon. PROV. SECY. concurred in this remark. The matter could be much more satisfactorily discussed after the committee had reported.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that all parties interested should be summoned to attend before the committee, and a full investigation would take place.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. remarked that both the company and the city authorities might be blameable for the inconveniences spoken of. The streets could not, without constant repair be kept even with the track, and it was not improbable that the City Council had left the whole work to be done by the company. No doubt much inconvenience had arisen. The salt should not be used as to make a nuisance, and the city authorities should certainly adopt some better system of repairing and cleaning the streets.

Mr. TOBIN said that in this matter the city authorities should be held blameless to a great extent, for when the original bill came up from the City Council, there was a clause providing that the streets should be paved to a distance of three feet on each side of the rail. It was evident that as the street wore down the rail must protrude and hinder the traffic to some extent. He had raised his voice against the provisions of the charter, on the ground that Water Street, especially from the Ordnance to Cunard's wharf, was too narrow. He had always been convinced that it was unwise to allow a double track to be laid. He trusted that the rights of the company, and of the citizens as well, would be guarded. Another matter which he wished to mention in connection with this subject was, that some parties had been encouraged by a former Government to purchase omnibuses for the railway traffic, and this property had become valueless after the railway had gone into operation. In other cities a track was used with a groove, in which carriages could run without any difficulty, and in some places only a single track was allowed, the cars running up one street and down another.

Mr. CHURCHILL thought that hon. members should express their opinions on the question. He contended that the Legislature was bound to protect a company who had obtained a char-

ter and invested their capital under it. The interests of every individual should also be protected as far as possible. It was well known that the business streets of Halifax especially Lower Water Street, were nearly always blocked with snow in winter, and that would oblige the company to use runners for a time, but they should not be restricted from using the snow-plow occasionally. He trusted the difficulties would be obviated satisfactorily.

Mr. PRYOR said that the subject required very careful consideration. Great complaints had arisen of injury being done to the truckmen and cabmen by the street traffic being obstructed, but if a right had been bestowed, the house should be careful to guard its exercise. He would reserve any expression of opinion until the committee reported.

The papers were referred to the committee on City Bills.

Mr. MCKAY introduced a bill to change the name of Rogers' Hill, in the county of Plouffe. The house adjourned.

FRIDAY, April 5.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

BILLS AND PETITIONS.

Mr. C. CAMPBELL introduced a bill to add a polling place in the county of Digby.

Mr. PRYOR presented two petitions—one from Herring Cove and the other from Sambro, asking the House to appoint an inspector of pickled fish.

TAXES ON MILITARY OFFICERS.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON, from the Committee on City Bills, reported in reference to petitions from military officers asking to be relieved from the payment of certain city taxes. The committee recommended a resolution to the effect that all military officers be exempt from the school tax and all taxation on their personal property.

Mr. TOBIN said that the Province did not contribute a single shilling towards the expense of the army and navy stationed here, and therefore the officers connected therewith were deserving of every consideration. He would go further than the resolution proposed, and refund these gentlemen the amount of taxation they had paid on their personal property and real estate. He did not think they should be obliged to pay taxes on the houses they occupied.

Mr. BLANCHARD considered that the committee had done a very liberal thing. Taxes upon houses were really a part of the rent.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL considered that if it was right to relieve these gentlemen from taxes for the support of schools and on their personal property, they should be exempt from any taxation on real estate. He did not feel any particular sympathy for the military authorities in this country in view of recent events, but nevertheless they were here for the protection of the Province, and should receive every privilege we could justly give to them.

Hon. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY said that there was a great deal in what the hon. member stated. It was certainly unfair to treat those gentlemen differently from what they were treated in other

Colonies. They ought certainly to be exempt from all taxes.

Hon. ATTY GEN. was anxious to give these gentlemen every privilege they were fairly entitled to. He did not think any distinction should be made in reference to these taxes. At the same time, he felt care should be taken lest the landlords were the only persons who would reap advantage from removing the taxation off houses occupied by military gentlemen. Landlords, in such a case, might ask more rent.

Mr. BLANCHARD said the course proposed by the hon. member for Halifax would be equivalent to making a present of money to the city.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that if there was any ground for exempting these officers it was one of a Provincial nature. They would have to defend the Province.

Hon. FIN. SEC. objected to taking money from the Provincial chest to pay the city of Halifax taxes for anybody. The citizens should remit the taxes themselves.

Mr. PRYOR agreed with the hon. member for Guysboro' that it was proper to relieve these gentlemen from taxation as far as practicable.

Mr. TOBIN proposed a resolution in amendment—that all local taxes levied on officers of the army and navy shall hereafter be refunded by the Government.

Mr. McDONNELL said that these officers were here under the authority of the British Government, and it is to that Government we owe obligations. He did not see why these gentlemen should be entitled to privileges which they did not receive in the parent State.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE approved of the report of the committee.

Mr. MILLER said that it was his motion that had been adopted by the committee. If the tax were taken off real estate, it would rebound to the advantage of the landlord.

Hon. PRO. SEC. could not agree with such opinions. The landlord only expected a certain amount of rent, and it was nothing to him if the tenant was relieved from taxation.

The matter was allowed to lie over for the present.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. LOCKE presented a petition from the Custos and Overseers of the Poor at Shelburne against the prayer of a petition presented on a previous day.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table the following petitions, by command:—

From — Isener, W. Smith, John Thomas, Mary Hardy, respecting education.

Respecting road damages.

J. Murphy, relative to Crown Lands.

William Condon, respecting a railway matter.

Inhabitants of Cape Breton, in reference to mining matters.

Thomas Harold, of Inverness, on the fisheries.

Mr. PARKER presented a petition relating to the union of two school sections, and a bill in accordance with the prayer thereof.

Mr. TOBIN presented a petition of gentlemen residing around the North West Arm in respect

to the Quinpool Road. He stated that the public debt of this little city amounted to \$666,000. The interest of the debt was about \$38,000 annually; the police cost about \$14,560 a year; the transaction of the civic business cost \$53,000; the taxes of the city were over \$100,000 at present, or about \$4 per head. He thought that the Province should, under such circumstances, assist the city to keep up so important a thoroughfare as the Quinpool Road.

Hon. FIN. SEC. introduced an Act to amend the Acts to Registration.

AGRICULTURE.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE asked leave to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Board of Agriculture, and in doing so, stated that he was able to say that that department was working most satisfactorily. A very large amount of benefit had been derived from its establishment. It was well known to every one that a very large proportion of the population of this country was interested in agricultural pursuits. The subject of agriculture attracted the attention of "Agricola" many years ago, and through the influence of his writings agricultural societies were established. In the course of time, however, the interest of the people dwindled, and but few societies existed when the present Board was established a few years ago. At present there were 58 societies in Nova Scotia—in fact, they had increased in all the counties. These societies were composed of 3000 members and had contributed \$3200 in 1866. These funds were devoted for various purposes connected with the promotion of this branch of industry. The Board had devoted the sums granted to them for the improvement of stock. For many years the stock of this country had been steadily deteriorating. The stock imported by the Board had been scattered over all parts of the Province.—Everywhere was the greatest interest taken in procuring new stock. At the recent sale held in the autumn, the stock was competed for by the counties of Cape Breton, where, it was believed, agriculture had not arrived at such a perfection as to require such fine breeds of cattle. These counties, however, largely competed and carried away some of the best animals from those counties which had always given a great deal of time and attention to stock. The Board had endeavored for the first time to get something like a statement of crops—what crops best flourish in particular localities—what was the description of stock to which the counties appeared best adapted. The Board had chosen a stock farm at Shubenacadie, but unfortunately, owing to some defects in the title, they were obliged to give it up, and so far they had been unable to find a place that would answer their purposes equally well. The funds, however, devoted for that purpose were deposited, and ready for use when required. The gratifying fact had also been exhibited, that very large prices were willingly paid by the people of the various counties for the stock imported. This fact shewed the great and growing interest taken in the agriculture of the country.

Mr. McDONNELL referred to the mode in which the horses had been distributed throughout the Province. It was the intention, he presumed, that the various sections into which the

Province was divided should have the benefit of the services of these animals during the season. Inverness, however, among others, had not enjoyed their services—though it is one of the finest agricultural counties, and is particularly noteworthy for its excellent horses.—Richmond, also, was overlooked. Now he had ascertained that the horses had been sold, and the Province deprived of their services.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE replied that it was found that these horses were very expensive to keep, and three of them were therefore sold and one kept. The persons to whom they were sold had to give bonds that the animals would not be sent out of the Province.

Mr. MCDONNELL pointed out what he considered defects in the present law. For two years Inverness and Richmond had not had any representation at the Board. As the law now stood, any two counties combined together, could keep the members within themselves and exclude any section from having a representation at the Board. He would recommend that it should be made imperative that each section should have a representative at the Board.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE said that the desire was to make the Board as popular as possible, and the appointment of representatives had been left with the Agricultural Societies. They had four societies in Inverness. Three of them never recommended any body. Two of these three voted for Mr. Davenport, who did not live in the county, while the fourth did not vote at all.

Mr. MCDONNELL said that was the reason why the law should make it imperative on each section to have a representative at the Board, independent of the action of any societies.

Mr. KAULBACK said that the horses had been very judiciously distributed over the country. As there has been no stock farm, it was thought advisable to dispose of the horses under certain conditions.

Mr. ROSS said that he had been appointed by a majority of the societies, and had always done his best to promote the prosperity of such associations. He would, however, go out in the course of next year. Mr. Davenport, a gentleman who took a great interest in agriculture, had been appointed from Cape Breton.

Mr. PARKER said that it had been a mistake to put too high a price on the horses during the season. He was gratified at the readiness with which the people, interested in farming, had come forward and bid for the other stock. The stock brought here realized exceedingly satisfactory prices. Hereafter it would be received at much less expense as the means of conveying it would be more satisfactory, for we would soon have speedy communication by steamers and eventually by rail with Canada. Each county should have its representative at the Board, and he knew that many societies were very negligent in making any recommendation. It would be wise for the Secretary to make a notice of those societies that had recommended no one. He considered that the importations of stock had been exceedingly satisfactory. He thought it, however, injudicious to have disposed of the horses, and deprived the country of their services. If we had a larger stock of horses it would have done a great deal of good.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the horses cost a great deal, and thought they had been disposed of at rates that were hardly a justification for the course pursued. He was of the opinion that these horses could have been kept at Shubenacadie or Truro for a small sum, and the Province during the forthcoming year would not have been deprived of their services. If we expected to have anything of an improved breed, the horses should have been kept together by the Government or else by some capitalist. If no capitalist was ready to engage in the enterprise, then it was the duty of the Board to do so. He believed we had the nucleus of a very fine breed of horses in this country, and therefore regretted that the Board should have felt it at all necessary to have disposed of the animals.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that the people of this Province were now paying a very large sum for the staff of life, and urged that more pains should be taken to encourage the growth of wheat. He had now in use in his own house as fine flour as could be procured in Halifax, and it was made of wheat grown on a piece of land belonging to himself. Attention ought also be paid to under-draining, so invaluable to agriculture.

Mr. CHURCHILL said that he fully agreed with the remarks of the hon. member who had preceded him, for he had learned with much regret that the horses had been disposed of. No doubt these horses would find their way, in course of time, to the United States, where they would bring the best prices. He was inclined to believe that the farmers of this Province did not pay that attention to the true principles of agriculture that they ought to do. In the article of ploughs, for instance, there was great room for improvement.

Dr. HAMILTON alluded to the difficulties that had arisen in connection with the purchase of the farm. The horses, he explained, had been found too great a source of expense; they had, however, been sold under certain restrictions, and were now just as available as if in possession of the board. He stated that the insect which had hitherto prevented the satisfactory growth of wheat was now disappearing, and our farmers would no doubt be soon enabled to return to that crop.

Mr. MCDONNELL said that the Government ought to be just as well able to keep the horses as private individuals.

Mr. D. FRASER expressed his satisfaction with the quality of the stock that had been imported. He believed if good wheat was imported at cheap rates, it would be a great advantage to the farmers.

Mr. HEBB alluded to his experience in wheat growing—especially to the satisfactory results that accrued from the sowing of Russian wheat. He believed that money might be advantageously expended for the importation of a similar description of wheat.

Mr. J. FRASER introduced a bill to incorporate the trustees of St. John's Church, Albion Mines.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON, from the committee on City Bills, reported against the bill relative to the market house in Halifax; also against the bill relative to byelaws for the regulation of markets. He reported up a bill relative to the sale of grain and coal, with amendment.

Mr. CHURCHILL presented to the Government a petition from Five-mile River. The house then adjourned till Monday.

MONDAY, April 8th.

The house met at 3 P. M.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. introduced a bill to amend chap. 2 Acts of 1866. He said that the object was to enable parties to withdraw from bonded warehouses articles for manufacture, giving bonds for the payment of the duties.

Mr. TOBIN said that some cargoes of merchandise, after being deposited in the warehouse, could be re-gauged before being taken out, and the duty paid according to the last measurement, but articles of bulk could not be re-weighed. There was frequently a great loss of weight in a cargo of sugar, after remaining warehoused for some months; and it was unfair to dealers and consumers to charge the duty according to the original weight. This circumstance had seriously diminished the trade with Canada, for purchasers there had preferred going to New York, where they could get the article re-weighed. There was no danger of embezzlement from the warehouse, and it was unfair to make parties pay for quantities which they did not get.

Hon. FIN. SEC. thought that the practice of paying duties on the original weight must have originated in a desire on the part of the wholesale dealers to sell at the original marks. There was no desire to exact a revenue from that which did not go into use. He would make enquiries and ascertain the position of the matter.

The Legislative Council announced that they had agreed to the bill concerning departmental officers and their salaries.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL presented two petitions—one for the removal of obstructions in Salmon River, the other for a way office at Indian Harbor.

Mr. TOBIN presented a petition from A. M. Uniacke and 1500 other citizens of Halifax, against the bill to amend the charter of the City Street Railway Company.

Mr. Hill presented a petition from Hants, on the same subject.

Mr. ANNAND presented three petitions from Dartmouth, Bedford, and Elmsdale, on the same subject.

Mr. MCKAY presented four petitions from Pictou, on the same subject.

Mr. PRYOR presented a petition from citizens of Halifax, praying for an amendment of the charter of the City Street Railway Company.

Mr. ANNAND presented a petition from Waverly asking for a change of Polling place.

Mr. TOBIN presented a petition from 875 merchants, grocers and liquor dealers asking such a change in the license law as would prevent the separation of the sale of groceries from that of liquors. The petition also contained a recommendation from nine Aldermen.

Mr. PRYOR presented a petition from forty junk dealers asking a reduction in the charge for their licenses.

Dr. BROWN introduced a bill to incorporate St. George's Lodge of Freemasons, Wolfville.

Mr. PARKER presented five petitions from Colchester County against the proposed am-

endment to the Charter of the City Street Railway Company.

Mr. HATFIELD introduced a bill to authorize the inhabitants of Argyle to sell a fire engine.

Mr. ANNAND called attention to an omission in the Act recently passed in reference to representation: In the Acts of 1859 there was a statute providing for nominations in the different ridings. There was nothing in the bill to show in what localities the nominations could be held under the new law.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL said that the matter had not been forgotten, but would be dealt with when the amendment to the Act relating to Elections was introduced.

Hon. FIN. SECY. by command laid on the table several petitions in reference to loss on the Railway. They were referred to the Railway Committee. Also a petition in reference to loss of money through the Post Office, which was referred to the Post Office Committee.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table the Calendar of King's College. Also further papers relating to the removal of Tweedell from the Insane Asylum.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL asked the government to lay on the table a return of the quantities of American coal admitted to the Province during last year.

Mr. PRYOR presented a petition from a number of inhabitants of polling district No. 11, West Halifax, against a proposed change in that district.

Mr. MACDONNELL moved that papers which he had previously asked the Government to lay on the table, in reference to a grant of Crown Lands, be referred to the Crown Land Committee. Passed.

Dr. HAMILTON introduced a bill to authorize the purchase of land and erection of a poor house in Cornwallis.

Mr. ANNAND said that as the time was approaching when gentlemen would be anxious to become acquainted with the financial condition of the country, he was desirous of knowing whether any contracts had been entered into with the Pictou Railway beyond the contract with Mr. Fleming.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said that no contracts had been entered into for matters included in Mr. Fleming's contract, but purchases of rolling stock had been made.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

The house then went into Committee on Bills, and took up the bill to incorporate the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.

Mr. KILLAM thought that this was not the time for such a measure. It was essential to ascertain the financial state of the country, so as to see how the construction was to be provided for. He did not wish to oppose the extension, provided the Province had sufficient means, and it should be remembered that the revenues would be very small after Confederation. It would be seen also that the bill was not the same as last Session, and the House should be cautious in making the change which would leave too much power in the hands of the contractors. The bill gave them the right to build the road to Annapolis or Troop's Point, and as to the bridge, it was stipulated to be built of iron, or otherwise as they might think proper, while the former agreement was for a

bridge with a roadway for the accomodation of the public. These matters should not be left indefinite in a work of such extent and importance.

Mr. COLIN CAMPBELL said he was glad to hear the member for Yarmouth express his views on this question, as he (Mr. C.) intended to ask for an extension to Digby. It was evident that danger might arise from leaving too much power in the contractors' hands, and he hoped that the Government would not allow the terminus to be at Troop's Point.

Hon. PRO. SEC., as to the financial part of the question, said that under Confederation Nova Scotia would be allowed to come in with a debt of eight millions, and in case the debt exceeded that amount, the assets representing the increased amount would belong to the Province. The delegates had found it impossible to make a contract for the extension except on the terms of allowing the contractors to choose from the routes surveyed by Mr. Fleming, but the best guarantee that could be desired was the fact that those gentlemen were investing large sums of their own money, and their interest depended on a selection that would be favorable for traffic. The reason why a roadway had been stipulated for in the Windsor Bridge was that a sum was provided for its construction, and that sum was more than sufficient for a wooden railway bridge, but the cost of an iron one would be largely in excess, and therefore the company could not be asked to provide a roadway.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that when the Government or their officer made a contract under the authority of an Act, the terms of that act should be kept in view. The law authorized the Government to enter into a contract for an extension from Windsor to Annapolis, while the agreement left a discretionary power which had not been authorized. It could not be said that Annapolis county was meant, for in that case the road might stop at the very border. If the agreement were not consistent with the Act it was not binding in the Legislature. The Government, therefore, had not shewn that regard for the law which they should have shewn, and they might as well have contracted for the road to be carried to any other part of the Province as to Troop's Point. As to the bridge, he thought it was understood that ample accommodation should be afforded for the ordinary traffic, but this had been lost sight of. These facts should throw matters connected with the work into their original position, and that being the case it would be wise to consider whether the country was in a position to carry on the extension.

The SPEAKER said that his position prevented him on most occasions from mingling in debate, and he regretted that the Government had not enabled him by allowing the House to go into committee on the general state of the Province, to express his views on the great public question before. He, however, had at last an opportunity of giving to his constituency his views on the subject. The railway policy was one that he had been educated up to by Mr. Howe, and ever since that gentleman moved on the question, he had felt that that subject and the question of the Union of the Colonies, to which public attention was then turned, were matters which, in the interest of the Province, should be steadily kept in view.

In speaking upon the latter question, it was not improbable that he spoke to his own prejudice; but he was not the man who would fail to give the people his views, or who would pander for a seat in the house when a question involving the interests of the Empire was brought forward. He would be happy to resign his seat and retire from public life, if called upon to do so, on the question of Confederation. He put the two questions of Railway Extension and Union on the same ground as regards the breadth of view in which they should be regarded. It was greatly to be regretted that such opposition had been shown to the Western Extension, and it was surprising to see the rejoicing when Knight and Company failed in their engagements. As to the objections raised by the member for Yarmouth it was well known that the previous agreement was worded in precisely the same way. He would have preferred that all mention of Troop's Point had been omitted; but any man knowing the Western part of the country would have no hesitation in saying that the road could not stop there. He well recollected the opposition given in 1851 by the member for Yarmouth to railway construction, and the cry all through the country was that the country would be ruined, and the tax-gatherer would be at every door, but it was found that notwithstanding the extension to Pictou, our road and bridge service was doubly as well provided for as it was in 1851. The same difficulties as to the terminus had arisen in connection with the Pictou line, and the same local feeling would always exist, but members must rise superior to such influences. There could be no doubt that this line, instead of stopping either at Annapolis or Troop's Point, must eventually reach the Bay of Fundy, and for that purpose must go to Digby Gut. In a few days his colleague would move a resolution, which he trusted, would receive the unanimous assent of the house, authorizing the Government to contract for the extension of the road to the waters of the Bay of Fundy. With such a line of communication, the distance from Halifax to Portland would be lessened by hundreds of miles.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said he was not surprised at the obstruction to the bill. The Government were told, in introducing the resolution for the extension, that they were not sincere, and had taken the step merely to secure support for the Pictou line, that had been repeated over and over again, and some members interested in the Western counties were rather pleased when the commercial depression in London enabled them to point to the scheme as a failure. He had never felt any duty a more pleasing one than when he took steps to carry out the terms of the act, and to give to the western people the road which they had been expecting. Mr. Killam's desire seemed to be that the people should consider the matter and decide,—if he knew anything of the people they were anxious to keep their honorable obligations, and you had only to shew them that they were in justice bound to do anything in order to induce them to demand that it should be done. It was not at that time to be considered whether the road should be built,—that had been decided long ago. The opposition had increased very much in their solicitude to secure the advantages of the road to Annapolis since the time when they voted

against giving the road at all,—he congratulated members on their change of views, and was willing to admit that further security should be pressed for if it could be obtained, but it should be remembered that the original Act said nothing about the bridge excepting for the railway traffic, and £40,000 was agreed on as the sum that the Province should pay for that work, but it was found that a substantial bridge, affording the desired accommodation, could not be built for double the money, and it had to be left with the Company to build as good a wooden bridge as they could, if not of stone, and it would be to their interest to make it substantial as the cost of its maintenance would rest on them. Nothing was said in the act of last year about the bridge, and it was only in London, in 1835, that the first mention was made of it, and the company asked the insertion of a clause to authorize them to build an iron or stone bridge if possible, but not obliging them to make the roadway in addition. The Government then had acted in this matter according to their instructions, and would have been blamed for going beyond their commission if the negotiations had failed in consequence of further accommodation being insisted upon. As to the route, a survey had been made, and the company insisted on having the selection of lines; but one great inducement to the enterprise was that the road might be made the through route to the United States, connecting Halifax with some place from which a ready passage could be made to New Brunswick and enabling passengers to be in Montreal or Boston as soon as by steamer. In order to do so the company had resolved to build such a road that the journey to Annapolis could be made in four hours, and they would require bridges of a very substantial kind. The true interests of the country had been well cared for in securing a first class road for the amount of the subvention. So strong was the opinion in the minds of some that no company could be got to do the work for the sum offered, that a member of the Upper house had voted last year against the bill on that ground. The Government had, however, been enabled to complete the contract for the amount offered, and the effect of the capitalisation would be highly favorable in a financial point of view.

As to Annapolis being mentioned in the original bill as the terminus, it would be observed that in the contract Troop's Point was also mentioned, and the contract was embodied in the act; but even if it had been otherwise, the duty of the Legislature was to take a fair and broad view of the matter, and not to take technical objections. When the question had been previously under discussion, it was considered that Annapolis might not be the best terminus in consequence of the tide and for other reasons; and although it would have been preferable to have had the line to that place, in order to extend it to Digby and Yarmouth, yet all the interests had to be looked to, and the contractors insisted on having the alternative. The act, however, provided that not a mile should be built except on the recommendation of the engineer, and the contractors possessed no power to force it to Troop's Point. All these stipulations were in the former agreement with Knight & Co., which was ratified last year, and the objections, therefore, came a year too late. The fears of some gentlemen, however as to

the road being built to Troop's Point, were groundless; it would be built to Annapolis and was located there already. Some gentlemen would, no doubt, be sorry it would not go to Troop's Point, so that they could have something to grumble at. The arrangement made by the delegates in reference to this railway was the only railway negotiation that had been effected during the year, owing to the depressed condition of business; and the Government having so far succeeded, and having acted in good faith, the house was in duty bound to fulfil the engagements entered into under its authority.

The SPEAKER expressed his pleasure at hearing the announcement that the road would go to Annapolis and not to Troop's Point. He was not aware of this in making his previous observations, but he had felt little doubt on the subject from what he knew of the locality. As he would not be in a position to speak to the resolution for the extension to Digby when his colleague might move it, he would say a few words on that subject. He did not wish that proposition to interfere with the bill under discussion, but when the latter was disposed of no gentleman could fairly consider the request that would be made an unreasonable one. Any one acquainted with the Western part of the country and its capabilities must be aware that the people would not remain satisfied so long as the public improvements they required were within the means of the Province. It would seem that the hon. member for Yarmouth was desirous of preventing the railway moving any further Westward than at present, but if he would soften a little in his desire to oppose the Government he would feel it his duty to come to the aid of Western countries. In five or seven years the road might be expected to reach the town of Yarmouth, for as long as the public finances warranted it, the Western extension would be demanded.

Mr. LONGLEY regretted that the members for Yarmouth and Guysboro' felt it their duty to oppose the bill; the former had a direct interest in the extension, and the latter was in no position to complain after the favorable consideration that the Eastern interest had received. By the projected railway Yarmouth would be placed within a day's journey of the capital, and it was therefore difficult to believe that the hon. member was truly representing his constituency in making the captious objections he had made to the contract. The members for the Western counties had supported the Pictou extension from a sense of duty, and had thereby established a strong claim to the support of the other members on this question. Too much credit could not be accorded to the Government for their untiring efforts in relation to this contract. But for the presence of the delegates and their exertions in London no contract would be in existence. The Annapolis Railway would be built on much more favorable terms than the existing lines. As to the extension to Digby, he thought that when the road reached Annapolis all would have been done that could reasonably have been asked. The measure was entitled to the support of all members representing the Western constituencies, for the terms were so favorable that not only local, but the general interests of that part of the country were benefited. As to the Pictou line, he rejoiced to be able to say

that by the 31st May it would be in a fit condition to carry the whole traffic, and this was under an arrangement that was so emphatically condemned a year ago. The question of our railway extension was involved with the question of Confederation, and the success of the Government in maturing the contract was to a great extent due to the fact that the Union of the Colonies had been secured. Too much praise could not be accorded to the Government in relation to the bill.

Mr. ANNAND expressed his regret at hearing the opposition styled obstructive, because they had discharged their duty in criticising the measure before the house. It was not correct to say that he was opposed to western extension, but he denied the right of the Government to insert any provision in relation to Troop's Point in the contract.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the name was used in the contract which was part of the act of last year.

Mr. ANNAND denied that the act of 1866 authorized the use of the word. It was well known that the cost of construction would be cheaper on the north side of the river than on the south side, and that it might be a gain to the contractors to adopt the northern route; but looking to the interests of the country, and the probability of an extension to Yarmouth at some future day, he thought it should terminate at Annapolis. Troop's Point is a quarter of a mile above the ferry and deep water, and would therefore be quite useless as a terminus. This fact should have induced the Government to secure the line and terminus beyond the discretion of the contractors. It would, too, be of importance to consider this question in relation to the financial position of the Province under Confederation. The debt incurred by Nova Scotia beyond the eight millions would be treated as a loan, on which five per cent. must be paid to Canada; and as the country was in a transition state, he thought a little more enquiry should be bestowed on the subject. He assumed that the indebtedness of Nova Scotia amounted to considerably over five millions, in addition to two and a half millions for the Pictou railway and rolling stock. This, with over a million for the Annapolis line, would probably bring our debt up to nine millions. Assuming this to be the case, we would commend Confederation with a debt of a million of dollars, which would stand as a first charge on the local revenues. As to the bridge he would only say that as under the original agreement it was intended to give accommodation for foot passengers and vehicles, a great wrong had now been done to the inhabitants of Hants and Kings in not making such a provision as would give them a free passage over the river for all time to come. He thought the house should pause, and take up the question after fuller information had been given.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that there was no doubt a great deal in the suggestion of the hon. member, and that an estimate of the character asked for would be of value. But the present was not the time to bring up such an estimate. The Province had already incurred liabilities in connection with this railway, and must carry out its agreement. A proper time no doubt would come when the hon. member could have his wishes gratified. It was a great pity

that hon. gentlemen would not take the trouble of reading public documents before coming forward and making incautious and incorrect statements. If the hon. member would look at the act of 1866 he would find that it recited the agreement. (The hon. Atty. General here read from the act to show that the agreement was made part of it.) That being so, he went on to say, were they not justified in assuming that the house would ratify the agreement that was made conditionally, in case it should be shown to be the best line?

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that it was the privilege of the minority to criticise the acts of the Government, for they were there for that purpose. The question he had to consider was not whether he was opposed to the Annapolis Railway or not, but whether the Government had performed their duty in a business-like manner. He contended that they had failed to do so. The hon. member had referred to the Act of 1866, but the articles of agreement recited the Act of 1865. They were bound by the terms of that act and should not go one iota beyond it. The house should not be asked to take the mere *ipse dixit* of the hon. gentleman, that the company had abandoned Troop's Point—it should be shown in black and white. He (Mr. C.) felt that it was his duty not merely to protect the rights of the people of Guysborough, but of the whole Province as well. When he saw an injustice being done to any portion of the people, he was bound to state his objections.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that the arguments of gentlemen opposite shewed very clearly how difficult they found it to find fault with the Government. No observations could be more puerile than those that had been made in the course of the afternoon by the opposition. The house had solemnly pledged itself to the construction of the railway, and after a year's deliberation had re-affirmed that decision. The Government having been charged to make a contract for the construction of the line immediately set to work to perform the duty entrusted to them. They entered into a contract with parties to build a railway to Annapolis town or to Troop's Point, and the house, with that contract before them, deliberately re-affirmed their former decision, and authorized the carrying out of their agreement. Though the hon. member was told that the representatives of the Government, when in London, could only make the contract by leaving it optional with the company to go to Annapolis or Troop's Point—both of which points had been left by the house to the choice of a previous contractor—yet he now declared that they should not have entered into the agreement at all for the construction of the road, but should have deprived the western counties of that means of railway communication with the capital which they so anxiously desired, and to which the faith of the Province had been pledged. He felt it was the greatest compliment that could be paid to the Government for gentlemen opposite to take up the time of the house with objections and assertions which every body must feel were perfectly puerile and unworthy the serious consideration of any intelligent man.

The house would remember that these hon. members once undertook to settle the railway

policy of this country, but did they carry the road to Annapolis? They put on the Statute Book an act pledging themselves to carry the road to Victoria Beach, instead of going to the town of Annapolis, to which they now declared it should go. The Government were authorized by the deliberate vote of the house a year ago to carry the road to Troop's Point, if necessary; not a single member then rose to object to such a policy. When the Government came to negotiate this matter, the best terms they could obtain were that they should leave this matter an open question for the contractors to decide. As respects the other matter in question, he would again mention that as the iron bridge would cost a great deal, the company were unable to include the roadway at the same time.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that the agreement did not state that the bridge would be of iron.

Hon. PROV. SEC. replied that the agreement provided that the bridge should be constructed in one way or the other. If it was built of wood then the roadway would have to be included: If it was, on the other hand, constructed of iron, the roadway would not be made. By the following letter it would be seen that the company had decided to build the work of iron:—

24 Great George Street,
Westminster, S. W., February 23, 1867.

DEAR SIR,—

"We have very great pleasure in informing you that we have made all arrangements necessary for the due completion of this line.

Our first and most important step, that of providing the capital necessary for the completion and equipment of the line, we have arranged with an eminent city firm; and for the security alike of the Province, the capitalists just alluded to, and ourselves, we have deemed it advisable to let the contract to Mr. Thomas Brassey, who has undertaken the same, and is now incorporated with us in the company established for the purposes of the railway.

We may add, that it is our intention to execute the works in a manner that we believe will give you entire satisfaction, and we have concluded to build the Windsor bridge of iron.

As this latter work will have to be prepared here, we have telegraphed to our agent, Mr. Grant, to come over with the plans of this and the other bridges by the next steamer, that the work may be immediately let; and we have made such arrangements as we believe will enable us to finish the principal bridges during the coming season, and the whole line by the end of the year 1868."

We have, &c.,

W. H. PUNCHARD,
EDWIN CLARK,
FREDERICK BARRY.

To the Hon. CHARLES TUPPER, Provincial Secretary.

Mr. KILLAM said that he thought it unwise to have allowed the contractor to take his choice of two points of termination, or to build the bridge of iron or wood. He was of opinion that the Government should have kept the company to the roadway. What he urged particularly, however, was that the Government should show the House and country what our financial position was likely to be. It was now admitted that

if we exceeded the debt of \$8,000,000, we would have to pay the excess, though the assets would be placed to our credit. The assets, in the case of the present railway, would be nothing, for they belonged to the company. It was the duty of the Government to show how we were to raise the large sum required for the work and at the same time have money enough to provide for other things. When the House was called upon previously to deal with this question, it was under very different circumstances, then we had our revenue to fall back upon, whereas now the largest portion was handed over to Canada. If things remained as they were we could build the railways to Annapolis, to New Brunswick, to Pictou, and eventually to Yarmouth—in fact, from one end of the Province to the other. He believed that the terms of the contract were injurious to the best interests of the country. The company were allowed to choose the way through the counties of Annapolis and Kings, besides to obtain gratis all lands required for the railway track and appurtenances. They were to build such a railway as they might think proper—in reality, there was nothing binding on them. They could use a rail that would not weigh much above 30 lbs. to the yard. He calculated the cost for a mile of rails would be \$1320; the cost of sleepers would be about \$400; and the whole cost of a mile of roadway would be \$172. It was quite evident that the company would have to take little or nothing out of their own pockets. He did not like to see the government getting mixed up with private companies. But when they did make a bargain, they should take care that it was a safe one for the Province. If we went on as we are now, and built all the railways ourselves, our debt would reach say \$18,000,000, on which we would have to pay an interest of about \$750,000. Our revenues from excise and customs would amount to at least \$1,250,000. We would, therefore, have \$500,000 independent of the railway interest, with a duty of say 10 per cent. With our revenues under our own control, we could increase them if necessity compelled us. Besides there was no doubt that the railways to Annapolis, Pictou and New Brunswick, under proper management, would bring us one or two per cent. Even the present railway, extravagantly as it was worked, had left something above its working expenses. As the trade increased, the different railway lines would become productive, and eventually we would be in a position to build a road to Yarmouth. As it was now, however, no such results could be expected. The revenues were to be taken from under our own control, and we were obliged to get along the best way we could under most adverse circumstances.

Hon. ARTY. GEN. said that it was really most refreshing to hear the hon. member for Yarmouth, who had so frequently urged that the country was not in a condition to build railways, now declaring that we should go into debt to the extent of \$18,000,000 for such public works. It would be remembered that the hon. member had, on a former occasion, even

made an apology for voting for the Pictou Railway, because it prevented us from going into debt for the Intercolonial Railway; he voted for the former because it was the lesser evil. Now the hon. member said that we should build railways to Annapolis, to Pictou, to New Brunswick and everywhere else. In fact there was not a day that the hon. member did not assume some inconsistent position; it was impossible to know where to find him, so erratic was his public policy. The hon. member had just declared that the Government should not have entered into the agreement but anybody who knew him would feel that if they had not done so he would have been the first to complain that they had sacrificed the interests of the West to the East.

Mr. COFFIN said that it was assumed by the Government that we would pass into Confederation with a debt of \$8,000,000. Anything that exceeded that amount would have to be paid for us. Now it appeared that the first charge upon the little revenues left us would be the interest on this railway. If we had no other means of paying it, we must do it by direct taxation. He would be quite willing to pay for the Windsor and Annapolis Railway if he could see any way of doing so. We were legislating ahead of the means at the disposal of the country, and saddling it with a debt which it would be most difficult and burdensome to pay. He was quite positive that instead of going into Confederation with a debt of \$8,000,000, the amount would be rather \$9,000,000.

Mr. TOBIN said that it seemed to him that gentlemen were always looking for troubles, and anyone listening to the debate that afternoon would imagine that the country was on the verge of ruin. He saw our revenues increasing, our railways extending and opening up new sources of trade, all branches of industry prosperous and progressing, and yet it was said that we were unable to get along. He saw ahead, not a prospect of ruin, but of prosperity. Our revenue in 1850 was not above \$382,000. Then we were told that if we built a single mile of railway we would be ruined. Now we had a revenue of nearly a million and a half of dollars, derived from the same sources. We had built railways, devoted large sums to education, roads and bridges, and other great public improvements, and yet the people were not oppressed with taxation, but were less burdened than any other country in the world. He did not expect, however ever to find the hon. member for Yarmouth satisfied; it was his privilege to find fault with all Governments. The Government had only done their duty in redeeming the pledge they had given to the people of the West. He was unable to see on what ground some hon. members argued that the construction of the Annapolis Railway would burden the local revenue. Mere assertion, however, amounted to nothing, and that was all the hon. gentleman and his friends indulged in.

Mr. ANNAND said that his hon. friend had attempted to prove too much. If our revenue

had more than trebled since 1850, it proved that Nova Scotia was now a prosperous country, and that any change in our political condition was unnecessary. We were to exchange this prosperous state of things for a union, under which we would hand over our revenues to Canada, and only get back a paltry sum in return. He was also quite prepared to prove by figures that if we were left in the possession of our revenues we would soon be in a position to extend our railways both to Yarmouth and the Gut of Canso.

HON. FIN. SECRETARY said that he would suggest to the hon. member the advisability of taking into consideration the possibility of the present Government having control of the revenue. The House remembered that, under the financial management of the hon. gentleman, the Province went backward to the tune of many thousand dollars a year, whereas the revenue went up the moment he and his friends were out of power. It would be therefore necessary for the hon. member, in making hypothetical assertions as to the revenues and what could be done with them, to take into consideration who would have charge of them. Everybody, in the most remote settlements, always expected to find the hon. member for Yarmouth bringing something about railways into every speech he may make. When the hon. member asked for information respecting the financial position of the Province, he was quite aware that he had every paper under his hand requisite for his purpose. He did not wonder at the assertions of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Coffin) who could not be expected to be so well informed on such subjects as the hon. member for Yarmouth. When the hon. member for Shelburne declared that we would enter the Confederation with a debt of \$9,000,000, he did it for merely electioneering purposes, and without anything whatever to sustain him. He was quite gratified, however, at the arguments adduced by gentlemen opposite, for they clearly proved that they had really no substantial reason for finding fault with the course pursued by the Government.

Mr. HATFIELD said it was the duty of every body to express his opinion on a subject of such great importance.

Dr. HAMILTON said that he had watched with much surprise the course pursued by a certain public journal, and a certain party in this country in reference to this railway. It was now, however, settled despite all the prognostications of the opposition, that Kings and Annapolis would have the railway, owing to the strenuous exertions of the Government. He thought that the railway had been surveyed through the wrong route in the county of Kings. He was quite satisfied, however, to know that we were to have the road at last constructed. He did not attach any importance to the figures which some gentlemen were so fond of adducing on every possible occasion. It was well known that figures could be twisted in any shape or chose. It was urged many years ago, the Province was not in a position to build railways

and yet she had done so without burthening the people to any large extent. Our revenues were increasing, and the country generally was prosperous. As this prosperity increased, the funds at our disposal would grow larger. Under all the circumstances he believed that there was no reason for the fears entertained by some gentlemen; they were either chimeras of the imagination or got up for electioneering purposes.

The bill then passed through committee.

The House then adjourned.

TUESDAY, April 9.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

PETITIONS.

Mr. KILLAM presented a petition from Argle in reference to a light house.

Mr. COFFIN, a petition from Barrington relative to the protection of the fisheries.

Mr. MORE, petition for the alteration of a post ride.

BILL.

Mr. BOURINOT introduced a bill in reference to a joint stock company.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. suggested a general bill for the winding up of joint stock companies, which were now becoming so numerous in this country. It would be well to refer the matter to a select committee.

Mr. BOURINOT agreed to the hon. member's suggestion, and the committee was composed of the Attorney General, Financial Secretary, Miller, Blanchard, and S. Campbell.

Hon. PROV. SEC. read a telegram from Mr. Fleming stating that an engine had gone over the rails all the way to Pictou, on an experimental trip. The experiment had succeeded perfectly.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table the report of Mr. McNab in respect to a ferry across Lennox Passage.

The bill in reference to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway was read a third time and passed.

Hon. ATTY. GEN., as chairman of the committee appointed to confer with a committee of the Council, read the following resolution, which had been adopted:—

"Resolved, That a humble address be presented to her Majesty the Queen requesting that whenever hereafter the members of the Legislative Council shall be reduced to 13, the number shall not be further increased; and that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to establish the number of the Legislative Council of this Province at 18 members, and to provide that absence for two sessions consecutively shall vacate the seat of a Councilor.

"Resolved, That a conference be requested with the House of Assembly, by committee, on the general state of the Province, and that the committee of this House be requested to communicate to the committee of the Assembly the foregoing resolution."

The House then went into committee on bills, and passed the bill to incorporate the Prince of Wales Lodge of Odd Fellows; the bill to amend the act incorporating the R. C. Bishop of Arichat; the bill to incorporate the Caledonia Lodge.

The committee rose and reported.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE introduced a bill relative to the Roman Catholic cemetery at Dartmouth.

The bill to provide for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals was read a second time.

The House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 10

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. HEBB presented a petition relative to protection of the fisheries.

Mr. ANNAND presented a petition from Tangle and another from Spry Harbor on the same subject.

Mr. BALCAM presented a petition from Eastern Passage and another from Shoal Bay, relative to insurrection of fish.

Mr. BOURINOT asked the government to lay on the table the memorial and plans connected with the bridge over Little Bras d'Or. Also the papers connected with the erection of the light house at Gurgon Island.

Mr. DONKIN introduced a bill to amend chap. 49 R. S., relating to County Assessments.

Mr. LOCKE introduced a bill relative to the Fall term of the Supreme Court at Shelburne.

Hon. PRO. SEC., by command, laid on the table papers relating to the sale of a school house at Shelburne.

PETITIONS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table the following list of petitions for money votes:—

Post Communication.

Mail Carrier, 6 Mile Brook—
Inhabitants, Weymouth—presented by Mr. Campbell,

Do, Kenville.
J. C. Morse, Sandy Co. Digby.

J. Calahan, Sydney.

C. P. Jones, Weymouth.

H. B. Prince, Renfrew.

A. Martell, Cow Bay, C. B.

J. B. Gray, Halifax.

Inhabitants, Weymouth.

Do, Lunenburg.

Do, Allison Mines.

H. B. McNutt, Co. Cumberland—presented by

Hon. Mr. McFarlane,

Postmaster, Co. Inverness.

Inhabitants, Broad Cove.

W. O. Keeper, West Dublin.

Inhabitants, Co. Lunenburg—Presented by

Mr. Kauback,

Do, Do.

Do, Do.

Do, Do.

W. O. Keeper, Do.

Inhabitants, Summerville.

Do, Co. Lunenburg—presented by Mr.

Joist, M. P. P.

Do, Long Island, Co. Digby.

Do, Mr. Ustacke, Gold Mines.

Do, Capt. George Mr. Henry,

C. R. Warner, Miford—Mr. Hamilton, "

Inhabitants, Waterville— " "

J. M. Parker, Berwick— " "

Postmaster, Laurencetown.

Inhabitants, Newport, Co. Hants.

Postmaster, Co. Queen's—presented by Mr. J. Campbell,

F. W. Creighton, Halifax
 W. O. Keefe, Mill Creek—Mr. Whitman.
 Do. Little River—Mr. Wade.
 Inhabitants Indian Harbor—Mr. S. Campbell.
 G. Fowler, West Aylesford—Dr. Hamilton.
 G. Givan, Givan Harbor, do.
 Inhabitants West Cornwallis, do.
 W. Sabeau, Little River, Co. Digby.
 Inhabitants St. Andrews.
 Do. North Bairn, River Dennis—Mr. Blanchard.
 Geo. Turner, New Ross—Mr. Kaulback.
 C. Publicover, Blandford, do.

Roads and Bridges.

Residents Co. Inverness.
 Do. Magher's Grant.
 Do. Co. Halifax—Mr. Tobin.
 Do. do Mr. Pryor.
 Do. Cape Breton—Mr. Bourinot.
 Do. Liverpool—Mr. Allison.
 Do. St. Margaret's Bay—Mr. Pryor.
 Do. Argyle—Mr. Hatfield.
 Do. Tangier—Mr. Balcan.
 Do. Bear River—Mr. Wade.
 Do. Halifax, &c.
 Do. Halifax County—Mr. Balcan.
 Do. N. Canada, Lunenburg—Mr. Kaulback.

Railways.

Henry Piere, Halifax.
 New Glasgow.
Revenue Expenses.
 Inhabitants St. Mary's Bay—Mr. C. Campbell.
 C. H. Harrington, Sydney.
 J. H. Whikey, Annapolis.
 J. Z. Randolph, Canning—Dr. Hamilton.
 Bridgetown.

Road Damages.

Amherst, County Cumberland.
 Parrsboro' do.
Steamboats, Packets and Ferries.
 James Hall, Lingan.
 Guysborough County.
 Ferryman, Petite Passage—Mr. Wade.

Transient Poor.

Overseers, County Pictou.
 Do. Horton—Dr. Brown.
 Do. Digby.
 Do. Weymouth.
 Do. Wolfville—Dr. Brown.
 Do. Horton—do.
 Do. County Cumberland.
 Do. Port Hood.
 Do. Co. Pictou—Fip. Secretary.
 Do. Clare—Mr. Wade.
 Do. Do.
 Do. Sydney.
 Do. Pictou.
 D. McDonald, Antigonish.

Indians.

Overseers, Cornwallis.
 Do. Wolfville—Dr. Brown.
 Do. Wentworth.
 Do. Lower Stewiacke.

Miscellaneous.

Wm. Smith, Ferguson's Cove—Mr. Tobin.
 Residents Co. Cape Breon.
 James Barnes, Halifax.
 John Murphy, Co. Inverness—Mr. Smith.
 Andrew Downs, Halifax.

James Carroll, Mulgrave—Mr. Blanchard.
 Residents Yarmouth.

Navigation Securities.

Residents Port Matoun Island—presented by
 Mr. J. Campbell.
 Do. Port Hood—Mr. McDornell.
 Do. Portuguese Cove—Mr. Tobin.
 Do. Broad Cove—Mr. Smith.
 Do. Clyde River—Mr. Coffin.
 Do. Co. Hants—Mr. Churchill.
 Do. do do.
 Do. Co. Annapolis—Mr. Whitman.
 Do. Co. Digby.
 Do. do —Mr. Wade.
 Do. Co. Guysboro'.
 Do. Co. Annapolis.
 Do. Liscomb—Mr. Campbell.
 Do. Cornwallis.
 Do. Co. Lunenburg—Mr. Kaulback.
 Do. Co. Annapolis—Mr. Whitman.
 Do. Argyle, Co. Yarmouth.

DR. HAMILTON introduced a bill to incorporate the Temperance League of King's Co.
 HON. FIN. SEC. introduced bill to amend chap. 32 of Acts of 1866, to authorize the sale of lands on which school houses are erected.

MR. D. FRASER presented a petition from Mitchell & Co, contractors of the Pictou Railway.

HON. MR. SHANNON introduced a bill relative to the Market house in the City of Halifax.

The bill to enable inhabitants of Argyle to sell a fire engine, and the bill to incorporate the Cumberland Coal Mining Co., passed a second reading.

The Legislative Council announced by message that they had agreed to the bill to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Bay of Fundy Canal Company.

HON. FIN. SEC. laid on the table, by command the petition of Albert Thomas for a drawback. Referred to committee on Trade and Manufactures.

HON. PROV. SEC. laid on the table a petition from J. F. Phelan, relative to a change in the Pilotage Law.

BILLS

The House went into Committee on bills and took up the bill to change a Polling district in the County of Victoria.

Mr. ROE contended that the polling place mentioned in the bill was very objectionable as not being central and as being a place where intoxicating liquors were sold.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL contended that the polling place was central,—the bill had already been altered to suit the views of his colleague.

Mr. ROE said that from the first he objected to the polling place. He moved an amendment on this point.

DR. HAMILTON remarked as there was only the difference of a mile between the two places mentioned, the difficulty in question would not be obviated by the change. It would be easy to send the distance of a mile for the liquor at elections.

The bill passed. Also the bill relating to the new bridge at Liverpool; the bill relating to the Town Clerk at Windsor; the bill to incorporate

the Home for the Aged the bill to change the name of Roger's Hill in the Co. of Pictou; the bill to legalize the proceedings of the Sessions of Annapolis County; the bill relative to the appointment of Commissioners or Streets for the town of New Glasgow; the bill to incorporate the Pictou Mechanic's Institute Savings' Bank; the bill to revert in the Crown certain lands in the town plot of Chester; the bill relating to the sale of coal in the City of Halifax; and the bill for the appointment of Commissioners of Streets for the town of Arichat.

Hon. ATTY. GEN presented a petition from Fownd, Cornwallis, asking compensation for loss caused by Crown Lands being granted to him after they had been granted to another. Referred to committee on Crown Lands

The House then adjourned to the following day.

THURSDAY, April 11.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

On taking the third reading of the bill for the appointment of commissioners of streets for Arichat,

Mr. TOBIN called attention to the fact that some opposition existed to the bill in Arichat. As the matter was purely local, he did not feel called on to interfere, but he wished the position of the matter to be understood.

Mr. MILLER thanked the hon. member for his attention to his (Mr. M.'s) constituents. He was prepared to take all the responsibility connected with the bill, and he believed that the opposition to it emanated principally from a few individuals who were opposed to him in everything, and would be hostile to any measure that he introduced.

The bill passed; also several other private and local bills.

Mr. ROSS said that when the local constitution was under discussion he had made a few remarks, and he noticed that in the report of the proceedings it was stated that he had advocated the system which allowed members to sit in both Parliaments. This was erroneous: he had merely said that in New Zealand such a system existed, and that in that colony the local superintendent was elected by the people. His conviction was that persons should not be allowed to sit in both the local and general Parliaments and therefore the bill met his approval.

Mr. ANNAND presented several petitions relative to the inspection of pickled fish.

Mr. TOBIN presented a petition from merchants of Halifax, for the appointment of an inspector of pickled fish.

ESTIMATES.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid upon the table the estimates of revenue and expenditure for the current year. He said that owing to the passage of the bill for Confederation, and the changes consequent thereon, the estimate had been made up only to the 30th June, for those services which under the Union Act would be transfer-

red to the charge of the General Government, it being understood that on or about that date the proclamation of Her Majesty giving force to the Act would be made. The other services were estimated to the end of the financial year. On the 30th September, 1856, the assets of the Province amounted to

	\$416 889 05
Liabilities,	349 534 06

Balance to credit of Province, \$67,355 00

The revenue for the year had been estimated as the expenditure; those sources of revenue which would be transferred being computed to 30th June, and the others to 30th September. The following was the estimate of revenue:—

Customs and Excise Duties to 30th June.	\$850,000 00
Light Duty.	25 000 00
Post Office Revenue.	30 000 00
Railway Revenue.	150 000 00
Crown Land Revenue, to 30th Sept.	40 000 00
Gold Mines.	15 000 00
Coal Mines.	70 000 00
Hospital for the Insane.	20 000 00

\$1,200,000 00

Add one-fourth annual contribution from General Government. 81 000 00

\$1,281 000 00

Add balance as above. 67 855 00

\$1,348,855 00

The proposed appropriations would be as follows:—

Civil List authorized by law.	\$38,250	\$38,250
To be voted.	\$9,025	
Agriculture to 30th Sept, authorized by law.		6,000
Board of Statistics to 30th June, authorized by law.		8,000
To be voted.	2,000	
Criminal Prosecutions to 30th of June, authorized by law,		2,000
Coroners' Inquests to 30th Sept., authorized by law,		1,500
Crown Land Department to 30th Sept., authorized by law,		4,200
To be voted.	12,200	
Department of Mines to 30th Sept. authorized by law,		9,795
To be voted.	4,355	
Distressed Seamen to 30th do., do.,		400
Debt to 30th June author. by law, due to 30th Sept. do do		295,100
To be voted.	10 805	
Indians to 30th Sept. do do		1 316
Imm'gr'n to 30th June, do do		800
To be voted.	4,000	
Judiciary Exps. to 30th June, do		1,400
Legislative to 30th June, to be voted.	88,200	
Militia to 30th June, authorized,		10,000
To be voted.	54,000	
Miscellaneous to 30th June auth.	16,700	
Navigation Securities to 30th Sep.	24,840	
Public Works to 30th June, auth.	195,000	
Post Com'n to do do	40,000	
Pub'ic Printing do do	8,000	
Poors' Asylum to 30th Sept., do	18,000	
Revenue Expenses to 30th June, authorized		10,100
To be voted.	51,515	
Relief, authorized.	12,398	
Roads and Bridges to 30th Sept. authorized	210,000	
Revenue Draw 30th June, auth.		10,000
Railway Expenses to 30th June, to be voted,	150,000	
Rations to Troops to 30th June, authorized,		100

Steamboat Packets and Ferries, } to 30th Sept., to be voted	12,340	
	\$455,995	\$869,789
Estimated Revenue as above.....	\$1,348,355	00
Estimated Expenditure—		
Authorized by existing laws. \$455,995 00 }	1,325	784.00
To be voted by Legislature... 839,789.00 }		
	\$22	671.60

Mr. McDONALD stated that it would be seen from the items contained in the papers that \$5000 was appropriated for steam purposes on the western coast, and in case a suitable steamer could be found to run to Yarmouth, \$3000 additional would be given.

Mr TOBIN called attention to the fact that the promised grant to the Point Pleasant Ferry had been omitted.

HON FIN SEC'Y promised that provision would be made for the additional grant.

Mr MILLER said that on the report of the engineer a grant was made last year for the break-water at West Arichat, but through mistake the sum voted was only half the sum required. He hoped that the remaining sum would be provided for.

Mr LOCKE called attention to the omission of any grant for the survey of the road between Annapolis and Shelburne, and expressed his surprise that only \$250 had been allowed to Shelburne for navigation securities.

Mr. S CAMPBELL said he presumed the estimate was not determinate. He was surprised to see that not a cent was allowed to Guysboro' for navigation securities.

HON FIN SEC'Y said that the grant to the Arichat and Guysboro' Packet would be added. The reason why the service referred to by Mr. Miller was not provided for was, that the Report had not been received until after the estimates were prepared, but provision would be made. The road between Annapolis and Shelburne would be surveyed by the engineer.

Mr COFFIN said that from the appearance of the estimates it seemed that the Government were determined not to make any provision for steam communication for the Southern coast. It was quite evident that no one could be induced to put a steamer on the route from Halifax to Liverpool, Shelburne, and Yarmouth, after the experience of the past year. It would have been more candid in the Government to have refused to give anything than to give the grant on the conditions mentioned.

HON FIN. SEC'Y said that every effort was made last year to give the Western coast the benefit of the large grant of \$8000 made. The steamer brought down from the States at the instance of the hon. member had failed to receive the certificate necessary to warrant her running, but the owners had received a consideration for the services she had performed. The proposed grant would be made in good faith, the Government would offer \$5000 for a boat running to Liverpool and Shelburne, and \$3000 additional if she ran to Yarmouth.

Mr COFFIN said he would state the facts as to the grant of last year: he had been requested to

state to the owners of the boat that on her arrival here an admiralty survey would be made to test her qualifications. Accordingly a staff of gentlemen, connected with the Admiralty service, made the survey, and the certificate they made was entirely favorable. The government, however, not contented with that certificate, engaged another surveyor, who, to suit certain purposes, made a different report. The boat had been running half the season without being able to get an answer from the government whether she was to be continued or not.

Mr ANNAND wished to call attention to the great necessity which existed for a lighthouse at Green Island, off Country Harbour. The work had been recommended by the Committee on Navigation Securities year after year. This was not a work of local interest but was necessary for the safety of all steamers coming on the coast from Europe.

Mr. TOBIN remarked that the lighting of the Eastern coast was ill provided for in comparison with the Western. The lighthouse on Peggy's Point had been asked for year after year and was at last provided for in the Estimates. The lighthouse alluded to by Mr Annand appeared to be a work of great importance and if a case were made out and laid before the government he had no doubt a grant would be made.

HON. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY said that gentlemen opposite could not justly challenge the strict impartiality with which the Government had distributed the public moneys. Their object had always been to have a single eye to the interests of the country at large. If the friends of the Government were displeased at anything, it was because political and personal considerations were not regarded as they thought they should be. He did not know much about the locality where it was urged a light house should be placed, but he felt that it was the duty of the Government and Legislature to do all they could to improve the facilities for reaching a port like Halifax, which, in consequence of the Inter-colonial Railway, must be soon visited by steamers every day.

Mr. S CAMPBELL said that the light-house in question had been recommended by a committee of the house. Other light-houses had been built in the meantime, but this important work had been entirely overlooked. He alluded to applications for aid in making important public improvements in Guysboro', which, he regretted to say, were overlooked in the estimate of the present year. Not a single dollar was given for navigation securities in that county. Petitions had been presented in respect to St. Mary's River and Salmon River, and Cape Canso, but none of them had been attended to. He hoped that the Government would yet rectify those omissions.

Mr S McDONNELL called attention to the fact that the county of Inverness was in the same position as Guysboro' in respect to navigation securities, although it had two representatives supporting the present Government.

Mr TOWNSEND complained of several matters of interest to Yarmouth having been overlooked. A fog whistle was very much required at Cape Fourchu.

Mr KILLAM said that notwithstanding the importance of Yarmouth in a commercial and industrial point of view, and its large contribution to the revenues to the Province, its claim to favorable consideration had in the present as in previous estimates, been overlooked. He alluded to the great necessity that existed for placing a fog whistle at the entrance of the harbour of Yarmouth. At his suggestion a fog bell had been placed in the harbor some years ago, but it was not found to answer the purposes expected, for it was situated on a lee shore, and was not heard at the very seasons it was most wanted. The people of Yarmouth had a steamer running between that town and Boston, and the need of a fog whistle was therefore more necessary than ever. He also referred to some applications for breakwaters which had been sent by an energetic and industrious portion of the people, and who were now exposed to many inconveniences for the want of such works. He thought that the sum offered by the Government to support a steamer to connect with Yarmouth was not sufficient. He believed the Government were far too regardless of the just claims of the important county he represented.

Mr TOBIN asked why the bell referred to by the hon member as placed on a lee shore had not been properly located. As respects the steamer, he believed it was not possible to get one to run between Halifax and Yarmouth even with the subsidy of \$3000. He thought it would be good policy to give \$5000 to a boat between Halifax and Liverpool and the other \$3000 to the one between Yarmouth and Boston. He expressed his conviction that mere river boats would not answer for the service in question.

Mr OFFIN could not understand why it was difficult to get a suitable boat to ply between Halifax and Yarmouth. If a boat had gone to Shelburne she would have had twice the business that she could have at Lunenburg. The trade with Yarmouth would also have doubled that with Liverpool. There was a steamer between Yarmouth and Boston; another should be put on between Yarmouth and Halifax, and both should be subsidized.

Mr KAULBACK hoped that a suitable boat would be procured to perform the service required. He thought that \$3000 ought to secure such a boat as was wanted. He wished to see the whole of our ports connected by a line of steamers. The hon member for Shelburne did not appear to have much knowledge of the trade of Lunenburg. Even Chester was fully equally to Shelburne in commercial importance. He alluded to the damage that had been done to the fisheries on the western shores by the steamer last summer, and hoped that some route would be marked out henceforth, so that the nets might not be destroyed.

Mr HILL thought that the Government should devote a portion of the special road grant to the purchase of the Toll Bridge across the Avon, for the accommodation of the people of Hants.

Mr BLACKWOOD was sorry that the subsidy had been taken from the steamer between Brulo and Charlottetown.

Hon Mr McFARLANE was of impression that the boat would not run when the Picton Railway was completed.

Hon PROV SECY laid on the table papers in reference to a bridge across the Bras d'Or.

Mr BOURINOT regretted that the Government had not been able to grant assistance for so important a public work.

Mr McDONNELL alluded to the importance of having steam communication with Cape Breton when the Picton Railway was open. He hoped that the subject would be attended to.

Mr McLELAN alluded to the advisability of keeping a steamer between Point Brulo and the Island.

Mr BLACKWOOD again spoke on the same subject.

Mr. CHURCHILL regretted to find that no notice had been taken of an application which he had presented for a lighthouse at Walton. It was a work of a highly desirable character, and it was time it was erected. He thought that the harbor of Yarmouth should receive the favorable attention of the government. He hoped that the railway would not stop at Annapolis, but would ere long reach the very furthest extremity of the Province.

Mr ROSS said that last year a sum had been granted for a breakwater at St Ann's; that money had been expended, but the work was not yet completed. A largely signed petition had been placed in the hands of his colleague for an additional grant. On looking over the estimate, however, he found that nothing had been provided. The County of Victoria had received very small public grants heretofore for matters of this kind, and he hoped that the Government would give an additional sum to finish the work.

Hon FIN SEC then moved that a supply be granted to Her Majesty, and that the house go into committee on the succeeding day.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon Mr SHANNON reported up an act to appoint a stipendiary magistrate, with amendments.

Mr ANNAND said that the Financial Secretary had not laid on the table such a statement of fines and forfeitures as he required. He could not tell when the moneys were paid. His object in asking for the papers was to show that the late government were much more vigilant in their management of the financial affairs of the country than their successors.

Hon FIN SEC said that the return would be made up in any way the hon member wished. He was confident the hon member would be shown to have formed entirely erroneous impressions—that the figures would disprove every assertion he made. The present government challenged the fullest criticism of their financial management.

Mr ANNAND said that there was no need to amend the question,—his request had not been complied with for the returns did not show what amount of fines were imposed, and what amounts had been actually paid.

Hon FIN SECY said that from the fact that under the administration of the hon member him-

self there was an item charged as mitigated fine, it might be inferred that all the other amounts had been not only imposed but paid.

Mr ANNAND did not agree with this view—he believed that some of the fines imposed had never been exacted. He requested the government to lay on the table a return showing the date of the appointment of J. W. Delaney as Collector of Customs and the amounts received and paid into the Treasury by that officer.

The house then went into Committee on Bills and passed a bill to authorize the appointment of a Stipendiary Magistrate for the City of Halifax, the bill being so amended as to vest the appointment in the Governor and Council and to provide that the Magistrate should be a Barrister of at least five years standing.

Hon FIN SEC laid on the table by command the petition of the Acadia Eclipse Blacking Company for a drawback. It was referred to Committee on Trade and Manufactures.

Hon PROV SEC laid on the table papers relating to the guarantee for the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon Mr SHANNON introduced a bill relative to the establishment of a Shipping Office in the port of Halifax.

Mr BLANCHARD as a partial report from the Committee on Humane Institutions introduced a bill relative to the City Hospital and Poores' Asylum.

Mr ANNAND asked the government to lay on the table a detailed account of the fines and forfeitures imposed by the Revenue Department and the sums paid thereunder.

The house adjourned.

FRIDAY, April 12.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr WHITMAN presented a petition from trustees of school section No 21, county of Annapolis. Referred to committee on Education.

Mr McKAY introduced a bill to alter a polling place in the county of Pictou.

Several local and private bills were read a second time.

Hon Mr McFARLANE introduced a bill to amend chap 72 R S, "Of Commissioners of Sewers." He said it was intended to apply to a tract of land between the two Provinces, for which a joint board would be appointed.

THE ESTIMATES.

Hon FIN SEC moved that the house go into Committee of Supply.

Mr ANNAND said that with the exception of last year, when an unusual delay had taken place in the preparation of the accounts, he had never known the estimates moved until they had been four or five days on the table. It was only fair that time should be given to members for examination, and it would be a great advantage, before discussing the estimates, to have the report of the Committee on Public Accounts. He had asked for a return which would show the exact financial condition of the Province up to the present time,

and this would afford information which would be necessary before the house voted nearly a million of dollars in addition to the expenditure authorized by law.

Hon FIN SEC said he would be indisposed to press the estimates at a time inconvenient for any gentleman, but he had no disposition to postpone the order of the day to afford the hon member for East Halifax an opportunity of attacking the Government.

Mr ANNAND said that the Government need not expect to avoid the attack to which they were open in connection with their financial policy.

Mr McLELAN thought the House would be better prepared for the estimates when the return alluded to was presented. The House would otherwise have to vote the money on the faith of the Financial Secretary's statement that the treasury would be able to meet the demand.

Hon FIN SEC said that the returns alluded to would be laid on the table as soon as possible, but that could not be before several days. He did not feel inclined to postpone the order of the day when it was admitted that the object of delay was to initiate an attack on the Government. The Government would be responsible for the estimates presented, and it was important that they should be passed so that members might prepare their road scales.

Mr S CAMPBELL thought the hon gentleman would consult the dignity of his position and of the Government in allowing the matter to remain over for the present. The road scales could not be prepared until the proposed subdivision was submitted by the Government.

Mr LOCKE urged that the estimates be allowed to lie over for consideration.

Hon FIN SEC said that if objections were made to any of the votes, those objected to would be allowed to lie over; in the meantime the ordinary votes could be passed.

The House then went into Committee of Supply.

The vote for the Civil List passed.

On the resolution for the agricultural grant being moved

Mr ANNAND said that he desired to see agriculture encouraged, but he wished to ascertain before the vote passed whether the money to meet it was available.

Hon PROV SEC said that the same objection might be urged with equal force to every item of the estimate, and it was apparent that the motive he had attributed to the hon member was the true one. The hon gentleman knew well that the Government were responsible for the estimate they had brought down, and no one ever heard of the administration being asked to shew on what their calculations were based. If the votes had been exaggerated, taking into consideration the state of the public finances, it could be shewn by the figures under the hon member's hand. The government must be exceedingly incompetent if they were unable to estimate the revenue for the three remaining months on which the estimate was based.

Mr ANNAND said that the Fin Secretary evidently misunderstood his position, for the moment

the Legislature was prorogued the political responsibility of the Government was at an end in consequence of the change which was about to take place. The house should know whether the money for these votes could be obtained without involving those who, under the Local Constitution, would afterwards come in charge of the public affairs with a heavy debt, which would be a first charge on the very limited revenue at their disposal. The arguments of the Fin Sec would be correct as applied to last year, but had no force under existing circumstances. He did not wish to be reproached hereafter with voting away large sums of money, and saddling those who came after us with liabilities they would be ill able to bear.

Hon ATTY GEN said that the estimate was not so intricate that the hon member for East Halifax, who had himself been Financial Secretary, could not ascertain whether the votes had been extravagant or not. As to the vote for agriculture, there were a great many societies in operation, which it was most desirable to maintain. The subject of agriculture would hereafter be under the charge of both Parliaments, and if these societies were allowed to go out of existence the exertions of years would be lost. If the vote asked for was to build a canal or railway, the hesitation shown by the hon member might be reasonable, but the agricultural interests should be sustained in any case.—The duty of the Fin. Secretary, as regards the estimate, had been very simple, he had merely to calculate the probable revenue for the comparatively short unexpired period, and to see that the votes were kept within the necessary limits. It was for the government to see that the funds were forthcoming.

Mr KILLAM said that the House was situated differently this year from last. The principal supply to the revenue would shortly cease, and it therefore was necessary to exercise more than usual care, and it should be borne in mind that the responsibility of the Government would soon be at an end. He did not wish to see any of the grants curtailed, but wanted to see that the country was not being involved in debt.

The resolution for the vote for agriculture passed.

The resolution for the vote to the Board of Statistics was then moved.

Mr S CAMPBELL called attention to a difference between the proposed vote and that of last year. In 1866 the vote for the Board to 30th Sept. was \$4000, whereas the present vote was \$5000 to 30th June.

Hon FIN SEC said that it was estimated that an additional \$1000 would be required, but if it were not found necessary it would not be drawn. He did not think that there was any department in which so large an amount of work was done so economically as in this department.

Mr ANNAND enquired who was the head of the Board.

Hon FIN SEC replied that he was the chairman and Mr Costley the secretary.

Mr ANNAND said that the gentleman last named received a salary of \$1000, and figured in the Civil List to the extent of \$250, drawn previous

to 1866, and \$142.46 for 1866. Considering that the Administration was an economical one he thought that the services of this officer, who was also engaged in the government service outside, had been well appreciated. The Government had come into office by raising the cry of retrenchment from end to end of the country, and had piled up salary after salary and created new offices until the conviction was forced upon the minds of persons considering the position of public affairs, that the time had come when this legislature should be swept away, so extravagant and corrupt had the men who governed the country become. He had turned his attention to two or three services in which this extravagance was apparent. The amount of money expended in Delegations during the last three years was astounding. It amounted to \$29,197.

The Provincial Secretary might be congratulated for his disinterestedness—he appeared to have received only \$1100 for his trip to Canada and England, while his colleagues were down for \$2900 for the same service. He would be glad to find that the balance had not subsequently been drawn. That gentleman had received for delegations altogether \$3400, and taking into consideration his salary and his pay as member, he will have drawn on the 30th June next the handsome sum of \$17,547, assuming that he received his full pay for delegation to England. That sum, equal to \$4500 a year, had gone into the pocket of a gentleman who had preached, not Confederation, but Retrenchment at every polling place in the province, immediately preceding the last general election. Then there was the Atty-General, although not in the receipt of so large a yearly salary, as he did not succeed to his present office until some time after the formation of the present Administration. That officer, between delegations, salary, and members pay, will have pocketed the snug sum of \$13,000. The Financial Secretary, too, who wished to force these estimates through in such a hurry, had drawn for a single delegation to the West Indies, requiring a little over three months service, the sum of \$4,200 although he was carried in one of Her Majesty's ships for a great part of the journey, free of expense, and all this while he drew his salary of \$2400 a year. As railway Commissioner, Finan. Secretary, delegate and member, that gentleman will have drawn on the 30th June next the pretty little sum of \$14,326, equal to \$3,581 a year. These three leaders of the Government divided among them \$44,945. That was the way in which the public monies had been disposed of. That was the way in which the retrenchment pledges upon which they rode into power in 1863, have been carried out. The Financial Secretary had taken credit to himself for the way in which the accounts had been made up and had stated the balance in the treasury at \$67,355; but he (Mr Annand) denied that any such sum was to be realized from the assets unless the government took credit for the Provincial notes which had been issued. The moneys received from the Savings' Bank appeared by the Receiver General's account, to be \$83,000,—the new treasury notes issued amounted to \$95,000. This gave \$133,000.

The amount paid on account of the Savings' Bank was \$62,800, making together \$95,706; paid for Hare's building and lot \$32,906, leaving a balance of about \$37,294 of treasury notes, which had improperly gone to swell the balance of assets. The reason why he desired to have the accounts he had asked for before discussing the estimates was, that these matters would be more fully tested than could be done under existing circumstances, and that the country might learn the true condition of our financial affairs.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that having only just come into the house he had not heard all of the observations of the hon. member, but it was obvious that that hon. gentleman was considerably excited, for he had used his favorite term "corruption." He did not intend answering at length the observations of the hon. member, but he did think that that hon. gentleman was not justified in making an electioneering speech in the very extravagant terms which he had ventured to use. The hon. member must not suppose because his position was a very unfortunate one—because, if he appealed to a constituency, he would do so under circumstances most disadvantageous—that the Government would permit him to make charges of extravagance and not meet them on the instant. The hon. gentleman had said a great deal about retrenchment. At the time the men now in office proposed to retrench the public expenses of the Legislature, the leader of the Government of which the hon. member was Fin. Secretary had to come down and make the startling disclosure that the expenditure was thirty-eight thousand pounds in excess of the revenue, and that there was no other means of meeting the paltry pittance which they were giving to education and the roads and bridges than by the imposition of an additional tax upon the people of 2½ per cent., thereby increasing the entire taxation by something like one-fourth, in order to carry on the ordinary services of the country. Did it not, then, require considerable powers of face on the part of the hon. member to rise and challenge the action of a Government who occupy so proud a position in regard to their financial management? Having given to the education of the country something like three times the amount these hon. gentlemen were able to grant—having more than doubled the amount to the road and bridge service—having largely increased the grant to navigation securities, yet they have been able to meet every charge upon the revenue, and leave a handsome balance in the treasury besides. All this, too, had been done under a tariff 2½ per cent. lower than what the hon. member had imposed upon the people of this country. Having on the floors of the Legislature fought against everything like retrenchment, the hon. member imposed those heavy burthens upon the people in order to enable him to get money sufficient to meet the ordinary public services. In the hour of his country's extremity, the hon. member stood forward the uncompromising opponent of retrenchment. Now, under a changed condition of things—under an Imperial Act, obtained by the present Government, aided by gentlemen on the opposite side, they were in a position to retrench—to save thirty or forty thousand dollars of the people's money, and still grant all

the money necessary for the great public services. This retrenchment was obtained by a reduction of salaries and of the expenses of the Legislature.

The hon. member had thought proper to address the house on the subject of delegations, and to ask him (Dr. T.) whether he was in a position to defend the amount of public money that he had taken as a delegate in connection with the most important public services. He told the hon. member that it did not lie in his mouth to raise an objection. He (Dr. T.) stood in the proud position of saying to the house and country that one of the first acts of the Government of which he had been a member, was to reduce the amount of money drawn out of the treasury for delegations to something like one-half of what it was before. When the hon. member and his friends stood in a position of bankruptcy, plunging the Province into debt for the ordinary services of the country, at the same time they were drawing (if anybody turn to the Journals he would see the fact recorded there) enormous sums for delegations to Canada and England. For every delegation they received the sum of £500 sterling or £625 currency. The moment, however, he (Dr. T.) and his friends came into power, they reduced the amount to £300 sterling, although the delegations, as everybody knew, entailed a large expense upon those engaged in them. What more did the hon. member and his friends do? When Mr. Howe returned from a delegation in connection with the railway, and had drawn his £625, in addition to his salary of £700 and his pay as a member, Mr. Annand declared that this house should vote £500 more, and he effected his object. It would be therefore seen that Mr. Howe actually received £1100 for a delegation which had occupied only a short time. These same gentlemen had year after year drawn these enormous sums for delegations which accomplished nothing, whilst the men now in power, at comparatively trifling expense to the country, had succeeded in effecting the great objects which they had gone to achieve.

He would ask the hon. member if, when he was drawing a salary of £600 as Financial Secretary and his pay as a member of the house, he did not get up a company which paid him £500 a year in addition. The hon. member had carried his official position into the market of England, and bargained it away, and succeeded in drawing £500 a year out of the poor people of England, who, under his management, lost their property. Let the hon. member talk about corruption, when he occupied a position very different from what he actually did. If he (Dr. T.) had stood in the position of the hon. member, instead of venturing to open his mouth before the people, he would endeavor to go somewhere where he could hide himself from the gaze of his countrymen for all time to come.

That was the position he occupied when he presented himself in England as the people's delegate—claiming the support of the people, statesmen, and Press of England? Every paper in London, at that time, contained the statement of the winding up of the "Nova Scotia Gold Amalgamating Company," and placed the damning fact before the world that the man who had been the Financial Secretary

of this Province had carried his office into the market of England and had drawn £56,000 from the people of England, and at the end of his operations had only \$8000 to show as the assets of the company. Instead of making use of this fact he (Dr. T.) had been only too glad to bury it out of sight, for he felt it was degrading, not only to the hon. member, but to the Province he represented. It had been a matter of complaint that the "people's delegates" had been treated with contempt—that they could not get the Parliament, the Government, or the people to shew them any respect. If such was the case, was it at all surprising when the self-constituted delegate of the people occupied so humiliating a position.

Instead of standing in the position of having made useless delegations to England, and having failed in accomplishing the work with which he was charged, he was able to show three millions of pounds sterling for the purpose of opening up this great highway in British America. As respects this delegation to Brazil, it was already beginning to bring forth fruits, and a far larger amount might have been well expended for the great object of opening up communication with the West Indies and countries of South America, and drawing attention to the capabilities of British America.

Mr. ANNAND replied that he was in the judgment of the House if, in the remarks he had made, he had not studiously avoided saying anything touching the private affairs of any member of the government. The Provincial Secretary, however, had ventured to pursue another course, and to bring up matters with which the House had nothing whatever to do, but he was not sorry that the hon. gentleman had done so. He could recollect the time when the same hon. member had risen in the House and endeavored to throw distrust upon the operations of an English company who had ventured to embark their capital in promoting an industrial enterprise in this country. He had it from English gentlemen that the Provincial Secretary did more, by his flagrant attack upon the company in question, to shake the confidence of capitalists in enterprises in this country than any public man ever did before or since. He (Mr. A.) would here take the opportunity of stating what his connection with that company was. The company was formed without his knowledge, and he was appointed a local director without ever his consent having been asked or obtained. No one could reproach him with having improperly made money out of the company. He owned stock in it to the amount of nearly a thousand pounds, which he might at one time have sold at a high premium; but having confidence in the undertaking, and anxious to sustain the credit of the concern, he retained the shares until they became worthless. No one connected with the company had ever ventured to say a word against the mode in which its financial affairs had been managed, either by himself or another gentleman in this city who also was a director in the company, and equally with himself was a sufferer by its failure. As far as he himself was concerned, he

had barely escaped shipwreck in consequence of his connection with the company, which he had been obliged to wind up and pay its debts. The hon. gentleman had referred to his having received a double salary. He had enjoyed it for a short time, but what had the Provincial Secretary done? Was he not enjoying a large practice whilst in the government, earning, as was reported, from a thousand to two thousand pounds a year—employing the time which belonged to the people, and for which he was paid an ample salary, in visiting patients and in expensive delegations? More than that, he had the incomparable meanness—he, the Premier of Nova Scotia—to go upon his knees begging the City Council for the petty position of medical officer of the city, with a paltry salary of £60 a year; and had been, whilst acting in that capacity, ridiculed by one of his present bosom friends—the "Munchausen" of the past—as going down to the wharves to examine suspicious looking gull eggs, and smelling hams of an unmentionable character at the public markets.

It was useless for the hon. Provincial Secretary to try and divert attention from the fact that he had deceived the country in respect to retrenchment. Owing to the American war the revenue in 1862 did show a deficit, and the Government of the day added a small amount to the *ad valorem* duties, but for one year only. Immediately that the revenue came up again, the tariff was reduced from 12½ to 10 per cent. But what are the gentlemen opposite doing now? By confederating with Canada our *ad valorem* duties will be increased, not 2½ but 5 per cent., and not for one year but for all time to come. He boasted, too, of the large revenue since the change of administration, but under what tariff and what regulations did they collect it? These increased revenues arose from the tariff and regulations, not prepared by themselves but by their predecessors, and the revenue would have been equally large if the leading members of the Government had been all their time instead of a portion of it absent from the country. The delegation to the Tropics was referred to. What was that delegation for? To secure free trade with the West Indies and countries of South America? Yet the first thing the Government did when the Financial Secretary returned was to increase the duty on the very articles that he had told the people whom he had been visiting he intended reducing. The hon. Provincial Secretary had declared that we had retrenchment at last—The country would not forget that when these gentlemen were fairly ensconced in their offices the doctrine that did for the hustings was declared to be unnecessary in the changed position in which they found themselves, and it is only now when they are done with the offices, and they are soon to be filled by others, that the pruning knife is applied. The Provincial Secretary might not have been able to touch the salary of the Lieut. Governor or those of the judges, but there was nothing to prevent him

reducing the salaries of himself, the Attorney General, the Financial Secretary, and Receiver General.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—The House could not legislate on the subject of the Provincial Secretary's salary. It was guaranteed by the Civil List.

Mr. ANNAND—What had been done in other countries could be done here. If the hon. gentleman and his friends had approached the Queen in a humble address from both branches of the Legislature, requesting that the salaries be reduced, who can doubt of their success?

Hon. PROV. SEC.—The late Government approached the Sovereign, and obtained the declaration that such an application could not be considered.

Mr. ANNAND—Not then, because the Local Government were opposed to the reduction, the very reverse of what would have happened if they were in favour, as far as the departmental officers were concerned. But admitting that he was right in his view, if the hon. gentleman had been sincere he could have left a portion of his salary in the treasury, and so could his colleagues. The other members of the Government—not forgetting the Railway Commissioner, who expressed such strong opinions on the subject of the salary of that officer—might have followed the same course. So desirous were these gentlemen to retrench that they not only proposed to cut down the salaries in all the departments, even to the clerks, but to take away \$20,000 from the postal service—a service of vital importance to the country at large, and which could only be done by sweeping away many of the post rides, and reducing the number of post and way offices. Again, they proposed to reduce the military service. The Government of which he (Mr. A.) was a member, when there was no money in the treasury, had the manliness to come down to the House with a militia vote of \$20,000—an increase of \$12,000. The Provincial Secretary moved to strike off the additional sum altogether, so far was his zeal for retrenchment ahead of his loyalty and his patriotism. He remembered the Provincial Secretary assailing him for having exceeded the estimate by £10,000 or £15,000. It was a mortal sin then to expend a few thousand dollars without the sanction of law. But what was seen now? That hon. gentleman and his Government had exceeded the estimate by a sum nearly equal to one-third of the entire revenue.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—Is it just to make such a statement when he must know that a large portion of it was in connection with the Militia Department, and that the House had placed the entire revenue at the disposal of the Executive.

Mr. ANNAND said he admitted the fact, but the over-expenditure on that service was only \$60,553 out of over \$300,000. The Board of Works had expended \$250,000, when \$160,000 only had been authorized.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—Was that without the authority of the House? No less than \$40,000 was added by a report of the committee for the protection of the fisheries and adopted by a unanimous vote of the House?

Hon. FIN. SEC.—Then there is \$30,000 for St. Peter's Canal.

Mr. ANNAND took the items precisely as he found them in the returns, published by the Financial Secretary, and the amounts he referred to were not authorized by the estimate adopted by the House. The railway expenses were put down at \$150,000, whilst the sum of \$205,000 was expended.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—The hon. gentleman should remember that the amount was swelled by the transfer of \$60,000 or \$70,000 chargeable to Pictou extension from the revenue account, whence it had been paid during the year for lumber, and other services for rolling stock for the Pictou road.

Mr. ANNAND said it was unnecessary for the hon. member to get so excited. He was not a witness in the box to be browbeaten by that gentleman, whom he was quite prepared to meet in that or any other discussion. He would leave his hon. friend from North Colchester (Mr. McLellan) to show how the taxes of this country were to be increased by the new scheme of government which was about being initiated. It was well known that the tariff of Canada, on the same articles of goods on which we charge 10 per cent duty, had been 20 per cent; it was recently lowered to 15 per cent., but how long it would remain at that rate it was not difficult to say. But even if the rate was 15 per cent., then fifty per cent. would be added to our present duty on the *ad valorem* goods. It would be remembered by the House that on a former occasion the hon. member for South Colchester (Mr. Archibald) had proved that during their former administration of public affairs these gentlemen had taken £100,000 of railway funds and appropriated it to carry on the ordinary business of the country; and when he (Mr. A.) and his friends came into power there was a considerable balance which they had to pay, and which formed a portion of the deficiency which occurred in 1862.

He was glad to find that the revenues of the country now enabled us to grant such large sums to education, to roads and bridges and the other public services; but what would be the case hereafter? It would be impossible to sustain the public services as they should be, with our revenues handed over to Canada, and only a paltry pittance given back in return.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL said that as the hon. member for East Halifax no doubt made the assertion that under Confederation our taxation would be more heavy, for the purpose of influencing the public mind against the Union he would ask him for the proof of the assertion that under Confederation our people would pay fifteen per cent as had been stated. Before the general government could be formed the hon. member had undertaken to state what their measures would be and what taxes they would levy. By talking of the Canadian tariff Mr. Annand was evidently attempting to make the people believe that Canadians were more heavily taxed than Nova Scotians. He was willing to go into the discussion of that point and tak-

ing the two tariffs to prove that man for man the people of Nova Scotia were paying a higher rate of taxation on imported goods than the people of Canada. The country was getting used to such statements as the hon. member had made and would soon find how little value was to be attached to them. That gentleman had also claimed the credit of originating the existing tariff, but the fact was that his government had gone out of office before the act originating the ten per cents was passed, and his statement in this as in other particulars was therefore unreliable. It could hardly be expected that any one knowing any thing of the facts would place reliance on the assertion that the party now in power had supported a government that took £100,000 of railway money from the treasury and applied it to other services. The facts as they had been proved over and over again were these: The Provincial Rail- of the Province and not by monies taken from roads were directed to be built upon the credit the treasury, but before the bonds could be sold £100,000 of the revenue was appropriated for the construction. During one period of the administration of the Government that came in in 1859, the revenue did not realize sufficient after providing for the ordinary services, to provide for the road and bridge service, and the Government, therefore, took part of the money back by the sale of railway bonds. It was not correct to say that this was railway money—it was money derived from bonds sold to repay money which the railway owed. He would not take up time by referring at length to the statements about the delegations, but where was the hon. member's friend, Mr. Howe? Did he adopt the principle of making a deduction from his salary to pay his expenses? And when the hon. member himself went as a delegate during the period in which he held office, did he not act precisely as those of whom he was complaining? Again, at a period when the hon. gentleman was not in office, he had not scrupled to receive pay for his services, and if a majority of the people would not be better satisfied at the end of twelve months to pay the expenses of the authorized delegates on Confederation than those gentlemen would be who paid the hon. member for East Halifax and his colleagues, he would be satisfied to listen to the complaint. From the official delegates the people had received value for their money—they had received accurate information; but those who paid the so-called people's delegates had not that gratification. The conclusion that the people would probably come to was that those out of office would not have acted very differently from gentlemen in power if the positions had been reversed. It was immaterial whether a delegate had to give up public or private business. If, when he was in office, a gentleman was expected to pay his expenses out of his salary, he would have nothing left on which to support his family. The people had never shown an indisposition to pay for these services at a reasonable rate, and it

was well known the hon. member would have done precisely what he complained of, if circumstances had placed him in the position.

Mr. McLELAN said that there was a material difference between the modes pursued in connection with the delegations. The late Government invariably came to the house, and asked its sanction to such advances as they had made; while the present Government merely drew whatever they chose, and placed the sums promiscuously among the payments for the year. Nor was there any occasion on which such an army of delegates were sent as had been lately commissioned. When the Attorney General had stated that he could show that the Canadians paid less taxation per man than our own people, he must have arrived at the calculation by dividing the revenue by the whole population, but he should have stated at the same time that in Lower Canada there were over a million of people paying comparatively nothing to the revenue. The great difficulty of Canadian finances arose from the fact that while these people contributed little or nothing, they claimed an equal share of the revenue. To show how heavily the Canadian tariff will bear upon the people of this Province, he would take four articles, the necessities of life to the poor man, and show what additional sum would have been paid under a Canadian tariff on the quantities entered here for home consumption during the past year. The consumption of tea being 1,365,000 lbs., that article would yield, under the Canadian tariff, \$160,087, while in Nova Scotia there was paid only \$82,000. On sugar would be collected \$135,000 against \$90,000, as at present. On molasses there would be an excess of \$28,000; and on flour, and on the meal imported last year from the United States, \$139,165.

The difference in currency, taking the present Canadian standard for gold, would make an increase of \$18,000 in the specific duties. Making on these four articles an increase under the Canadian tariff were concerned, it should be remembered that the duty on the packages, in which the goods are brought, which are free from us, would more than make up the difference. The Provincial Secretary had boasted of having effected a saving of \$30,000, to be appropriated to the roads and bridges; but would any one believe that the increase he had alluded to in the taxation would be appropriated? That would go into the general revenue, and if the new Dominion were to follow the example of Canada in making provision for the local services they would be ill provided for. The road and bridge service of that country had been provided for by loans or direct taxation, while lavish expenditures were made in other departments. The Provincial Secretary's office in Canada cost in 1865 for salaries and contingencies \$26,000; the Receiver General's, \$26,205; the Minister of Finance, \$25,026; the Minister of Agriculture, \$25,028, while the grant for roads and bridges in that year was \$170,000 or \$100,000 less than the grant in Nova Scotia. These facts were sufficient to show that the Provincial Secretary's new retrenchment scheme would not contribute to the saving of the people's money.

Hon. FIN SEC. said that from the tone of

the discussion it might be fairly inferred that the cause of Confederation was taking a turn throughout the country unfavourable to the opposition. It had frequently been proclaimed in triumphant tones by these gentlemen that the people only wanted an opportunity to hurl the Government from power on this question all along, and reinstate gentlemen opposite, or if they believed those assertions where was the necessity for reverting to worn out arguments and false statements as these gentlemen had done? What had he or any member to do with the transactions of Governments ten or twelve years ago? It might have been better for some gentlemen who had spoken had they confined themselves to the question of Confederation, on which they could indulge in the vaguest generalities and declamation, but the hon member for East Halifax had ventured to challenge the financial policy of the Administration, although it would have been more consistent with that gentleman's knowledge of the business of the House if he had raised the question at a time when the discussion would not interfere with the matters in hand. It was extraordinary that a man seeking the position to which that gentleman aspired, and being before the public for a long time, as he had been, could not address the House for five minutes without committing some glaring error. No wonder the hon member had been told that the time had come when the value of any statement he made must be doubted. The first attack had been made upon the Secretary to the Board of Statistics, who was not only an attentive and laborious public officer, but had shewn an ability, acuteness and aptitude, that would do credit to any public servant. Any attack made upon that officer fell harmless, not only on him but on those whose servant he was, but even in respect to that gentleman, the hon member had made a misstatement calculated to mislead the public mind, he had said that Mr. Costley was provided for in the Civil List, and when asked to shew where, he had pointed out an item in the statement of warrants drawn for last year. Such a misstatement was unworthy of any public man; Mr. Costley was not provided for in the Civil List.

He would ask the hon member whether he considered it consistent with the dignity that should belong to his position to be caught every moment making statements which could not be sustained, and of which a school-boy would be heartily ashamed. The press under his command scattered broadcast the same declarations with the same reckless disregard for truth, and had been proclaiming to the country that the Government had plunged their hands up to the elbows in the public treasury. The press supporting him throughout the Province had done all that malignity could do to break down and crush the credit of the country, and if their statements had not been refuted by every warrant drawn on the treasury, the public credit would have been ruined in every market in the world. At the very hour when that portion of the press was charging the Government with such reckless expenditure as would make the country bankrupt, stating that the debts and expenditure of the Province were greater than the assets and receipts, and in-

viting the public creditors to come down upon us, there was, as shown by the official documents which could not be challenged, a cash balance of \$118,000 to the good, and not only so, but after deducting every liability in connection with the enormous expenditure of the year, the Government were able to meet the house with a surplus of \$71,000. Knowing these facts, had not the hon member added insult to injury in the attack which he had made on the financial position of the Government?

Proceeding to the consideration of some items of expenditure that had been challenged, the Hon. Financial Secretary said that while a Government should, as far as possible, limit their outlay to the amount authorized by the legislature, it was impossible not to exceed the estimate for some services, and it was only when a reckless disregard of the public interests was exhibited that their conduct in that particular should be called in question. The first item which had been challenged was the charge for delegation expenses. He would not pause here to vindicate the propriety of these delegations; that on which he was detailed had vindicated itself,—it had borne fruits already, and in Canada it was admitted that the results would have justified ten times the outlay. But in reference to that item every dollar of expenditure was authorized by the House.

The delegates proceeded to England under a resolution of the Legislature,—was it intended that they should go at their own cost? Had the hon member acted on that principle himself? He felt it necessary now to meet these charges of extravagance, though he would not go back to the question touched upon by the Provincial Secretary, and shew that the member for East Halifax was the last man to make these taunts. The position he desired to take was, that a government with a tariff so low as ours could not be extravagant except by expending more money than the treasury contained, or by expending it for their own benefit. Every government was bound to expend the moneys coming from the people; and if, instead of having a moderate margin of \$60,000 in the treasury, there was a balance in hand of half a million with a revenue of two millions, they might very properly have been questioned as to their right to have that sum in hand, and been told that they had committed a crime in keeping in the chest those moneys of the people which should have been circulated for the development of the interests of the country. In reference to the expenditure of the past year, he could safely ask, was it expended for the good of the people, or recklessly squandered to suit the interests of the administration? During the year there had been collected \$290,000 more than in 1865, and the collection of this large increase had cost the Province not a dollar more in the shape of revenue expenses. The next item was agriculture, and for the over-expenditure there he was willing to stand his trial in any county in the Province. The next item was the Board of Works, and the over-expenditure there had been explained by shewing that services had been transferred to this department to the extent of \$90,000 or \$100,000, and it was well known to be impossible to estimate to the dollar what was required for this department. Would any man say that when the funds voted had been expended, the

contractors on the Lunatic Asylum and St. Peter's Canal should be told that they must cease operations, when there was an abundance of money in the public chest? Such a course would be utterly destructive of the public interests.

The over-expenditure of \$27,000 for Education no one could object to, and who could have raised a voice as to the outlay in the Militia Department if it had been \$500,000, when it was made under a resolution which placed the entire revenue at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief? Having gone through these figures he would proceed to contrast the expenditure of the Government with that of their predecessors in three or four important items, and would ask the country which administration they preferred. The late Government had only spent on the roads and bridges in four years \$464,000, while the present Government had appropriated \$1,015,665 or two thirds more,—for education their votes were \$266,915; those of the present Administration \$550,305 or nearly double. In Navigation Securities they had given \$20,000, while in the last four years \$194,629, or even nine times as much as had been voted. That was all the late Government had done when their vote to the Militia was but \$56,000, while the present Government were obliged to withdraw for that service \$300,000. The hon. member might call this extravagance, but it was such extravagance as the country needed and approved of, and the Government were at the same time sufficiently conversant with their duties to enable them to meet all demands upon them and to maintain the credit of the country.

The vote to the Board of Statistics passed. Also all the other votes excepting that for miscellaneous services, which was allowed to lie over.

The Committee adjourned.

Hon. PRO. SEC. laid on the table a communication from the Superintendent of Education in reference to the purchase of meteorological instruments for the use of academies. Referred to Committee on Education.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table two petitions asking for return of duties on goods destroyed by fire. Referred to Committee on Trade and Manufactures.

Hon. PRO. SEC. laid on the table the Report of the Adjutant General of Militia.

The house adjourned.

SATURDAY, April 13.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill to incorporate the British and American Telegraph Company. The bill was passed two readings and was sent to committee.

Mr. HEFFERNAN introduced a bill to improve the road between Guysboro' and Canso.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE introduced a bill relative to River Philip Harbor. Also a bill to incorporate West End Lodge of Good Templars.

The resolutions connected with the estimate, which passed committee of Supply, were adopted by the House.

The House then went into committee on bills, and passed the bill relative to the Fall Term of the Supreme Court at Shelburne; the bill to amend the act relative to the Registration of

Births, Deaths, and Marriages, and the bill to amend the act relating to Provincial Government Railways.

The Committee adjourned.

Hon. FIN. SEC'Y., by command, laid on the table two petitions in reference to road damages. Referred to the committee.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' BILL.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON moved the third reading of the bill to provide for the appointment of a Stipendiary Magistrate for the City of Halifax.

Mr. TOBIN moved that the bill be recommitted for the purpose of conferring upon the Magistrate the Civil Jurisdiction of the City Courts.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that such a provision was contained in the bill when it came up from the City Council, but the alteration was made at his suggestion, as he was of opinion that the united duties would be more than one man could discharge; but as a different opinion seemed to prevail, he would not oppose the motion.

Mr. TOBIN thought that when such material alterations were made in the bill there should have been some consultation with the City Council.

Mr. ANNAND quite agreed that the Council having asked for one bill, and the committee having framed another, the Council should have been consulted. They having the funds in their own hands might refuse to pay the Judge after his appointment.

Mr. BLANCHARD did not think that any difficulty could arise as to the payment of the judge. It was difficult to give the Council a voice in the appointment without giving them the appointment itself, for if a power of nomination were given them an altercation and difficulty might ensue by the City Council recommending persons whom the Executive would decline to appoint.

Mr. MILLER said he would not oppose the motion, although he thought that the alteration made by the committee as to the jurisdiction was wise and judicious. He believed that the civil and criminal business combined would be more than one man could attend to. As to the appointment by the City Council, he did not believe that that was a tenure on which any judge should hold his position. He had been instrumental in getting a clause inserted in the bill placing the Magistrate in the same position as regards removal as a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. BLANCHARD said he understood that the opinion among some gentlemen connected with the City Council was that by having a regular system in connection with the business one judge would be able to undertake the whole jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that on further consideration he felt disposed to accede to the amendment.

Mr. TOBIN expressed his regret that no means had been devised of meeting the views of the City Council as to the appointment of the Stipendiary Magistrate, and urged the motion on the consideration of the House.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that from what had been seen of the elective system of the United States, he did not think there would be any general desire to follow the example there set.

If the right of nomination and removal were given to the Council, there was no means of knowing how far the civic elections might influence the position of the judge.

Mr. Tobin's motion passed.

The House then went into Committee on Bills, and passed the clause as amended.

Mr. WHITMAN presented a petition from inhabitants of Annapolis asking for a daily mail. Also a petition against trawl fishing.

CONSTITUTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Hon. PROV. SEC'Y said that the house was aware that under the Act of the Imperial Parliament which authorized the legislature to change the local constitution, the government had brought forward a bill to change the representation in the Assembly and in detailing to the house the whole scheme which had been devised he had felt it his duty to state the change which was proposed in relation to the Legislative Council. Three members of that body had seats in the government and he was quite sure that anyone who had listened to the discussion would acquit the government of any desire to invade the privileges of the Legislative Council. On the contrary when the gentlemen who had been opposed to Union proposed the abolition of that branch of the legislature the government resisted the proposal and laid themselves open to the charge of having made a more extensive change in the constitution of the Assembly than in that of the upper house. Though they were open to that charge the government felt that in standing by so important an institution and in maintaining the number of its members at eighteen, which would allow one representative for each county, they were only discharging their duty to the country. He had been one of the Committee appointed for the purpose of holding a conference with the Council; for it was desired that the proposal for a reduction of that body should be made in the most respectful manner; and instead of proceeding by bill a resolution had been introduced for a joint address. Under existing circumstances the upper house was entirely the creature of the prerogative, a despatch from the Secretary of State was sufficient to fix the number of its members. After proceeding in this the most respectful manner, as a member of the committee he had not attached the slightest importance to the verbal alteration made in the form of the resolution adopted by the Council, and as it fully carried out the intentions of the government, he had no hesitation in accepting it. His surprise might, however, be judged when he learnt from the report of the debate in the Upper house that such a statement as the following had been made by the hon. Mr. Almon the leader of the Opposition in that branch. He used the term "leader of the Opposition" because he did not wish the house and the country to suppose that that gentleman was in friendly relations with the government when he was actually a most determined antagonist of the administration.

He wished it to be understood that he was quite willing that every hon. gentleman who was called to discharge the high and responsible functions of a member of the Legislature, either in the one branch or the other, should at all times be able to give to the coun-

try the views and opinions he might entertain on all public questions; but at the same time it was due to the Parliament that it should be clearly known what position such parties occupied. If it should happen that an hon. gentleman was supposed by the house and country to have a connection with the Government of the day which he did not hold—if he was supposed to be friendly to the Government, whereas he was placed in the strongest possible antagonism to them, and wished to embarrass them on every possible occasion it was necessary that the position of a gentleman so situated should be clearly understood. Under these circumstances, he would have to refer to the action of the hon. Mr. Almon, in another place, as that of the leader of the Opposition. In the official report of the debates he found that hon. member reported as follows:

"Hon. Mr. Almon had expressed some doubts as to the propriety of this resolution when it was first introduced. He felt very much annoyed that such a resolution should come from the Lower Branch of the Legislature. He considered it very improper on their part, and wholly unjustifiable."

He had, for some time past, known the position of the hon. gentleman in relation to the Government, and he had a pretty accurate idea of the cause of this antagonism. He had certainly found with much surprise that the charge could be brought against the Government or the Legislature of having invaded the privileges of the Upper Branch. There was no member of the House but must feel, that so far from the House having invaded the privileges of the other Branch, they had only been discharging a duty properly devolving upon them as a portion of the Legislature.

It was only the other day that the Legislative Council, in their wisdom, thought proper to initiate a bill touching the franchise of the country. How came the Legislative Council into existence? By the action of the house. Who had changed the constitution of the Council? The house. Although nominated by the Crown, and holding its functions from the Crown, it was actually to the house that it owed its origin. By the house had it been touched, time and again, in order to bring it into unison with the views and sentiments of the people of this country.

He would only say, under all the circumstances, that he felt it would ill become him, maintaining as he must the privileges of the House, to proceed a step further in relation to this matter. The Government would not, therefore, ask the House to appoint any committee of conference in connection with the subject. The object in view had already been fully attained by the Government, and they would have the opportunity of placing before Her Majesty the views of the Legislature. Without any further controversy upon a question of privilege, the matter could be satisfactorily disposed of by the Government, and in such a way as to fully accomplish the object they had in view in introducing the resolution to the House. He would only suggest to those gentlemen who appeared to be desirous of giving the Committee of Privileges something to do, that they might more profitably employ their time than in troubling themselves about a resolution passed unanimously by the popular branch of the Legislature. They might much profitably occupy themselves in consi-

dering how far it was legitimate for any gentleman to sit in the other branch of the Legislature, when, according to the Royal Instructions he had deprived himself of the right to the seat. It was well known that a member of the Legislative Council could not take his seat if he was absent for a year from the Province without permission under the Royal sign manual.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that it was hardly to be expected that he should rise to speak in reference to this matter, since it appeared to be simply a personal question between the Government and a gentleman in the other branch. He thought, however, the hon. members had hardly done justice to the case as stated in the paper in his hand. As he remembered it, the suggestion that the question should be submitted to the committee on Privileges did not originate with the hon. gentlemen referred to, but with the President of the Council.

Hon PRO SECY.—Who made the motion?

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said that looking over the report he found that he was quite right. The President of the Council was reported to have said previously to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Almon:—

"Hon. President was very desirous to meet the views of the Government, but he thought that by passing the resolution the house would not be acting in conformity with its privileges and dignity. He disliked that part of the resolution which gave a member the opportunity of being absent from the house for two years. The seat of a member absent for one year should be declared vacant. The resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges."

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that it was, however, the hon. Mr. Almon who had made the motion to refer the question to the Committee on Privileges.

Mr. ANNAND said if the measure was a good one—if the Government believed it was sound in principle, he did not see why the action of any gentleman in the other branch should divert their attention from it.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that the object in view would still be carried. The motion made by Mr. Almon was only prevented being brought to a vote by the initiation and adoption of a new resolution. If the house proceeded any further in the matter, it would be tantamount to an admission that there was something in the charge that had been made. Nobody would deny that the house had a perfect right to touch the constitution of the Council.

Mr. MCLELAN said it was perfectly legitimate for any member of the Council to question any resolution that came up from the house.

The subject then dropped.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. TOBIN presented a partial report from the railway committee.

Mr. S. McDONNELL presented a petition from Charles McCoy and 140 other residents of Wyccoomagh, in the county of Inverness, asking for a special grant for the erection of a wharf at that place. He said that on the completion of the railway to Pictou, it was expected that there would be one continu-

route to Sydney, and the necessity for a wharf at the place mentioned was very evident.—This was not a matter of merely local importance, for the work would shorten the time of travel very materially. While the journey to Inverness at present occupied two days, after the opening of the Pictou line, and the establishment of the necessary accommodation at other places, the trip could be made in ten hours. This matter affected the interests of the whole island of Cape Breton, and the petition was very respectably and influentially signed. He trusted that this matter would not be lost sight of in the supplementary estimate which was usually brought down.

On calling over the list of committees, Mr. ROSS remarked that the attention of the committee on Indian Affairs had been directed to the fact that large sums were due to the service from the proceeds of lands which had been sold.

Mr. TOBIN urged that the petition of Mr. Hyde for compensation for depreciation of property by the railway extension be taken into consideration by the house, instead of being investigated by the committee, as it was a matter that would occupy a great deal of time and delay the committee's final report.

Mr. ARCHIBALD briefly explained the nature of Mr. Hyde's claim.

The house then adjourned.

MONDAY, April 15.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

A number of private and local bills were forwarded.

Hon. FIN. SEC. moved the adoption of the subdivision of the ordinary road grants. He said that this was the same subdivision as that of last year. Passed.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. presented a petition from the trustees of Preston school section, in reference to a difficulty which had arisen in obtaining a proper title to certain lands, which it was considered desirable to purchase for school purposes. Referred to committee on Education.

Hon. PRO. SEC. laid on the table the Catalogue of Acadia College.

Mr. ARCHIBALD asked leave to introduce a bill to provide for the inspection of petroleum, coal oils, burning fluid, and to regulate the sale thereof.

Hon. PRO. SEC. laid on the table a statement asked for by the hon. member for East Halifax showing the liabilities incurred in the construction of the Pictou Railway.

Mr. PRYOR, chairman of committee on Private and Local Bills, reported up the following:—

To incorporate the trustees of St. John's Church, Albion Mines.

To provide for the erection of a Court and Poor House at Cornwallis.

To enable the Sessions of the district of Argyle to sell a fire engine.

To alter the bounds of two school sections at Shubenacadie.

To alter a polling place in the County of Pictou.

To amend the act relative to the Roman Catholic Cemetery, Dartmouth.

To incorporate St. George's Lodge, of Free masons, Wolfville.

To incorporate the Temperance League, of King's Co.

The House then went into committee, and passed the preceding bills, and also the following:—

To incorporate the Cumberland Coal Mining Company.

To incorporate the Cape Breton and Glasgow Railway Co.

The committee rose and reported

PETITIONS, &C.

Mr. HEFFERNAN presented a petition from the district of St. Mary's, Guysboro', praying for an extra Session of the Supreme Court in that district. Also, a bill in accordance with the prayer thereof.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL spoke favorably of the prayer of the petitioners; the bill would enable them to receive facilities to which they were fairly entitled. The people at the other end of the country were quite willing that the application should be granted.

Hon. ATTY. GEN said he would not oppose the bill, although it inaugurated a new policy to a certain extent.

Mr. BOURINOT presented petitions from Louisburg and Lorraine, relative to inspections of Pickled Fish.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL presented from Guysboro' petitions relative to the inspection of pickled fish; also relative to the rights of our fishermen on their own fishing grounds. He stated he was not ready to acquiesce in the prayer of the first mentioned petitions, but he felt very strongly on the subject of the system of licensing American fishermen that had been adopted last year. He believed the rights of our people to these fisheries were inalienable.

Mr. DONKIN presented petitions from a number of persons living on River Philip, to change the name of their settlement; also a bill in accordance with the prayer thereof.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill in reference to the division of the County of Richmond into two municipal districts, in accordance with the prayer of petitions he had presented on a previous day. He pointed out that the county was geographically divided into two natural divisions, each containing about the same population.

Mr. LONGLEY alluded to the system heretofore pursued in relation to the importation of Canadian flour coming through New Brunswick, and on which duty was exacted.

Hon. FIN. SEC. would give a definite answer in a few days.

Mr. ANNAND also called attention to the fact that Canadian crude oil was charged duty, although it entered free into the neighboring Province.

The house then adjourned.

TUESDAY, April 16.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. FIN. SEC., in accordance with a request which had been made, laid on the table a report concerning the road from the west branch of River John to Riversdale.

Mr. BOURINOT remarked that the number of petitions being continually presented to the Committee on Post Office affairs prevented that committee from bringing its labours to a conclusion.

A number of private and local bills passed a third reading.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table a report in reference to St. Peter's Canal. In reply to a question asked by Mr. Locke, he said it was hoped that the tenders taken in May last would be sufficient for the completion of the work.

REVENUE MATTERS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table a petition from H. Kaulback, et. al., asking the cancellation of commercial bonds. Also a petition from Rand & Tupper for return of fine imposed by the Board of Revenue. He said that the latter petition was presented in consequence of an impression that the subject to which it referred had entered into the consideration of the committee on Trade and Manufactures in deciding upon another claim which the petitioners had made.

Mr. ANNAND said that the previous application was not viewed favorably by the committee, because the principle which it involved was not one in their opinion that should be established. As a partial report from the Committee on Trade and Manufactures, he introduced a bill to repeal the provisions in a recent Act, which makes it compulsory on parties trading to the coasts of Labrador and Newfoundland to produce consular certificates of the landing of their goods at a port of entry. He said that the bill would bring matters back to their position before the passage of the Act of last year.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said that the Act was passed at the instance of the Board of Revenue, and there were strong reasons in its favor. He thought the hon. member should consider the matter carefully before proposing the repeal of the law.

Mr. TOBIN said that the Act alluded to had paralyzed a large and valuable trade to the places named, and had inflicted great injury to the merchants engaged in it. He thought that the large number of petitioners were entitled to have their views considered before those of the two gentlemen at whose instance the Act was passed. It was well known that merchants trading to the Newfoundland coast would have to send their vessels to the United States to be fitted out if the law were retained. No such Act could be considered necessary in view of the fact that the merchants of England carried on an enormous trade all over the world, and no one ever heard of any merchant to whom their exports were consigned being obliged to obtain the consul's certificate that the goods had been landed in order to cancel the exporter's bonds. The rule adopted in other countries was to punish persons caught in illicit trade with such severity that they would not attempt it again. A great part of the Newfoundland coast not being under revenue laws, it was very hard that vessels going to such localities should be compelled to pay duties by clearing for a port of entry. The effect of the law was only to put money into the treasury of Newfoundland at the expense of our traders. The proper mode to prevent illicit trade would be to increase the penalty and not to lay on this burdensome restriction for the sake of restraining a few individuals from violating the law.

BILLS.

Mr CHURCHILL presented a petition against the bill introduced by Mr. Hill, to amend the law relating to dyke and marsh lands.

Mr. ARCHIBALD reported the following bills from the committee on law amendments; the bill relative to commissioners of sewers, having relation to a tract of marsh land lying between the two Provinces; the bill to amend chap. 61 E. S., "of commissioners of streets," the object of which was to change the mode of appointing the commissioners for the town of Pictou; the bill relative to the appropriation of fines for violation of the license law in New Glasgow, the committee recommended to be deferred as it had been rejected by the sessions; a bill to amend the law relating to licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors; a bill relative to the sale of school houses, and the bill relating to highway labor in the county of Richmond. The committee also reported a bill to amend certain certain chapters of the Revised Statutes: 1st—As to partition of land extending to cases of property devised the recent provision concerning the partition of intestate estates. 2nd—In relation to the Probate Court, giving the Judge the power to make such orders after an order of insolvency as he might deem necessary. 3rd—To amend the law relating to interrogatories in cases in the Supreme Court. 4th—To authorize the taxation of larger counsel fees, than are at present allowed, where the Judge may see fit to allow them. 5th—To equalize the witnesses fees in the Supreme Court and Inferior Courts. 6th—To enable Prothonotaries to take the bonds necessary, to be given in actions against absent and absconding debtors.

LICENSE FEES IN PICTOU.

Hon. FIN. SEC. moved that the report of the committee in reference to the bill to alter the mode of appropriating license fines in the town of New Glasgow be not agreed to. He said that the inhabitants desired the privilege of expending in their own township the fines collected there. He thought that the disbursement of the fund would not be improved by the change.

Mr. D. FRASER sustained the report of the committee, and remarked that the bill had met the strong opposition of the sessions.

Mr. MILLER said that the bill was reported against on two grounds: it was not considered wise to adopt exceptional legislation, and in addition to that the bill had been opposed before the committee by one of the members representing the county.

Mr. ARCHIBALD supported the report on the ground that all legislation on such subjects should be general, and not local.

Hon. FIN. SEC. replied that the bill affected nearly the whole of one electoral division; it was not of an exceptional character, and would not take the disbursement out of the hands of the Sessions, but would give to the locality in which the most vigilance existed in relation to the license law the benefit of the fund so realized.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the effect of such legislation would be to cut up the fund into small dribbles that could do no good to the sections in which they were applied.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. remarked that the rule against exceptional legislation was very good,

but it had been lost sight of in a great many instances. For example a general statute labor law was passed a few years ago, and ten out of eighteen counties were exempted from its operation. He thought that the arguments in favor of allowing the district where the greatest vigilance existed to enjoy the benefit of the fund raised from the fines were very strong, and instead of throwing out the bill on account of the application being local, he thought it might have been wise to have applied the change to the whole Province. He expressed himself opposed to the policy of imposing heavy fines and enacting too stringent regulations in reference to license.

Mr. D. FRASER and Mr. MCKAY urged that the amendment of the Hon. Financial Secretary be withdrawn.

Mr. TOBIN said he felt it his duty to vote against the bill, principally because the members representing the county were not unanimous in its favour.

The amendment was withdrawn,—the bill was deferred for three months.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SECY. laid on the table the report of the committee of the Legislative Library.

The house then went into committee on bills, and passed the bill relative to the partition of lands; the bill to authorise the sale of school houses in certain cases; the bill to amend the act relating to Commissioners of Sewers; the bill to amend certain chapters of the Revised Statutes, and the bill to incorporate the Pictou Mechanics' Institute Savings Bank.

The committee adjourned.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill to provide for the holding of an Agricultural Exhibition in 1868. He said that the exhibition was authorized to be held by the Legislature, but no provision had been made for the necessary funds. A Provincial grant of \$6000 was intended.

Mr. McDONNELL said that this was not an expenditure in which he felt disposed to concur. He failed to see that any adequate return was realized from the large expenditure connected with these exhibitions.

The House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 17, 1867.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

SUBDIVISION OF ROAD GRANT.

Hon. FIN. SECY. laid on the table the subdivision of the special road grant. He said that this was made in the same ratio as the ordinary grant with the exception of two or three counties, for which special provision was made.

Mr. S CAMPBELL said he felt in duty bound to comment upon the absence of any provision for the bridge across the St Mary's River. From the manner in which the petition had been received he expected that this service which had the strongest claims for consideration would have been favorably received. The Government could not plead want of funds for they had given for new roads in Colchester County \$3,500, for the River Philip Bridge \$5000, for the Liverpool Bridge \$8000 and for the public pier at Digby \$1000.

He felt that in this respect his constituents had been treated with gross injustice, and that he would be a traitor to them if he failed to express in the strongest language his condemnation of the subdivision. The petition had come from a class of individuals who were doing a great deal to develop the resources and add to the revenues of the country and whose claims were in every respect entitled to consideration. He would be bound to submit, however, to the injustice of the government on this, as on other occasions.

Hon PRO SEC was sorry that the hon member approached the subject with the impression that the Government desired to do injustice to his constituents for such was not the case,—only a few days ago, when the vote for Navigation Securities was under discussion, the government had on the representations of the hon gentleman agreed to erect a light house which he had stated to be a necessary public work, although the cost and maintenance would be great. As to the argument that the moneys at the disposal of the government were sufficient because grants had been made to other works, it would be seen that this was the very reason why the grant asked for by the hon member could not be made. Only a portion of the sum stated as being given for roads in Colchester County was in the nature of a special grant, and the necessity of making these roads to connect with the railway was evident if the benefits of the line were to be extended to the settlement throughout the country. The River Philip Bridge had been built a few years ago over one of the largest rivers in the Province that were spanned by a bridge, the length being half a mile,—span after span had broken down and the members for the county had been obliged to borrow £1,800 to keep up the communication. As to the Liverpool bridge the existing one was subject to tolls, and as it was going into decay and the proprietors had no intention of continuing the communication, their charter having expired, the work contemplated was essential. Its cost would be \$12,000, and the members for the county would have to furnish \$4000 in addition to the grant. So far from being disposed to ignore the claims of any constituency the government would have been only too glad to have given all the applications a favorable consideration, if the means at their disposal warranted it.

Mr LOCKE expressed his regret that no grant had been made for the survey of the road from Shelburne to Annapolis. The application had been made continually for the last ten years and the Government had promised last year that the survey would be made.

Hon PRO SEC'Y said that when the hon member was in power himself he must have turned a deaf ear to the application. That fact threw suspicion on the genuineness of the request for the present government had not treated the hon gentleman's constituents worse than he had treated them himself.

Mr LOCKE said that he would not make complaint only for the promise made by the Government last year.

Hon. AFTY. GENERAL said that when in charge of the financial department last year, he had made

a promise in reference to this work, but the hon member was largely to blame for not reminding the government of the promise during the vacation.

Mr BOURINOT expressed his regret that the government had not been able to provide for the erection of the bridge over Little Bras d'Or. A petition from the inhabitants had been forwarded, and they offered to contribute by subscription to the amount of \$1400. He and his colleagues together with the members for Victoria had forwarded to the government the following letter on the subject:—

Halifax 30th March, 1867.

SIR,—We have the honor to lay before the Government for its consideration, the accompanying plan of a Bridge, which is intended to be erected across the Little Bras d'Or, which separates Cape Breton proper from the island of Boularderie, which bridge will be the connecting link of the only main post road leading from the Cape Breton Coal Mines to the Counties of Victoria and Inverness.

With the plan you have the letters of Mr. Crandall, an American gentleman, of a well established reputation for scientific attainments of a high order, which explain fully the nature of the proposed structure.

The present means of communication is now by a ferry-boat, named the "Charles Tupper," a most inconvenient and uncertain conveyance which has to be kept in repair at much expense.

We entertain the hope that the Government will take immediate means of erecting it. It is a work which must be considered Provincial, and not local, and which can be done at a cost of somewhat less than a mile of railway.

It must be remembered that Nova Scotia proper is being intersected with lines of railways leading to sections which cannot for a moment be compared in a commercial aspect with the great resources of Cape Breton.

We await with confidence the attention of the Government to this appeal.

We remain, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
J. BOURINOT,
THOMAS CALDWELL,
C. J. CAMPBELL,
W. ROSS.

The Honorable The Provincial Secretary, etc.

The work was very necessary, and the county would not rest satisfied until its accomplishment. He would not have been so urgent in this matter if it were not that the inhabitants had made very liberal offers, but he would do the government the justice to say that they had dealt by Cape Breton in a liberal spirit, as compared with former governments. Another important matter was the lighthouse at Guyon Island, which was a place of resort in connection with the mines. He trusted that under the changed state of affairs which Confederation would produce, Cape Breton would receive a greater amount of justice than she had hitherto been able to obtain and this was one reason why he gave his cordial support to the union which was about to be consummated. Cape Breton was on the highway to Canada, and could

not fail to receive a great impulse from the extended commerce and enterprize that were expected to accrue from the union of the Provinces.

Mr. Ross also expressed his regret that these two works had been left unprovided for. He thought that a special grant should have been made for the bridge, more especially as the people had made such liberal offers. He had not such sanguine expectations as the hon. member who preceded him as to the benefits of Confederation, and feared that the bridge would not be built for many a year to come. He wished also to ask that some provision be made for completing the breakwater at St. Ann's, which had been commenced.

Hon FIN SEC'Y replied that provision would be made for the last mentioned work.

Mr ANNAND said that generally speaking, the subdivision was fair but there was an important omission in reference to his constituency. It was well known that in many parts of East Halifax there were no roads, and that communication was maintained by dangerous and expensive ferries. He thought it would have been a true policy to have made a road along the Eastern shore and to have constructed the bridge asked by Mr Campbell.

Mr KAULBACK said it was natural for gentlemen to press strongly the claims of their respective constituencies at that time. It was of great importance that Lunenburg should have road communication with the Annapolis Railway and he had hoped that the petitions on this subject would have received attention from the Government, more especially as one of them came from a locality with the very attractive name of New Canada. He was however disposed to give the Government credit of having made liberal grants to the county for its roads and bridges and Navigation Securities.

Hon ATTY GENERAL said that when the subdivision was brought down the only cries heard were, "money, money," and "give, give." The object of the grants this year was not so much to encourage the undertaking of new works and the construction of new lines of road as to place within the means of members the repairing of existing works. The Government could not have made the large grant of £10,000 for the bridge over Little Bras d'Or without doing gross injustice to the other counties; even if one fourth of the whole special grant had been given it would not have been one-third of the sum required. It would be almost useless to give \$2000 or \$3000 to a work that would cost \$40,000.

Mr Ross—Is not that the principle carried out in reference to St. Peter's Canal?

Hon ATTY GEN answered that the canal was a progressive work carried on under a permanent Act of the Legislature. There had been a bridge at the place alluded to some years ago, and great difficulty and complaint had been made by the inhabitants in consequence of navigation being interfered with, a draw had been put in it, and the whole work had been destroyed by the worms so that a stone one would have to be built. If these works were of such importance gentlemen

should have shewn their sincerity by offering to contribute from the road grants. No county would have more reason to make a complaint than his own, but the Government could not be expected to do impossibilities, and had to look to the interests of all the counties.

Mr BOURNOT said that the opposition of the inhabitants was made to the erection of a wooden bridge, which would be unsafe. The plan which he had submitted obviated the difficulty, as according to it the bridge could not obstruct navigation. His remarks had been made not with the view of censuring the government but in order to shew his constituents that he had not neglected the duty devolving on him.

Mr Ross, in reply to the Atty General, said that if the interests of Antigonishe had been neglected, the government should be brought to account—the representatives for that county had the matter in their own hands, but that was no reason why other counties should be neglected. The intention was to have built the Little Bras d'Or bridge of granite so that it would have lasted for ages—longer, probably, than the new dominion. The difficulty was that when Confederation was so near there could be no certainty that if a sum were expended this year any grant could be obtained next year, while if the old state of things had been allowed to proceed the work could have been done gradually with the assurance of regular aid. The very fact that there had been some years ago a bridge at the locality referred to was a reason why the facilities of communication should be continued.

Hon FIN SEC'Y said that if the work were of such importance the hon gentleman might have appropriated his special and a part of his ordinary grant to it. He would then be in a better position to ask that funds be withdrawn from other counties to its aid.

Mr Ross said that the bridge would not be in the County of Victoria at all.

Hon FIN SEC'Y replied that the hon member would do well not to go outside of his own county when he wished to make complaint. The remarks of Mr Bournot had been made in a very creditable spirit, and it was possible that it was from the desire that gentleman's successors in the representation of the county should have something to do that the government did not accede to his request. That gentleman had succeeded in obtaining such large sums of money for his county that the wonder was that all the bridges required there had not been built. He had hoped to have made provision for the bridge across St Mary's River, but the demands from every county had been so urgent that it was found impossible to depart from the equal subdivision, except in a very few cases of absolute necessity. Unless the members for Cumberland had received the grant for River Philip they would have been unable to expend a dollar for other purposes and would have been left in debt. It was essential to repair the damage occasioned to the Digby wharf, and the grant would be inadequate for that purpose. The government had endeavored to do what was fair and honorable irrespective of

party relations. The hon member for Shelburne was hardly warranted in his expressions of distrust as to the survey of the Annapolis and Shelburne road, for the Attorney General, who made the promise last year, was absent from the country for a great part of the vacation, and, after the pledge that had been given, the government might be expected to go on with the work.

Mr LOCKE thanked the Government for the assurance that the survey would be proceeded with.

Mr McLELAN said that he observed an item of \$1052 charged as an advance against Colchester. That sum had been expended by the Government without consulting the members for the county, and he thought it should go in as a special grant.

Mr BLACKWOOD said that a charge of \$3000 for expenditure on French River Bridge was given against his county. This should have been given as a special grant, for when thus charged, it absorbed all the funds at the disposal of members this year. The special grant had been all appropriated for the making of roads in one section of the county, and the expenditure would produce little benefit for a long time.

Mr ARCHIBALD said that the large investment of two millions of dollars in the railway depended on the ease of access by the great body of the inhabitants. Although a large sum had been at first expended in the opening up of roads for this purpose, yet it had been replaced by the proceeds of crown lands, the sale of which had been thus facilitated. Last year during his absence \$1,600 dollars had been spent on one road in his county,—he would hardly have advised the expenditure if he had been present, but since that 6000 tons of freight had passed over the road, shewing that in course of time the addition of the railway freight would be more than an equivalent for the outlay. The government had therefore acted wisely in making a grant for roads to connect with the railway. There was an enormous tract of the country lying in a wilderness state,—the object was to fill it with the houses of an industrious population, and to shew that this object could be attained, he referred to one locality wherefrom the construction of a road a settlement had sprung up with its Post Office, its Literary Society and other local organizations. Earlton and Stewiacke had formerly no connection but by a very circuitous route, and although they were but twenty miles apart the length of the journey was sixty miles, and the result of the recent expenditure there was to bring these two settlements into contiguity.

Hon FIN SEC'Y, in reply to Mr McLELAN said that the expenditure which he referred to had been made on the application of himself and Mr Donkin.

Mr McLELAN replied that the application was for a special grant,—he had received no reply to his request and when he had heard that a commission was to issue for the expenditure he understood that allowance had been made in the supplementary Estimate. The Government had expended the money without consulting the members and a further sum would have to be laid out to complete the road this year.

After some further explanations on this point

by hon Atty Gen and Mr Donkin, an intimation was given by hon FIN SEC that some arrangement would be made in reference to the expenditure and that it would not be charged against the county.

Hon Mr McFARLANE remarked that during the past season numbers of bridges throughout the country had been swept away. A number of expensive bridges required an outlay in the county of Cumberland, and a large portion of the expense in connection with the River Philip Bridge would have to be taken out of the grant so that very little would be left for the roads.

The subdivision was adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Thursday next was ordered to be the last day for receiving the road scales.

Mr BLANCHARD presented the petition of the Nova Scotia Telegraph Company, against a bill before the House.

Hon Mr SHANNON introduced a bill to incorporate the Halifax Blind Asylum, and in doing so, referred to the large bequest made by the late William Murdoch for that object.

Hon PROV SEC was glad, as one member of the Legislature, to express the pride and gratification that he had felt in hearing that Mr Murdoch, who had so long been a citizen of Halifax, had set so creditable an example to other capitalists. The large sum he had left to the various charitable institutions in this city could not have been more judiciously bequeathed.

Hon Mr SHANNON added that Mr Murdoch's liberality was more creditable, inasmuch as he was not a native of Nova Scotia, although he had made his money here. He knew of many Nova Scotians who had gone away and never thought of their little country again.

Mr PAXON reported up a bill to add a polling place in the county of Pictou; bill to incorporate the West End Lodge of British Templars, Wallace; bill relative to River Philip Harbour, Cumberland; bill to incorporate the Pictou Mining Company, with an amendment; bill to provide for the settlement of certain causes in Pictou.

HUMANE INSTITUTIONS.

Mr BLANCHARD, as Chairman of the Committee on Humane Institutions, reported from that committee. In reference to the Hospital for the Insane, the Report says:—

“The Committee have considered the complaints against Dr. DeWolf submitted to the Government with the Doctor's reply and the evidence taken thereon,—the Report of the Medical Commission and the observations thereon. They have also heard the testimony of several witnesses who appeared before the Committee after public notice, and have given the most patient attention to the evidence.—The Committee are much pleased to be able unanimously to report that *there is in these cases no evidence to fix any blame on either Dr. DeWolf or any of the attendants employed in the Institution, and the Committee are satisfied that the condition in which Mr. Harvey was found to be after his removal can be well attributed to other causes than either cruelty or neglect on the part of the officers of the Institu-*

tion. The Committee have the more readily taken this view of the case in consequence of the most reliable testimony, medical and otherwise, which has been given before them of cases equally if not more extraordinary than the one referred to in which it was beyond dispute that no efforts have been spared to prevent the deplorable condition which had been found to exist shortly after death. The Committee deeply regret that the complaints referred to should have had any tendency to weaken the confidence of the public in the institution and they desire as far as in their power lies to lessen the feeling which appears to exist without any sufficient cause."

The committee also report favorably of other humane institutions. In connection with the Deaf and Dumb Asylum, Mr. Blanchard stated that there are in that institution some five or six persons receiving education, although natives of the Province of New Brunswick. The government of that Province had hitherto only paid the small sum of £10 for each, annually; and the committee therefore thought that if the directors would apply through the Government of this Province to that of New Brunswick, the sum for the support of the persons in question might be increased.

In relation to the bill introduced by the Government on the subject of the Lunatic Asylum, Mr. Blanchard also reported from the committee to this effect: They concur in the proposition for the appointment of a board of commissioners, but not in the appointment of a steward and matron; they also unanimously recommend that an assistant physician, at a salary of \$1000 a year, be appointed, instead of a consulting physician.

Mr. McDONNELL introduced an act to establish a new polling place in the county of Inverness.

Hon. PROV. SEC. stated that it would further the business of the House if the committees would vigorously devote all the time they could to the completion of the matters before them. As it was the wish of many members to attend the important public meeting which was to be held on the next day, and as the House never met on Good Friday, he would move that they adjourn over until Saturday.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE expressed the wish that every gentleman who possibly could would attend the public meeting on the following day.

Mr. TOBIN also alluded to the importance of the object in view.

The House then adjourned until 3 o'clock on Saturday.

SATURDAY, April 20.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. DONKIN presented a petition from Mr. Kennedy and others, residents of the mouth of River Philip, asking a change in the name of the settlement. He introduced a bill to change the name to Bridgeport.

Hon. PROV. SEC. suggested the adoption of some other name than Bridgeport, as that name had already been given to several settlements.

Mr. DONKIN said that he would take the suggestion into consideration.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL introduced a bill to add a polling place to the county of Guysboro'.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL reported from the Committee on Law Amendments the bill for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals; the bill relative to the conveying of timber and lumber on rivers; the bill to amend the law relating to county assessments, and the bill relating to statute labor in the county of Richmond. The committee reported unfavorably of all accepting the last named bill, stating, however, that they would approve of the adoption of the first mentioned bill as far as the city of Halifax was concerned if deferred for three months.

Dr. BROWN introduced a bill to incorporate the Gaspereaux School House and Public Hall Company.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill to repeal chap. 16, Acts of 1859, and to substitute certain provisions therefor. He said that the object was to repeal the law providing for the holding of nominations in the various electoral divisions, and to provide that the nomination be held in the court house of the shire town of each county.

Mr. BLACKWOOD reported from the Committee on Private and Local Bills, the bill to incorporate the Gas-Consumers' Company of Halifax with amendment.

EDUCATION.

Hon. PROV. SEC., as a partial report from the committee on Education, introduced a bill entitled "An Act for the better encouragement of Education." He said that the first two clauses would enable two school sections to be united where it was desired. The bill further provided for the appointment by the Council of Public Instruction of a provincial board of examiners. He said that under the existing arrangement, teachers had to be re-examined in passing from one county to another; the change proposed would lessen the expense by one-half, and the license issued by the board would extend over the whole Province. The bill would also amend the law as it relates to the city of Halifax, by taxing every male person of full age, being resident in the city for six months and upwards, to the extent of \$1; this poll-tax would, however, only apply to those who had not been rated to that amount on their property, and was designed to meet the case of parties who children being educated, but who paid nothing under the existing law. The City Council would have the power to relieve any persons thus taxed who were unable to pay. He said that an explanatory clause had also been inserted, to place beyond doubt the fact that the law intended the assessment to apply only to inhabitants; there were cases in which parties resident in Dartmouth had been assessed in Halifax for property there, although they previously paid into the county treasury a tax on all property within the county. The bill provided also that the public grant might be paid quarterly to the commissioners for the city of Halifax; that the commissioners should be authorized to sell the debentures which they have the power to issue at the current rates, and that the commissioners should be paid \$1000 for their services. The Provincial Secretary said it might seem objectionable that this board should be paid, while

the boards throughout the country were unpaid; but these gentlemen, whose position in the community was such as to make their time of great importance, discharged also the duties of trustees, for whom pay was provided in other places by the existing law. The board had met no less than 235 times during the last year, and they would not be expected to devote so much time as was required without remuneration.

Mr. S. McDONNELL asked whether it was the intention that the section in which the owners of property resided should receive the benefit or the assessment rather than of the section in which the property was situated. He did not think such a provision wise, for a section might have sufficient property to support a good school, and yet receive no support from such property, as its inhabitants might live in another section.

Hon. PROV. SEC. replied that the clause in the bill was only explanatory of the existing law. The difficulty did not arise in the country sections, for the rate was levied by counties. But the question had arisen between Halifax city and the county outside, there being two bodies charged with the collection of the rate.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table the report of the Superintendent of Education.

THE HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

Mr. BLANCHARD moved the adoption of the report of the Committee on Humane Institutions. He said that members of the committee had requested him to state that not only had the committee, as a body, visited the Insane Asylum, but that every member of it had made a surprise visit.

The report was adopted.

The House then went into committee on bills and took up the bill relating to the Hospital for the Insane.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that the bill had been brought forward with the sole desire to re-establish public confidence in the institution, and after giving the report of the committee their most careful consideration, he and his colleagues had come to the conclusion that the desired object would be as well, if not better attained, by the bill introduced by the committee. He, however, entertained a strong opinion in favour of the payment of the three commissioners to be appointed. The amount need not be considerable—say \$200 each; but it was only right that gentlemen charged with such heavy responsibility, and devoting so much time as would be required of them, should be remunerated in such a way as to defray incidental charges and secure a prompt attendance.

Mr. BLANCHARD remarked that one view of the committee recommended a change from the bill introduced by the Government was that the moneys saved by the change would be sufficient to pay the salary of the assistant physician. He did not, however, think that the committee objected to the payment of the Commissioners.

Hon. PROV. SEC. concurred with the committee as to the appointment of an assistant physician, and thought that such an appoint-

ment would serve the same end as the appointment of a steward and matron.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL suggested that a provision be inserted in the bill to the effect that the assistant physician be of a certain number of years' standing.

Hon. PROV. SEC. thought that such a provision would hamper the choice of the Government, especially if the salary offered was small.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. remarked that as the officer to be appointed would only be a subordinate, there was not the same necessity for inserting such a condition as there might be if he were to be the head of a department.

The bill passed.

CONSUMERS' GAS COMPANY.

The bill to incorporate the Consumers' Gas Company was then taken up.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said that the object of the measure was to do away with the practical monopoly of the present company, and to afford the citizens cheap gas. The committee on private bills had introduced an objectionable amendment compelling the company to lay their pipes at least four feet from the present company's pipes and from the water pipes. The only objects served by the amendment would be to obstruct the new company and to deprive the citizens of Halifax of a great advantage,—the intention being that an opportunity should be afforded to every gas consumer to become a share-holder in the new company. If such a change were made in the bill it would be necessary to blast the rock all through the streets instead of laying the pipes in the trenches already formed. He could see no reason why they should be compelled to go to such a large outlay, especially as the new company, when they extend their operations to new localities, must submit to have their excavations used by the present company in the same way. He moved that the clause inserted by the committee be struck out.

Mr. TOBIN said that he understood that the present Company did not desire a monopoly, but care should be taken that their rights were not interfered with or their property injured. The pipes should be kept at a sufficient distance to enable the officers of the respective companies to ascertain from which pipes an escape of gas was going on. The committee, he thought, were the best judges of the arguments which had been brought before them. He did not wish to obstruct the investment of capital by the new company, but he desired to prevent the difficulties which appeared in the way, and to secure to the present company the enjoyment of any rights which had been given to them.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the existing company had incurred the outlay in connection with their excavations, purely as a speculation, and they should not therefore be allowed to obstruct a measure evidently beneficial to the citizens at large. It was notorious that the price of gas in Halifax was three times what it was in many parts of England, and was higher than in any part of the world. He agreed that existing rights should not be interfered with, but it was evident that the company had no claim to the exclusive enjoyment of the streets, and if any damage was done to the pipes already laid, the new company would

be liable beyond doubt to make it good. The difficulty of ascertaining from which pipe an escape came would be as great when they were at a distance of four feet as at two feet or less; and in any case he presumed that the same arrangement would have to be made between the two companies. He could not see any reason why the new pipes should not at any rate be laid in the trenches made for the water pipes,—no objection had been made on that point by the City Council. He thought that the opposition proceeded from a desire to obstruct the new company rather than from a fear of any actual injury.

Mr. ANNAND said that all his prejudices were in favor of the new company, but he could not shut his eyes to the fact that their predecessors had spent a large sum in their excavations, and it was not improbable that at some future time they might wish to avail themselves of the entire openings that had been made. It seemed unfair to allow another body to come in and make use of the expenditure, without compensation. The case of a telegraph company asking permission to place their insulators on the posts of another company, would be precisely similar.

Mr. BLACKWOOD said that the principal objections urged by the existing company were that the gas would be supplied cheaply to the consumers at the expense of the present company, by the excavations which had cost £28,000, being used. He thought it only fair that compensation should be made to the old company. A gas bill which had passed some years ago had contained such a provision as the committee intended.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said he did not see the propriety of burdening the new company with an unnecessary expenditure. He thought that the pipes could be put down in the excavations for the water works, and this would prevent £20,000 or £30,000 being wasted. It would be a great nuisance to the citizens to have the streets opened up for the whole of another season for the purpose of blasting, which could not be necessary. He thought that some mode should be adopted of settling this matter in a fair and equitable way, without passing the clause as it stood.

Mr. TOBIN said that he had no personal interest whatever in the matter, and indeed his prejudices were in favor of any company which would ensure the public cheap gas. At the same time he did not think it fair after a company had gone to a large expense in making excavations, laying pipes, and supplying the city with gas, to allow a new company to make use of its labours without affording it compensation. If there was a clause in the bill which would enable the two companies to come to some arrangement mutually satisfactory, he would be quite content.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. did not agree with the hon. gentleman in the conclusions he had arrived at. For twenty years and more the present company had been making very handsome profits, and now were desirous of hampering a new company with a heavy expense at the very inception of its enterprise. The present company had no exclusive privilege to the streets. They should not be allowed to levy a contribution on any

competitors, as was now proposed to be done. It was the duty of the Legislature to give to the citizens cheap and good gas.

Mr. HEBB was desirous of giving as many charters as necessary to new enterprises. He believed it was the wrong policy to leave the gas in the hands of any single company. Let the new company lay down the pipes wherever it chose, but the moment it injured the pipes of the present company, compensation should be given to the latter.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said, no doubt cheaper gas would be a great boon; at the same time, however, nothing unfair to any body should be done. He did not think any company would now have as much difficulty in excavating as was anticipated. The rock only lay in a series of ledges running down to the harbour. The gas company had broken what rock there was to a considerable extent. He was in favour of the pipes of the two companies being brought within two feet at least of each other.

Hon. FIN. SEC. was not in favor of compensation. The present company had no right to prevent any privileges such as those asked for being granted to the new company. For twenty five years they had put on such a price as would reimburse them for all outlays, and leave a very large profit besides. If they would impose burthensome terms upon the new company, then the public could never have the cheap gas which it was hoped to obtain. There was no likelihood of the pipes interfering with each other. It did not follow that the company would lay down its pipes exclusively in the trenches of the old company. The places where the water pipes were laid would be equally available.

Mr. McLELAN could not but feel that since the old company had expended so much money—some £28,000—in making excavations, it would be unfair to allow a new company to step in and avail itself of the same excavations without giving the former some compensation.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL thought it would be an injustice to allow the new company to come in and make use of the labors of the old company without compensating the latter.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that the present company, under the old manager, had made very poor work in excavating some places; but under Mr. Buist it had been well done.

Mr. BLANCHARD also urged the claims of the new company to favorable consideration.

Mr. KAULBACK was opposed to all monopolies, and was in favor of giving the privileges sought for to the new company.

After some further remarks on the subject,

Mr. TOBIN moved to amend the clause by inserting two feet instead of four. He made the motion, he stated, at the suggestion of Mr. Shannon, who had had an opportunity of seeing such operations as those in question.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE was in favour of giving every necessary facility to the new gas company.

On a division, Mr. Tobin's amendment was lost by 19 to 16. An amendment made by the

Financial Secretary, that the clause be struck out, was then carried. The bill then passed as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The following bills also passed in committee: To add a polling place in the county of Pictou.

To incorporate the West End Lodge of Temperance, Wallace.

Relative to River Philip Harbor, Cumberland. The committee then adjourned and reported.

Mr. LONGLEY laid on the table the road scale for Annapolis county.

Mr. ANNAND remarked that one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, Mr. Ray, was out of town. He hoped that the division of the road moneys for the county had been made with a due consideration of that gentleman's interests.

Mr. LONGLEY replied that Mr. RAY had received the same consideration as formerly.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced an Act relative to the manufacture of vinegar.

Mr. MILLER, an Act further to amend 19 R. S. of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors; also laid on the table the road scale of the county of Richmond. In reference to the latter, he stated that in the absence of his colleague, he had of course not tracked the whole of the grant.

Mr. LONGLEY presented a petition from Sons of Temperance, Whycocomagh, in Inverness County, praying for some alteration in the license law.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced an act to amend Chap. 41 R. S., relative to coroners. It provides for the holding of an inquest in the case of a sudden death at the Hospital for the Insane, or any jail or penitentiary; also, for the holding of *post mortem* examinations. The hon. gentleman also introduced an act respecting the medical profession. It provides for the establishment of a College of Surgeons, and gives them certain corporate powers. He stated he did not, in introducing the bill, commit himself to support all its provisions.

Mr. WHITMAN presented a petition from Annapolis, asking for the establishment of a Savings' Bank at that place.

Hon. PROV. SEC. stated that, as the control of the Savings' Bank would soon pass to the General Government of the Confederation, it would be impossible to comply with the request of the petition. There was nothing, however, to prevent the people of Annapolis from organizing themselves into a Savings' Bank Company.

Mr. LONGLEY called attention to a mistake of about \$100,000 in connection with the Pictou Railway, that appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*.

Hon. PROV. SEC. thought that his hon. friend was rather sensitive. If the paper in question came within a hundred thousand dollars of the true amount, it was as much as could be expected.

Mr. ANNAND expected to be able to show, before the house rose, that the Government had made a mistake of \$200,000, in respect to the financial state of the country.

Mr. TOBIN presented a petition from Prospect relative to an inspector of pickled fish.

The house then adjourned.

MONDAY, 22nd April, 1867.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A number of private and local bills were read a third time.

Mr. PRYOR introduced a bill to incorporate the Merchants' Marine Insurance Company. Also a bill relative to rag and junk shops in the city of Halifax.

Mr. C J CAMPBELL asked the Government to lay on the table a return of wharfage on Cow Bay breakwater during the last two years. He said he understood that a heavy wharfage had been imposed.

Hon. PRO SEC'Y laid on the table by command a petition from Patrick Walker asking that railway damages be not exacted, in consequence of loss of petitioner's property by fire.—Referred to Railway Committee.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON, from Committee on City Bills, reported a bill relative to the Market House of Halifax with amendments.

HALIFAX LICENSE LAW.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON presented a Report from the Committee on City Bills in reference to the License Law of the City of Halifax. The Committee recommended that the bill before them be deferred, as the powers which it asked for were already possessed by the City Council, and at the same time urged upon the Council the necessity of enforcing the existing laws, especially in reference to the sale of liquors on the Sabbath.

Mr. MILLER said that he and another member of the Committee were decidedly opposed to the tone and character of the report. It was believed by himself and other members not only that the bill introduced was unnecessary but that the legislature should step in and control the powers exercised by the Council. A large petition from liquor dealers was before the Committee the object being to enforce the granting of general licenses, and on the other hand a number of well-disposed gentlemen had asked for the adoption of more stringent legislation. He thought that the object sought by the latter would not be well served by the separation of groceries and liquors, but that on the contrary the evils of intemperance would be thereby increased.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that he would have gone strongly for the bill which had been introduced, but the Committee considered that, as the matter was in the hands of the City Council, and as that body had recently shewn a disposition to act with decision, it would be better not to interfere.

Mr. TOBIN regretted that the Committee had not set the question at rest. The Council had frequently attempted to enforce the separation,—the citizens had resisted it. The members of the corporation were divided on the question, nine of them having signed the grocers and liquor dealers' petition, and none of the ordinances hitherto made with that view had been carried out. The community should not be kept in such a state of turmoil. He was strongly of opinion that no good would be accomplished by the separation of gro

ceries and liquors; for the seductions held out in the shape of attractive amusements in places devoted to the sale of liquors only would be far more injurious than those now offered. He thought that the time had not come in Nova Scotia when the various trades and pursuits of the people could be separated with advantage.

Hon Mr SHANNON replied that there was no bill before the Committee to carry out the views of the liquor dealers. The recent ordinance of the City Council shewed a determination on the part of that body to carry out what they believed to be advantageous to the community.

Mr MILLER said that he had intended to have brought forward a bill making the issue of general licenses compulsory, but the decision of the Committee shewed that such an effort would be useless. He thought that the question had been settled, as far as the Committee could settle it, in favor of the recent action of the Council. The gentlemen who had urged the separation were, without doubt, sincere in their desire to repress intemperance; but he was as sincere in differing from them as to the effect of the change, for he believed that the result would be that the sale of liquors would after the separation be principally carried on in low dens where other evils than intemperance originated. He would not, however, feel bound to move in the matter, unless some action were taken by the members representing Halifax.

Mr S. CAMPBELL said that the report commended itself to his view, on the ground that the City Council were a body elected by the citizens for the purpose of promoting the morality and general welfare of the community;—they were therefore eminently the authorities who should set the question at rest. Throughout the country the Sessions had the power to refuse to grant licenses if they thought fit, and he did not think that Halifax should be made an exception in that respect. The citizens would have the matter in their own hands, and could compel the Council to represent and act upon their views.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that this question was before the House the first year he obtained a seat, and the proposal for the separation was then carried. Mr. Johnston had, however, proposed as a compromise, that the matter be left to the City Council, and that was also agreed to. If the matter had been left there it would have been better. He was in favour of the report of the Committee. The liquor dealers claimed that the majority of the Council was with them, and if so they had nothing to complain of.

Mr LONGLEY said he could not refrain from expressing his regret that a question of so much importance should be dealt with so summarily by the Committee. When all the clergy in Halifax had agreed to recommend a certain course after consultation, and when numerous signed petitions on the subject had been presented, something more was due than the mere recommendation that the existing law in reference to the Sabbath day be carried out. The action which the City Council might be expected to take in the way of separation did not amount to much, taking into consi-

deration the strong influence exerted in the city by the traffic. The subject had been too cavalierly dealt with Session after Session, and he would have liked to see the sense of the House tested by a bill. He had heard some of the arguments advanced pro and con before the committee, and was struck by the weakness of those urged in opposition to the separation. It had been said that the sale of groceries only yielded ten per cent, and that the change would work the ruin of many engaged in the traffic,—it was an indication of the hardihood of those engaged in the business that they should attempt to bolster up their case with such assertions. There were men in the community who were heaping up fortunes by the sale of groceries alone, and they could do this at a return of ten per cent when they did not combine the liquor traffic in their operations. He did not consider the sale of liquors a legitimate business, but it was legalised and should at any rate be separated from every other branch of trade. On this question the intelligence and moral feeling of the community had been aroused, and the petitioners were entitled to more consideration than they had received. If the influence of the liquor traffic did not prevail to so great an extent in the city, he would be favorable to the proposal to leave the matter to the Council, but the wishes of the disinterested portion of the community were not likely to have their views carried out by that body, dependent as it was upon the popular voice. Possibly the majority of the citizens regarded the sale of intoxicating liquors as a nuisance, and yet licenses were being multiplied to an indefinite extent. He regretted the legislature should evince so little desire to do anything practical on behalf of Temperance. Repeated professions of sympathy were made, but few members could be found to rise and condemn a traffic which was fraught with the utmost misery, and as far as actual legislation went, it was almost *nil*. He would have been better pleased with the report if the committee had expressed a stronger opinion in concurrence with the views of the petitioners, and this was due to those who asked for the bill, inasmuch as numbers of persons of the first respectability, although differing as to prohibition and total abstinence, had agreed to urge the separation alluded to.

Mr BLANCHARD said that when a compromise was made it often happened that both parties were offended and so it seemed to be in this case. One body of petitioners had asked the Committee to pass a law preventing the issue of general licenses,—the other asked for a law to compel the granting of such licenses, but the Committee had decided to leave the matter in the hands of the Council, and unless the ordinance of the 21st March were repealed the separation would be effected. He yielded to no man in his desire to prevent intemperance, but anyone acquainted with the criminal business of the country knew that the evils did not emanate from the grocery shops, but from the places in which other vices were indulged in than the vice of intemperance. The City Council, in addition to the separation ordinance had recently raised the tavern license fee to \$100, and had raised the other licenses from \$60 to \$80.

There could be no doubt that in some streets two thirds of the inhabitants got a living by selling liquor and maintained some sinks of iniquity, but this it was in the power of the City Council to prevent.

Mr. LONGLEY admitted that the greatest amount of crime emanated from places of a low description, but the more respectable resorts were the training school in intemperance. He was mistaken if some establishments not very far from where he spoke did not inflict more evil upon the community than some of the disreputable houses further up. The places really doing most harm, were the places where the joint trade was being carried on extensively. In such establishments scores commenced their downward course, beginning moderately and scouting the idea of danger, but ending in the lowest depths of degradation. It was true that in the traffic there were men who in many respects were worthy of imitation, but that only made the matter worse, for the larger amount of respectability there was in the business the more support it would get, and without the aid of such respectability as was thus given to it, the credit of the traffic could not stand an hour. Formerly there were half a dozen gentlemen in the House who felt in duty bound to engage in the discussion of this question when it was brought forward, but matters seemed to be getting worse, for no one seemed to be disposed to lend his voice or energy to the cause, or to assist in legislating for it, although there are thousands of persons in the Province most energetically striving to save the country from the evils with which it was being deluged. The views of this large body of persons were entitled to some recognition and response, but members were content to pass over the matter in silence and so it would doubtless be until the question was brought to the polls. He would be willing to sacrifice every political prospect which he had, could he effect the testing of the question in this way. It was plain that an amount equal to one-half the revenue was being spent for an article which was not only worthless but was positively injurious and every intelligent man knew that the position of the country would be far enhanced if this waste of means could be saved and applied to useful purposes.

The Report of the committee was adopted and the bill was deferred for three months.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. introduced an act to incorporate the Dartmouth Water and Gas Company.

Mr. BLANCHARD presented a petition from the inhabitants of Pictou, respectfully asking that a steamboat be placed between the terminus of the railway in that town and Cape Breton.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said that the subject had engaged the attention of the Government, and they had made provision for a steamer which would run twice a week between the terminus and Port Hood.

FINANCIAL MATTERS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table a return asked for by the hon. member for East Halifax

in reference to fines and forfeitures, and the disbursements thereof. In doing so, he said: The hon. member (Mr. Annand) was kind enough to intimate that the present Administration had not equalled their predecessors in their vigilance in protecting the revenue. I am glad, however, to be able to say that the return which I hold in my hand shows a result very different from what the hon. member appears to have expected.—Whilst the nett proceeds during four years of the administration of the hon. member were \$3161, they realized, for only three years, under the present Government, no less a sum than \$3,500.

Mr. ANNAND.—I am glad the hon. member has laid these returns on the table, and have no doubt, when I come to analyze them, the result will be not what the hon. gentleman states. By the very imperfect return handed me previously, I found these facts: there was a change of Administration in 1863, and I give the gentlemen opposite credit for \$1000, which was imposed by their predecessors, and yet the result may be summed up as follows—whilst the late government collected, from 1860 to 1863, the gross sum of \$10,150, their successors, up to the present time, had only collected \$7059.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—I challenge the hon. member to controvert the statement I have made, that the nett proceeds, in three years, under the present Administration, exceed those of four years under their predecessors by three or four hundred dollars. As respects the statement made by the hon. member, let me ask him where is the vigilance and ability shown in financial management when the expenses of collecting actually cost more than the sum realized? That is what the the hon. member calls vigilance.

Mr. ANNAND.—The hon. member has the advantage of me; he has under his hand all the books and papers, and can bring down here just such a statement as he may think proper.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—I have no advantage over the hon. member. He has only to ask for any return that he may require, and he will have it.

Mr. ANNAND.—He is in the Government, and has access to all the books, and can make up such returns as will answer his purpose. Therefore I tell the hon. gentleman it was not fair for him to argue the question before I was in a position to answer him.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—I did not discuss the question; I simply stated the result of a return asked for by the hon. member. I may also state that I shall be prepared to lay on the table tomorrow the return asked for by the hon. member relative to the collector at Amherst.

Mr. ANNAND.—I am very much mistaken if I shall not be able to prove from the papers that the Government cannot take much credit either for their vigilance or financial ability.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—The hon. member is always mistaken—that it his normal condition. He makes any number of threats, and generally ends in finding he was all wrong.

Mr. ANNAND.—Let me now tell the hon. member that he has himself committed a blunder in making his statement respecting the amount in the treasury. The hon. member said:

"I will now call attention to the returns of revenue and expenditure. The total receipts of the year, as per the Receiver General's account, show \$2,080,180,68, &c."

Now, the Receiver General received no such amount. The hon. member forgot he was actually including the sum of \$222,000, the balance left in the Receiver General's hands at the end of 1865. Here, then, is a mistake of no less than \$222,000 dollars in the hon. member's statement.

Hon. FIN. SEC'Y.—The hon. member has verily found a mare's nest. He has been swelling with importance for some days past thinking he had at last discovered an error in the financial exhibit of the Government. The hon. gentleman does not understand the figures under his own hand; he misinterprets the statement before him. If the hon. member had the ordinary intelligence of a school boy—if he understood the rule of three, he would not attempt to get up here and make such absurd statements. He has shown that he is unable to comprehend a simple column of figures. I hold the Receiver General's account in my hand, and the first item on it is the balance from the previous year. The hon. member must know that is the proper way of keeping an account of this kind. I congratulate the hon. member on the mare's nest he has found.

Mr. ANNAND—I have been too long in this House to be put down by that sort of declamation. He talks about a school boy, but I do not know one who, understanding the first rule of arithmetic, would bring such a statement here. I am quoting from the hon. member's speech, as reported by the official reporters, and corrected by himself, and in which he told the House and country that the receipts were actually \$222,000 larger than they really were.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—The hon. member knows I was talking about the Receiver General's account,—in fact the report says so,—and it is absurd for him to harp on a mere expression.

Hon. ATTY. GEN.—I have been not a little amused at the hon. member. He has seized upon a mere expression in the financial statement, and put his own construction on it. I can remember the hon. member coming down to the house, when Financial Secretary, and stammering until he had to be helped along by the hon. member for Colchester. We remember the exhibition the hon. member made of himself in the course of last winter, when he used expressions on the public street that should have forfeited his seat, and was brought to task in this house. Yet the hon. member now presumes to get up here to-day and misinterpret the expressions of another gentleman. He knows perfectly well it is always usual to place the balance of the previous year among the assets. The hon. member is grasping at mere shadows.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—I call the attention of the hon. member to a statement he made when he was Financial Secretary, and the first item in that is the balance of the previous year.

Mr. ANNAND—I am perfectly well aware that that has always been the practice, but I am now referring to the hon. member's own speech, when he stated that the receipts were over \$200,000 more than was received. I only rose, however, to state that the return just handed to me is not what I asked for. I want to know the amount of fines imposed by the

Board of Revenue as well as the amount collected.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—If the hon. member will take the trouble to look over the returns he will find there all the information he requires.

Mr. ANNAND—I want to know whether under the present administration fines have been imposed which have not been collected?

Hon. FIN. SEC.—None.

Mr. ANNAND—I want to see whether the fines in any case was paid in full or commuted.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—The hon. member has on one side the fine imposed, and the other the fine received.

Mr. ANNAND—Well, all I can say, the return is made up so clumsily I have not been able to find it.

Mr. MCLELAN then asked the Government to lay on the table a detailed statement of the sums due from the collectors of customs up to the 31st March.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—The hon. member, as a member of the Committee on Public Accounts, asked for that return this morning. He must see that he is asking me, not for a simple return, but for a very full financial statement embracing a great deal of labor and difficulty in its preparation. I shall lay the information on the table at the earliest possible moment, but I am not under any obligation to press into the service extraordinary assistance in order to afford information which is only intended to effect one object.

Mr. MCLELAN—The hon. member could have satisfied the Committee on Public Accounts in a few minutes. As it is now, we cannot find whether there are large arrearages due by the collectors or not.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—I told the hon. member that the Financial Secretary could not be fairly called upon to get up a lengthy financial statement in a few minutes. If the hon. member occupied the same position I do he would have given the same answer. The hon. member was sent out to enquire into the condition of the Provincial accounts up to the end of the financial year. The hon. member, of course, is entitled to any information he may ask for at the proper time and place.

Mr. MCLELAN.—It is the custom of the committee to report in reference to the arrearages of collectors.

Mr. ANNAND.—The information asked for by the hon. member for North Colchester could be got in an hour. An account is kept with every officer in the Financial Secretary's office, and, at the end of each quarter, the books are balanced.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—Nobody said there was any difficulty in obtaining the information required.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PRO. SEC'Y introduced an Act to provide a site for a School House at Preston. He stated that the objection to a general Act on such subjects, was that it might be used in an arbitrary manner. He was quite satisfied, however, that the house would be always ready to pass such acts as were necessary.

Mr. S. McDONNELL presented a petition from River Dennis in reference to the Presbyterian Union Act. The subject, he stated, had been before the house for some years, and he hoped that it would be satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL presented petitions from Whyocomagah and Victoria on the same subject, praying that the Act may be repealed, and justice done to the complainants by the house. The matter was to have been amicably settled, and he had withdrawn a bill he had introduced, with that understanding. No satisfactory arrangement, however, had been arrived at.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. PRO. SEC'Y. introduced an Act to amend the Act incorporating the St Lawrence and Bay of Fundy Company; its object is to prevent the Company interfering or coming into conflict with the Inter-Colonial Railway.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL—Will the railway come as far as the borders of Nova Scotia?

Hon. PRO. SEC.—I suppose that the hon. member's enquiry was made in jest, but I would remark that his question may become one of very serious consideration. If his friends could secure a majority opposed to Union and pledged to obstruct it, the parties under whose control the construction would be might question the propriety of extending the road beyond the borders of New Brunswick. If a large obstructionist party could be got together with a prospect of detaching Nova Scotia from the Union, there is no knowing what effect it might have on the building of the road. Those opposed to Union after failing to defeat the Railway project by representing that the debt would be repudiated and that the road would not pay grease for the wheels, may yet succeed in getting up such hostility as will prevent the city from obtaining the benefits of the line. If the road be built to Halifax it will be because those with whom the hon. gentleman is acting were powerless to prevent what every Nova Scotian regards as the greatest boon that his country can enjoy.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman has attributed to me a desire to obstruct the interests of the country in this particular, but I think that the charge is not justified by my action in the House. My remark, however, in reference to this bill was not without meaning, for the delegates have not taken care as they should have done, that the road should be commenced at both ends. Again, only three millions are guaranteed, and as this sum would be insufficient, I ventured to doubt that the road would reach the point of communication referred to.

Hon. PRO. SEC.—I understand the hon. member then to repudiate the action of the people's delegates,—if he does not do so he is responsible for their acts. Those gentlemen laid upon the table of the Imperial Parliament a declaration drawing attention to the fact that all the money which Mr Howe had asked for was three millions, and that this was all that the Imperial Government were pledged to. They thus endeavored to prevent our getting another shilling beyond the three millions. If they had been believed, the credit of British America would have been destroyed, and their determined and avowed policy was to oppose the construction of a single mile of railway. When

the hon. member for Guysboro' heard his friend acknowledge the truth of these charges on the floor of the House, and when he continues in co-operation with the hon. member for East Halifax, I ask if he does not place upon his own shoulders the responsibility of endeavoring to obstruct the work. I was glad when I heard him (Mr. Campbell) declare that the Union having become a fixed fact, he was prepared to give his best energies to carry out the new system, and to obtain all the advantages that could be obtained for the country. That declaration was creditable to the heart and to the head of the hon. gentleman, because every intelligent man knows that the people would turn their backs with scorn and indignation upon the men who would shrink from taking such a position as the interests of the Province demand. But when the press advocating that gentleman's views has repudiated those doctrines, and has declared that so far from endeavoring to make the change beneficial to Nova Scotia their object is to obstruct and destroy and defeat the advantages which the country might expect, whatever his views upon the question of Confederation, every man actuated by a spirit of manly patriotism must act upon the view enunciated by the hon. member for Guysboro'. But that gentleman's associates have proclaimed that instead of seeking an onward course for Nova Scotia their only motto is obstruction. The hon. gentleman's sentiments having been thus repudiated, he must come out from the company of his associates or must take the responsibility of standing in the company of men whose only aim is to impede the country's progress. Am I not right, then, in saying that under certain circumstances there is a possibility of the railway stopping at our borders? But I believe that when the true position of these gentlemen is placed before the intelligent constituencies of the country; when they are called upon to choose between the friends of union who will be prepared to combine in making the union as largely beneficial to the country as possible and their opponents who are opposed to everything like progress, there is not a constituency but will turn their backs with contempt upon the men who being unable to carry out their individual opinions are prepared to trample under foot the prosperity of the country. The men who crossed the water as the people's delegates, the hon. member knows have defamed and libelled the fair credit of the country, giving the lie to all their past lives, and stating that the railway which they had held out as the highest boon would not pay grease for its engines, and were compelled to admit that they urged the British Government to spend their money in iron-clads and everything but in giving to the Province that position which God and nature intended she should occupy. And in what position are these gentlemen to-day? Is it the position of myself and my colleagues who having fought the battle through and accomplished the great union, are prepared to commit their fame and future fortune to the hands of the free electors of Nova

Scotia? The only man amongst the people's delegates who had a seat in this Assembly has slunk from the averted faces of his countrymen, knowing the doom that must fall upon him. Instead of appealing to the constituency that hitherto supported him, he has sent his emissaries abroad to see if in some outlying county a seat cannot be obtained for him in any Parliament. I ask the hon. member for Guysboro' if he does not think it would be wise for him to take a note of that? I ask the men throughout the country who are opposed to union if they do not think it a significant fact that the man who controls a portion of the press enunciating anti-Union sentiments is at present like Japhet in search of a father, and if they think it would be well for them now to respond to the call of the men who, having done all they could to trample down the credit of the country, are now reduced to the position which I have described? With the messengers which the hon. member for East Halifax has sent out coming back to him without being able to find a place on which he can rest his foot, I ask the hon. member for Guysborough if he does not think it would be wise for him to come back to the patriotic stand which he took in declaring that he would endeavour to work out the new system for the benefit of the country? I have little fear as to the result of the contest which is approaching, for I believe that the people will not look for men belonging to one party or the other, but will elect the men who regardless of the past are prepared to obtain all possible advantages for the country.

Mr. McLELAN—I have been much amused at some of the remarks of the Prov. Sec., and especially at the remark he made in reference to the hon. member for East Halifax not being able to find a constituency. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should make such an observation, after the issue of the *Colonist* on last Saturday, which shows him to be in that very position. The Prov. Sec. has been driven from the constituency in which his daily life and the motives which have actuated him are best understood. His own messengers have not yet come back to tell him whether a place for his foot can be found or not. He says that we are arrayed to obstruct the progress of the country, but will he put his finger upon one advantage that is to flow from union. The only benefit which they promise is the construction of the Intercolonial railroad, and the hon. member for Guysboro, and those who concur with him, are therefore in a position to enquire whether for that work we are not to pay more than it is worth,—whether we are not to be taxed to an extent that would be sufficient to build the whole road. Surely if these are the facts it would have been better to forego the railroad on such hard terms. Is the member for Guysboro' wrong when he says that the delegates failed to secure to us that one benefit on which the friends of union relied so much? Any one who compares Mr. Fleming's estimate with the amount guaranteed will see that sufficient care has not been taken to ensure the building

of the road through this province. They failed in discharging the trust which they undertook, and in condemning their want of attention we are not to be met by the charge of obstructing the progress of the country.

Mr. TOBIN—It is a very singular that fact the men who have been obstructing the passage of the Imperial Act—doing all that men could do to prevent the consummation of union—are now the most desirous to go to Ottawa. I find that there is an election card out for this city, containing four names of the most determined opponents of union. I know something about the retirement from this constituency of the hon. Provincial Secretary. If he had wished it, I know he could have beaten every Anti-Unionist who might have the hardihood to run against him. I have conversed with highly intelligent men, from East and West—with professional men, clergymen, and others of weight and influence—and my conviction is that there is not a shadow of a doubt that all such persons are in favour of union. I say to the Union party: Wait, have patience for a days, for there will be candidates in the field worthy of your support,—men who will reflect credit upon the constituency of this metropolitan county. The game is not up yet, but will be fought to the bitter end by men of tried value and of ability. I am convinced that there are in this city four Unionists to one Anti-Unionist. An unfair advantage has been taken of the fact that the Provincial Secretary has retired, and it is said that he did so for want of support. Never would an election have been more easily won, if he had run it. If he felt it his duty to go back to his own county, that is his own affair, but I believe he could have won an easy victory in Halifax. Don't let gentlemen believe that this struggle has even yet commenced. I regret the more that the Provincial Secretary retired, because at the moment he did so a requisition was about being handed him with some 1600 of the best names in this city and county. Let me here take an opportunity of stating that there will be a public meeting held in this city, a few days hence and every part of the county will be asked to send their delegates. Then there will be given a full expression of the public opinion of this county, and candidates worthy of support will be nominated to represent the constituency in Ottawa and in the Local Legislature.

Hon. Prov. Sec.—I thank the hon. member (Mr. McLelan) for having afforded me this opportunity of giving some explanations on the subject to which he has referred. As my hon. friend (Mr. Tobin) has intimated, some gentlemen will soon find, to use a homely phrase, that they have hallooed before they were out of the wood. I came into this Legislature, it is well known, in conjunction with my hon. friend, Mr. McFarlane. We have been long allied as members of the same Government. In order to discharge the important duties of the position to which my country has called me, I was obliged to remove from Cumberland, and have since lived in this city, whilst my hon. friend re-

mained a resident of his native county. I need not say that I have felt the strong claims he has to continue to represent the county where he lives in the United Parliament. I was, therefore, in a manner, bound to waive any claim I might have to that constituency in his favor and seek a seat elsewhere. But there was another reason which operated both upon my honorable friend and myself, and that was, that the position I had taken in reference to the Union and other measures would make it easy for me to find a constituency outside of my own county. The hon. member for North Colchester lives close enough to Cumberland to know that every attempt to find a man either in or out of the county to come forward as an anti-Union candidate, has failed. Deputation after deputation has gone to gentlemen in this city, and there has not been a man found—and I do not believe one will be found—who will dare to go to the hustings to test the feeling of the people either with myself or any other Unionist. If there is such a man I shall be proud to meet him, and I am convinced that I do not misjudge my own constituents when I say that they will give such an account of themselves as will prove that they fully appreciate the character and tendency of the anti-Union policy. I may also tell the hon. gentleman that his party have gone again and again to one of the most influential men of the county who lives here, and he has refused to come out, because he is unwilling to take a position hostile to a movement which must do so much for the county of Cumberland. When I waived my claim to the county in favor of my hon. friend, I did so—and gentlemen of both parties are aware of the fact—with the knowledge that the men who had always supported me were ready to return me more triumphantly than ever before. But that is not all. I was returned at the last election by acclamation, by my own party; but I can now go into the county and rally to my support not merely the friends who have always sustained me, but men who opposed me, in former times. From Wallace to Parraboro' such men are ready to give me the most enthusiastic support. Yet in the face of facts like these, persons have dared to send the libel throughout this country that I was in doubts of being elected for the county I have so long represented. Under such circumstances I was asked if I would allow myself to be put into nomination for the county of Halifax. I said if there was a battle to be fought anywhere, I was prepared to fight it; if the friends of Union required my services, they were at their disposal. At a few hours' notice a meeting was held at the house of Dr. Parker—such a meeting as never before assembled in this city at the house of any gentleman,—it was not only large in numbers, but powerful in respect to the influence and wealth it represented. More than that, it embraced gentlemen representing every shade of political opinion, creed, and class. No man could hear the names of these gentlemen without feeling that the moment they supported a candidate for this city, his election was

sure. When not only the great bulk of the Conservative party but the most able and intelligent supporters of the Liberal party are arrayed, as they are now, in support of Union, can any one doubt the result in this city and country? I felt that it would be very questionable if there was a contest here at all. When I retired, it was not because I feared the result—for that was certain—but it was because I felt that the moment the county that had always so nobly sustained me required my services, it was my duty to respond. I have heard the names of some gentlemen mentioned as likely to run on the anti-Union ticket, but I feel that such parties, situated as they are, would hardly venture to go to the polls at all. In a few days the people of the county will be asked to support Union candidates, not nominated in a private office, but at a meeting of the electors. Then will be put before the constituency such a platform as they can support. I feel that the people will respond as they should; that they will not permit any obstructionists to impede the progress of a great measure which is to open up a new career of prosperity to this country. It has been said, time and again, by the opponents of Union that we could hardly get men to go to Ottawa; for it was too far off, or to go to the local parliament,—so contemptible would it become under Union. What do we see to-day? No sooner is the measure of Union accomplished than we see that the men who are most anxious to go to Ottawa and to the local legislature as well as the men who have been opposing Union. Hitherto no merchant could be obtained, except my hon. friend, to run for this city, whilst Nova Scotia was isolated and a separate province. Now we see four bankers taken in tow by Captain Balcarran, and rushing to Ottawa and the local legislature.

Mr. TOBIN.—Hardly four bankers,—not more than two.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—As respects the Intercolonial Railway, let me say that it did not depend upon the Imperial guarantee at all. Canada is able to build it without the assistance of the Maritime Provinces. Her bonds before this Union was effected were selling in the market higher than those of either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. If the Imperial Parliament had refused to guarantee a single dollar the Intercolonial Railway would have been built as rapidly as it was possible to carry it on. By having the money loaned at four per cent., of course, it is obvious that a great advantage is gained.

Mr. ANNAND.—I feel it due to make a few remarks after the allusions made to me by the Provincial Secretary. I imagined when I came here this afternoon that I was in the Assembly, but as the speeches proceeded I almost began to doubt that fact and to imagine that these addresses were being made to the constituents outside. I do not wonder that the Provincial Secretary ventured upon the broad and glaring mis-statement that the anti-Union ticket for Halifax county included four bankers, for this is characteristic of his general accuracy. But I am not aware that it is such a great offence to

be a merchant or a banker,—I believe that the hon. member for Halifax who has spoken is himself a banker—and I am inclined to think that the selection of four merchants and a gentleman from the shore to represent the constituency of Halifax will be proved by the result to be a respectable and taking nomination. We have been told that the friends of Confederation will carry the county four to one. We were only afraid this morning that our candidates would have no opposition, and I am relieved to hear the hon. member for West Hatifax say that there will be opposition, and that the game is not up yet. I have a strong desire to see that gentleman upon the hustings, and I sincerely regret that the Provincial Secretary has retired from the contest, for I should like to see him face the constituency of Halifax, where it has been said that the Union sentiment prevailed more strongly than in any other place. The men who formerly supported Confederation in this city feel that they cannot rally to the support of these gentlemen who have deprived them of the privileges of freemen. I was amused to hear him speak the other day as one of the sovereign people. What right has he to speak here in that capacity? The sovereign people have been denied the right to speak, and the measure of Union has been forced on them contrary to their well known sentiments. They were almost told in terms that they were not intelligent enough to decide the question, and are now appealed to by the very men who considered them so besotted and ignorant that the measure should be passed over their heads.—The hon. gentleman seemed surprised that the anti-Unionists should aspire to a seat at Ottawa. They will go there as the Nova Scotia party, not to be mixed up with the politics of Canada, to commit themselves to the support of either party, or to identify themselves with Canadian factions, but to be there to watch over the interests of Nova Scotia and to throw themselves into any scale in which they may secure the best advantages for their country. The House has been told that I shrank from offering myself to a constituency; it is well known that four years ago I decided upon the course which I have taken, and when I returned from England, and before I learned the result of the exertions of the delegates, I visited my constituency and gave those who supported me to understand, as I had previously given my family to understand, that it was not my intention again to offer. When asked if I would serve in the Dominion Parliament, I answered no. When asked if I would serve in the Local Parliament, I answered no, and when asked if I would continue in this House provided no change were made, my answer was "no"; I have had twenty-five years' public service, and you had better select a younger man for the work." When the Union measure passed, and the time came for consultation, I was pressed urgently to allow myself to be put in nomination by leading Conservatives and Liberals. I still firmly refused, and will continue to do so unless a nineteenth member of the Nova Scotia

Party is wanted to go to Ottawa. The Prov. Sec. spoke in glowing terms about the offers of support which were made to him; we know how he has been canvassing the city and the rebuffs he received from quarters where he expected the opposite treatment. He thought that he could bring to his support his old friends and perhaps that the old Conservative cry could be raised, but he found that not only he, but his friend, Mr. Tobin, had worn out their public reputation, and then it became convenient that his colleague in the representation of Cumberland should make way on the plea that the local interests of that county would be better represented by the Provincial Secretary. What have the local interests of Cumberland to do with the matter? I thought these gentlemen prided themselves on rising above local feeling, and considered such matters as lunatic asylums, ferries, roads and bridges were beneath their notice. But under cover of this plea the hon gentleman shrinks from facing the constituency of Halifax. He has said that no one was prepared to contest Cumberland with him, but I can tell him that he is mistaken. I would ask him what to day is the feeling in Parrsboro, Malagaash, Wallace, and other populous districts of Cumberland? That part of the county will have to be revolutionized before it will support a union candidate, and I pledge my word that the hon gentlemen will have opposition. We have been treated this afternoon to more declamation on the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. I repeat now, as solemnly as I made the statement before, that for a railway which may or may not be beneficial I should be very sorry to give up the privileges of the country, its free government, its right of self-taxation, its right to appropriate its own revenues and to place it under a load of taxation from another province. I would have been recreant to my duty to the people if I did not for the sake of destroying a scheme fatal to their interests, use every effort to impede one of its essential parts. I only hope that the road will be built, but if Canada alone is able to build it, as has been asserted, why did she not step forward years ago. We might have had it in 1851 or 1862 only for the bad faith of the Canadian Government. If Canada could borrow the necessary money, how was it that she was struggling with in a year to borrow at eight per cent.? True, her bonds have gone up in the market, and well they might, in view of the fact that she is about to get the control of the more prosperous revenues of the Maritime Provinces. Deprive Canada of the revenues which she will get from us, and her bonds will go down again, not perhaps to the same point as before, because it must be borne in mind that the bonds of all the Colonies of the Empire rose simultaneously when money became plentiful and cheap in the market of the world. It can be clearly shewn that the money to be drawn out of the treasury, and out of the people by Confederation, would under a Canadian tariff in a few years more than pay the entire cost of the railway. Assuming the cost to be three millions, and that that sum were borrowed at four per cent.,—our revenues would enable us to

build the road to Riviere du Loup, and for this work we are asked to give up treasure that would cover the country with railroads, and to reduce ourselves to the position of accepting a paltry pittance in the shape of a subsidy from Canada. The three millions guaranteed are not likely to build the road, and if it is to be commenced as the Canadian papers state, at Riviere du Loup, what is to become of the Nova Scotia end? It was proclaimed by Mr. Tilley all through New Brunswick that St. John was to be the terminus, and this three millions may be just sufficient to connect with St. John.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL:—I ask if there can be any stronger inducement to the people of this country to give a favourable consideration to their position than the very argument that the three millions guaranteed will only be sufficient to establish the terminus at St. John. I ask the people what position Nova Scotia would have been in if Canada and New Brunswick had formed the union without us and built the road to St. John. If the member for East Halifax and his colleagues had succeeded they would have deprived the people of this country of the benefit of having the terminus located among them, and the trade of Halifax and of the western part of the Province would have been drawn to St. John. So obvious is the truth of this argument that in England the exclamation was repeatedly heard, "what are the people of the city of Halifax thinking of? That a man among them should oppose union is something miraculous, for the road is going to build up their city till it will be second to none on the continent." When therefore the hon. member shows his anxiety that the privileges of Halifax should be preserved and that security should have been obtained that the terminus should be here I feel that his anxiety on these points would have been more useful and appropriate if displayed in England. He has told us that we did not procure money enough, but does it lie with him to say that? What was the conduct of some of the people's delegates in England even after the union bill passed? They tried to induce the people there to believe that Nova Scotians were not loyal, that we would soon be annexed to the United States and that the debt would be repudiated. What would have been the conduct of any patriot under the circumstances? Would it not be to say, "I represent the true interests of Nova Scotia, its people are opposed to Confederation and I am bound to take every legitimate means to oppose it, but having failed my next course is to use every means to obtain for the country the railway as cheaply as possible?" That is the stand that any patriotic man would have taken but I say and can substantiate my statement that up to the last moment, when the guarantee bill was awaiting its passage, the gentlemen who professed to represent the people of Nova Scotia left no stone unturned to destroy the good opinion of the people of England in these Colonies and to lead them to believe that we would pay neither interest nor principal of the loan. They used every effort to prevent the passage of the bill and if they had succeeded, what position would we have been in? We would have had to build the road by a loan at six per cent. Under the present arrangement in thirty-seven years the

debt will be paid off, and in the meantime we are only to pay five per cent., four per cent. for interest and one per cent. as a sinking fund, but without the guarantee we must have paid six per cent. and would have had the principle to pay after that.

These, then, are the patriots who now come forward and tell us we did not obtain enough, when we got all we did in opposition to their most strenuous exertions. Their position is that of a counsel who, after the verdict is given against him, taunts the opposite parties with not getting more. They have suddenly become very solicitous that the interests of Nova Scotia will not be looked after. They voted in favor of a bill by which £50,000 a year was to be laid as a tax on the people of this country for the railroad, and when they applied to the British Government they only asked three millions. I ask the people of this country, if three millions is all we could obtain, and if we had difficulty in getting that, who are to blame but the member for East Halifax and his colleagues, who went across the water to oppose us? Suppose they had never gone, how different would have been the position of the delegates; as it is, we obtained what we asked for, but how much more confidently could we have asked a larger sum under the circumstances. They took pains to inform the British Government that three millions was all that had been promised, and that a delegate some years ago agreed to take that sum and build the road. The British Government, after this intimation, felt disinclined to give the guarantee unless we would say that the amount would be sufficient to complete the work. Of course we had to ask to be relieved from that condition, and we asked for all that we could reasonably ask, and for all that Mr. Howe had asked. In answer to the complaint that no provision had been made for the work being begun at both ends, I ask where was the provision in the bill that these gentlemen passed some years ago? If they were so careful of the interests of the country, why did they not provide, in the measure which they passed by a party vote, that the work should be commenced at Truro? If they did not consider any such provision necessary, I ask with what face he can get up and complain of our not doing what they thought was unnecessary? For all time to come, therefore, when any complaint is made of our not procuring a larger guarantee, we will be in a position to say—"Go to these gentlemen who professed to represent the people, and ask them." If they had not been there, no complaint could have been made.

Mr. MCLELAN.—The hon. gentleman has made this important admission—that the delegates only asked for three millions, and he says that this was the sum asked for in 1862. In 1862 it was supposed that that sum would build the entire road, but recent surveys have demonstrated the impossibility of that, and there is therefore an important distinction between the position of the delegates and their predecessors. In view of the fact that such a sum had been shown insufficient, the delegates were in duty bound to have asked for a larger guaranty. The terms which they secured were not so advantageous as the terms obtained in 1862, for then we were allowed a breathing space before commencing to form the sink

ing fund; but we are now bound to commence paying off the debt immediately. As to the assertion that St. John would have been made the terminus if Nova Scotia had not gone into the Union, it is plain that that city would not have been the terminus unless it was considered capable of supplying the wants of Canada; and when we see Mr. Fleming estimating the cost of the road to St. John at fifteen million dollars, and we see exactly that sum provided, the fair inference is that St. John is to be the terminus.

As to the conditions of the guarantee, we are in about the same position as we were under the terms of 1862; for the stipulation then was that the act should not go into operation unless the proposal for a sinking fund was ratified by the Canadian Parliament, and we know that that Parliament repudiated the arrangement. Mr. Adderley said, in reference to the terms agreed upon by the delegates, that the guarantee would not be given unless the Confederate Parliament assented to the formation of a sinking fund. It was said by the Provincial Secretary that under certain circumstances we might have lost the benefit of the road, and have failed in getting connection with Moncton; but we know that New Brunswick has already contracted for the building of the road to the Nova Scotia border. Our increase of revenue last year was about \$184,000—more than enough to pay the interest for the Pictou extension—and with such prosperity we could easily have connected with New Brunswick. But supposing the Intercolonial line is built, does any one suppose that cargoes would be brought over here and shipped at Halifax, when an open port could be had at St. John, or within thirty-seven miles of the place where the road will be tapped? I am convinced that the much talked of prosperity which is promised to accrue to Halifax is all imagination, and that no part of Nova Scotia will suffer so much from Confederation as this city. I fear that this city will decline and diminish under the burthens that will be placed upon it, and that the "dead march in Saul" will ere long be appropriate to its condition.

HON. FIN. SEC.—One advantage is possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite—that being gifted with vivid imaginations, they do not shrink from placing before the people as facts the results which their fancy depicts. On this side of the house we have some desire to be consistent, because we feel that the common sense of the country demands consistency in the arguments and public conduct of its representatives. The hon. member who has just spoken has followed in the footsteps of the people's delegates, and used the arguments of the men who have endeavored to thwart and prevent the accomplishment of a work which for twenty-five years was the watchword of his party. The policy of constructing that road was the policy sustained by his father and the men whom he supported. The work was held forth by his party as the only thing that would give to this country its proper position in relation to the commerce of British America—the only mode of expanding our resources and making our Province the most desirable country in the world. That was the position of these gentlemen, until, to suit another purpose,

they had the hardihood to propound doctrines which totally differed from the teachings of their lifetime. What wonder was it that Mr. Lowe and other leading commercial men of the day in England declared that the road would not only not be a paying investment, but that it would be ruinous to the colonies, when they were being indoctrinated for months with the views which these gentlemen now enunciate?

The house adjourned.

TUESDAY, April 23.

The house met at 3 p. m.

BILLS.

Mr. COWIE introduced a bill to provide for the construction of the new bridge at Liverpool.

Mr. BOURINOT introduced a bill to amend the Act to incorporate the Boston and Bridgport Coal Mining Company.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE, as a report from the Committee on Agriculture, introduced a bill to amend the Act relating to Agriculture.

PRESBYTERIAN UNION ACT.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL introduced a bill to repeal the Act of 1862 relative to Presbyterian Church property.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that the agitation of this subject should end at some time. The introducer of the bill should feel that he had done his duty already in the matter, and that being defeated after doing all in his power, he might allow the matter to rest, instead of raising difficulties which did not really exist, and bringing in bills year after year to stir up strife among people who should live as brethren.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that personally he had not the slightest desire to meddle in this matter, and had only done his duty as a member of the house. He regretted that he was obliged to interfere session after session, and bring the quarrels of a religious body before the house. Last year the Revd. William Murray had pledged himself to effect a reconciliation, and upon that, and upon the recommendation of other leading clergymen, the bill had been withdrawn; a committee of the two branches of the churches had met in conference for several days, but had broken off without coming to any conclusion. The petitioners asked nothing belonging to any one else—they merely wished the rights which they enjoyed before the passage of the Act which they now asked to have repealed. It was formerly said that the petitioners were few in numbers, but they were now increasing to hundreds. The petitions had come principally from Inverness, and he had given Mr. Blanchard an opportunity of presenting them.

Mr. BLANCHARD remarked that on the second reading of the bill the discussion would be more appropriate.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. FRYOE, from the Committee on Private and Local Bills, reported a bill to incorporate the Dartmouth Gas and Water Company.

Mr. COFFIN presented a report from the committee on land damages. The report was adopted.

Mr. BILL presented a petition from C. W. Bartell and others for additional mail accommodation.

Mr. LONGLEY presented a petition from Spryfield, for the establishment of a way-office.

STATUTE LABOR LAW.

Mr. HEBB introduced a bill to amend chap. 64 R. S., of the expenditure of moneys on roads. He said that last year the rate of payment for men's labor on the roads had been raised, but no change had been made as to the hire of teams. The present allowance being \$1.50 the bill proposed to raise it to \$2 per day.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said that in view of the necessity for making the road moneys go as far as possible, it might fairly be considered that there was an obligation resting on the people to do the work on the roads without full remuneration.

Mr. COFFIN said he was glad to hear this subject brought forward. A great deal of difficulty had been experienced in getting teams to work.

Mr. KAULBACK remarked that the disproportion between the pay for men's wages and for teams was very apparent.

Mr. HEBB said that the pay was not sufficient for a pair of cattle working 10 hours a day. The addition proposed in the bill would be only just.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that in his county the only difficulty was to keep teams off the road under the existing rates. He had seen a yoke of oxen fastened to a stump and their owner receiving their pay, although there was no work for them. If a discretion was given to the Commissioners they were sure to go to the fullest extent of the allowance.

Mr. HEBB said that matters were very different in Lunenburg County; for a yoke of cattle could not be obtained for private labor at less than \$2 a day.

Mr. BILL thought it would be good economy to offer such remuneration as would procure good terms. It would be well to give the Commissioners something of the same discretion that was exercised by men in their private business.

Hon. PRO. SECY. said that the statute labor law possessed considerations of a somewhat peculiar character,—the act should not be altered unless the present rates failed to obtain the necessary amount of team labor.

Mr. ROBERTSON remarked that circumstances were different in the various counties. In Lunenburg, for example, just at the season when the money was being spent on the roads, the teams were engaged in hauling lumber and bark, and commanded prices as high as \$2.50 or \$3.

Mr. COWIE said that in his county good teams could not be procured at the present rates. For private labor the price paid was \$2.

Dr. BROWN said that in the county which he represented there was no difficulty in getting more teams than were wanted. He was opposed to the change.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE said that there was no doubt a difference between the counties, and the danger was that if the prices were raised it would affect counties in which no difficulty had been experienced.

Mr. BLACKWOOD said he could not support the bill as there was an abundance of cattle labor in his county.

EDUCATION.

Hon. PRO. SEC. presented a report from the committee on Education. The committee recommended a payment of \$80 to Donald Grant who had contracted for and completed a school which was destroyed by fire, and a grant of \$180 to compensate the owner of a building which had been given gratuitously for school purposes and had been burnt owing to its being occupied for that purpose.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. PRYOR reported up from the committee on private and local bills: a bill to provide for the construction of a new bridge at Liverpool; and a bill to amend the act incorporating the Boston and Bridgeport Coal Mining Company.

The house then went into Committee on Bills, and passed the following:

To change the name of River Phillip, East Branch, to Williamsdale.

To amend the act for the better encouragement of Education. In reference to the clause imposing a tax upon all male persons of the age of 21 years, resident in the city, for the support of Education.—

Mr. TOWNSEND considered it unfair to tax persons in the city and not allow them to vote.

Hon. PRO. SECY., Mr. PRYOR and Mr. TOBIN agreed that it would be proper to allow such persons a voice in the votes for Aldermen and Mayor.

Hon. PRO. SEC. according moved by the following addition, which passed *nem con*.—Upon the production to the presiding officer of such payment, the holder thereof shall be entitled to vote Mayor or Alderman at any election in the Ward in which such party resides for the year, wherein such payment shall have been made.

Some desultory discussion ensued respecting the bill relative to the city Market House.

Mr. TOBIN said that the bill required a great deal of consideration before it was allowed to pass. He did not think it advisable to make a change in the character of the market—a change that was never contemplated when the building was erected. He moved that the bill be deferred until that day three months.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON supported the bill on the ground that the City Council had the right to dispose of their property as they thought most advisable, and that it was positively cruel to afford no protection to the poor women who came to market on rainy and stormy days. Everything objectionable, he added, had been struck out of the bill.

Hon. PRO. SECY. thought it but right to allow the Council to make such arrangements as they considered wise.

Mr. TOBIN said that the present market could not afford the accommodation required by the women who came to market.

Mr. BLANCHARD was in favour of granting accommodation to the market women.

Hon. FIN. SEC. alluded to the discomfort that the market women were exposed to in rainy and stormy weather.

The bill finally passed.

Mr. TOBIN'S motion having been rejected by a large majority on a division.

The following bills also passed:—
To incorporate a Public Hall Company at Windsor.

To provide for the improvement of roads in Guysboro'

To incorporate the Pictou Mining Company.
To incorporate the Dartmouth Gas and Water Company.

Dr. BROWN presented a petition from Wellington Eagles for compensation for injury incurred at target practice. Referred to the Government.

Mr. HILL introduced an act to amend chap. 36 R. S., relative to Crown Lands and County Surveyors.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table a statement asked for by the hon. member for East Halifax, relative to the collectorship at Amherst.

RAILWAY AFFAIRS.

Hon. PRO. SEC., by command, laid on the table a report of the Chief Engineer on the Pictou Railway.

Mr. TOBIN presented a report from the committee on railway affairs.

Mr. LONGLEY asked on what grounds the committee recommended a grant of \$600 to Messrs. Conlon. He failed to perceive any strong claim on the part of those gentlemen to compensation for the deterioration of their property by the Street Railway, for though they were most deserving persons they should meet the loss as others had to, and it should be remembered that they had received every consideration in the way of patronage from the Railway department for years.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that the committee had no doubt given the matter a careful consideration, and the grounds of this recommendation appeared on the face of the report.

The report was adopted.

The House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 24.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

EDUCATION.

The bill to amend the act for the better encouragement of education was read a third time.

Mr. KILLAM thought it would not be wise to log the working of the educational system by establishing a provincial board of examiners.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that the expense of examinations would be greatly diminished, and the confusion consequent on re-examinations in different counties would be avoided.

Mr. KILLAM thought that the readiest mode would be to exempt teachers from re-examination.

ROAD AND BRIDGE SERVICE

Mr. ARCHIBALD introduced a bill to enable the members for Colchester County to borrow sum of money on the credit of the road moneys of the county. He said that this was necessary to meet the expenditure which would be required.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill to provide for the improvement of the great road from Liverpool to Annapolis. The bill enables the members for the county to borrow a sum not exceeding \$1500 to complete an alteration in the road.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE introduced a bill to authorize the members for Cumberland to borrow \$600.

Dr. HAMILTON introduced a bill to incorporate the Victoria Harbor Pier Company.

UNION ACT.

Hon. PRO. SEC. laid on the table a copy of the Act for a Union of the British North American Colonies, as it passed the Imperial Parliament, there having been some slight verbal alterations from the copy previously submitted.

Mr. MILLER enquired whether some clauses had not been added in the House of Commons.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that as the clauses relating to the monetary arrangements had to be inserted by the Commons, they were printed in red ink in the bill introduced in the House of Lords.

Mr. MILLER asked whether it was the intention of the Government to have any copies of the bill printed for circulation throughout the country. It contained the constitution under which we would hereafter live, and it was most desirable that it should be distributed in some durable shape; and this would have the effect of preventing the misrepresentations which were being made from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL remarked that the Act had been already published in the newspapers.

Mr. MILLER replied that in that form the bill could not be preserved, and it was not probable that fifty persons in the country could put their hands upon a copy.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said it was of the highest importance that correct information on the subject should be widely circulated. Newspaper publications were so ephemeral that when in one issue of a journal published by an hon. member opposite, he saw a statement glaringly inconsistent with the one that preceded it, he found difficulty in making an accurate comparison. The Act would be placed in the hands of the public printer for publication in the Journals of the House, and at the same time a number of extra copies could be procured without much additional expense.

Mr. ANNAND said he did not object to the publication as the information which the bill would give was very valuable, but he would suggest that as the Government had been making free with the public moneys in circulating a recently issued pamphlet on the benefits of Confederation, an equal sum should be placed at the disposal of the opposition for the purpose of distributing a reply to that production.

Hon. PRO. SEC. replied that the proposition would receive a favorable consideration whenever a document of equal value and containing an equal amount of accurate and reliable information was produced.

Mr. KAULBACK thought that the recent pamphlet of Mr. Howe on the Organization of the Empire should be published. It had been printed in the paper of the hon. member for E. Halifax, and had been endorsed by that gentleman as the scheme propounded by him and his colleagues, and placed before the people of England. That production was considered utterly fruitless and futile by those whom it was intended to influence, but it was useful as showing what the scheme of the opposition was. Those gentlemen proposed that the question should be settled, not by the people them-

selves, as they recently contended, but by their representatives. Attempts were being made to frighten people by the idea that they would be drafted for military service in Canada, but that scheme proposed that Nova Scotians should be taxed to an unlimited extent, and be liable to be drafted away to any part of the world. That was the scheme of these gentlemen—they admitted that a change was necessary, and they were willing that it should be made by the people's representatives with the arbitration of the Imperial Parliament.

Mr. COFFIN said that the hon. member must fancy himself stumping the County of Lunenburg.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE, from the committee on Mines and Minerals, introduced a bill to amend the present law relating to mines, one of its objects being to prevent pilfering at the gold mines.

The house adjourned.

THURSDAY, April, 25.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

Mr. HATFIELD called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that there was not a quorum of members present.

The house therefore stood adjourned to 10 o'clock on the following morning.

FRIDAY, April 26.

The house met at 10 o'clock.

THE COUNT OUT.

Hon. PRO. SECY. said it would be gratifying for the member from Argyle to know that the journals would record in connection with his action of yesterday a notoriety such as no member of the house had ever attained before. They would show that a member in discharge of what he considered his duty to the country availed himself of the opportunity immediately after the reading of the journals to count out the house. The records of the house would be searched in vain to find an instance in which any member was so regardless of the waste of public time and money. The people would have to pay a pound a day to each member of the legislature for no consideration whatever because he had chosen to exercise a power never exercised in a similar way by any member before. So unseemly a spectacle as a member counting out the house before the time when members usually assembled, and before the opening of the galleries was never before presented,—he could easily understand why this step was taken before the galleries were open and the reporters in their place, for a member who desired to take such a liberty with the house and to insult the people by preventing the legislature from doing business at that period of the session might well desire to screen his action from the country. He, (Prov. Secy.) would feel himself unworthy of his position if he did not denounce and discountenance so unseemly an act, but it was the only act at the close of the hon. member's public life to which he could point as having been achieved by himself.

Mr. HATFIELD said that as to the public money being wasted, the history of the past two years shewed how much regard was attached to that. The Pro. Sec. had had the ho-

nor of being appointed on a delegation which would take an enormous sum out of the pockets of the poor people of the country. He contended that he had done perfectly right in calling attention to the state of the house yesterday. When prayers were being read only three members were present, and there were only five when the clerk counted. As to the time and pay of members being wasted, the fact was that the house only sat about three hours a day, and if the Prov. Sec. was so anxious about the public business, why could not the house meet twice a day, and do the business as it should be done?

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that the hon. member had failed to make the only apology that he could have made: that he was not responsible for his action of yesterday.

Mr. HATFIELD replied that he had done nothing but what was consistent with his duty.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill to enable the Sisters of Charity to hold certain lands. He said that the object was to enable the Sisters of Charity to convey certain property at present under mortgage.

Mr. ARCHIBALD reported a bill from the Committee on Law Amendments in reference to Dyke and Marsh Lands. He said that some difficulty had arisen in the township of Falmouth, but instead of approving of the bill applicable to that locality, the committee proposed to make the law general, and to provide that the parties interested in the lands should meet once a year, and that the commissioners should lay before them an account of the year's expenditure, and if the commissioners failed to do so, his office should thereby be rendered vacant, and then successors should be elected by two-thirds of the parties interested.

Mr. CHURCHILL thought the bill unobjectionable.

Dr. HAMILTON thought that a difficulty might arise in localities where different meetings would have to be held if they were convened on the same day.

Hon. PRO. SEC. laid on the table the road scale of the Co. Cumberland.

Mr. COLIN CAMPBELL introduced a bill to change the name of Petite Passage in the Co. of Digby.

Mr. ARCHIBALD reported from the Committee on Law Amendments, an act to amend the practice of the Supreme Court, in connection with Prothonotaries. He also reported against a bill (from the Legislative Council) in reference to evidence in matrimonial cases.

Mr. ROSS presented the road scale of Victoria.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table the petition of Hector McLeod, in reference to Crown Lands in Cape Breton. It had been presented to the Government by Mr. Bourinot.

The bill respecting the sale of Petroleum was read a second time.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition in respect to the setting of nets in the Liverpool River. Objection was made to the receipt of the petition at this late period, but it was finally received.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL presented a petition from Middle River, Victoria, respecting Presbyterian Church property.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced an act to amend

Chap. 123 R. S., 3rd series, relative to the Supreme Court; it sets the holding of the Court commencing at Windsor one week ahead.

THE FISHERIES.

Mr. S. McDONNELL reported from the Committee on the fisheries. The committee recommend the appointment of a Chief Inspector of River Fisheries, and order the Courts of Sessions to do their duty strictly. The Committee do not advise the appointment of a Chief Inspector of Pickled Fish.

Petitions from Granville and from James Carrott are not favorably considered. As respects the petition of E. D. Davison of Lunenburg, the committee recommend that no prosecution be entered against the petitioner until the fishway is inspected. A law to remove obstructions for the passage of fish in Shubenacadie is recommended.

The petition of William Prosser, of Kemptville, in Yarmouth, is favorably considered. The Committee speak favorably of the pamphlets of Mr Knight, and of the efforts of the Inland Fisheries and Game Protection Society.

Mr. TOBIN said that mercantile men in the city were in favor of having the inspection law, which was repealed some years ago, re-enacted. The fishermen were now subject to loss and inconvenience in consequence of the want of inspection. Every means should be taken to give character to the fish exported. One class of the petitioners were of opinion that there should be such classification as formerly existed; others, again, believed that the classification ought to be assimilated to that of Massachusetts. All the petitioners, however, he thought, were in favor of a general inspector, to be paid out of the general funds. He was desirous of doing everything to meet the wishes of the fishermen.

Mr. KAULBACK alluded to the great value of our fisheries, and to the necessity of doing everything that was practicable to encourage them. Their value might be seen from the interest that had always been taken in them by the Americans. As long as the Provinces were isolated, and without means of co-operating with each other, it was impossible to protect our fisheries as they ought to be. He had read with much interest Mr. Knight's pamphlet, although he did not agree with all of his deductions. He thought the appointment of an Inspector of Inland Fisheries would work beneficially. He was of opinion that the committee had done all they could well do in reference to the petition from Mr. Davison, LaHave, which he had presented.

Mr. ROSS thought that all the proceeds arising from the privileges accorded to the Americans should be given for the use of the fishermen.

Mr. COLIN CAMPBELL did not think any benefit would arise either to the merchant or fishermen from the appointment of a Chief Inspector.

Mr. TOBIN thought that the suggestion of the hon member for Victoria was worthy of consideration. He thought the money might be well expended in providing models of boats and giving information to the fishermen as to the best modes of curing fish. He alluded also to the advisability of stimulating trade with the Mediterranean and South America.

The report was adopted.

Mr. S. MACDONNELL introduced a bill, in accordance with the prayer of the report, for the better protection of the Inland Fisheries.

PILOTAGE.

Mr. KILLAM reported from a committee to whom was referred the petition of Mr. Phelan and others, in respect to pilotage, a bill to amend that portion of Chap. 79 R. S., "of pilotage," regarding the port of Halifax.

Mr. TOBIN was desirous of knowing if the change proposed was demanded. The pilots were a very worthy and hard working class of the population.

Mr. KILLAM said that there had been an application from Mr. Phelan, agent of a steamboat company, on the subject, and the committee had also conferred with a commissioner for licensing pilots.

Mr. TOBIN regretted that the bill had not been introduced at an early period of the Session, so that it would receive fuller consideration. He trusted that notice would be given to him before the second reading.

PETITION.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table a petition from Wellington Eagles, asking compensation for injury incurred in target practice.

Referred to committee on militia affairs.

RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. CHURCHILL presented a petition from W H Blanchard and other residents of Windsor, asking that, as a heavy liability would be placed upon the county in providing the right of way for the Annapolis Railway, the taxation be spread over the whole county by an equal pound rate. He said that by the existing law the assessors were directed to have reference to the proximity of the various properties to the Railway in levying the tax. Hants county had already paid for right of way \$80,000, and of that sum the township of Windsor had paid \$15,707. He urged the prayer of the petition strongly on the House, and asked leave to introduce a bill in accordance therewith.

Hon PRO SEC'Y remarked that if the representations contained in the petition were true, it might be important to enquire whether a tax should not be levied upon the rest of the Province to compensate the people of Windsor for the injury that the railway appeared to be doing to their property, for the petition stated that the value of their property had already been depreciated fifteen or twenty per cent. He feared it was too late to stop the railway, but it would seem that something should be done for the people of Windsor.

Mr. PARKER thought that the petitioners could hardly be serious in asking that persons living sixty miles from the line of railway should pay an equal rate with those who had the road passing their doors. He understood that there was still a large sum due from the county, and the complaint formerly was that, as other counties were being benefited, they should contribute to the expense. There could be no greater injustice than to make the rural districts pay equally with those more immediately benefited.

Mr. HILL said that he had not been made aware of the petition, but was prepared to introduce a

bill to effect the same object. Windsor had already been heavily taxed, and was about to be taxed again for the right of way and station ground through the very heart of the town.

Mr. TONIN said that some consideration should be given to the matter before imposing upon the township the expense of providing for a second station ground. He thought that the accommodation was ample for the requirements of the company as well as for the Railway department. One gentleman in Windsor had built a house and prepared his grounds for a garden, and the company had taken part of his grounds and run the railway close to his house. He had looked forward with great anxiety for years to the time when our railways would be extended to the Gulf of St. Lawrence on the one hand, and the Bay of Fundy on the other, and believed that with this accomplished and with the prospects of the Intercolonial road the greatest results might be expected, but a good deal of consideration should be given to the position of the residents of Windsor.

Hon. FIN SEC'R said that hardship and inconvenience were only to be expected where a road passed through a settlement like Windsor. In some instances it was impossible to avoid the destruction of valuable property. He had gone to Windsor during the survey and knew that the impression was that the proper line for the road would have been outside the village, but it was essential that the road should be a continuation of the present line and therefore the route had to be as at present unless the station now used were abandoned, which was not to be thought of, because it would involve the waste of an enormous sum of money. The only way in which the expense of a new station house could be avoided would be to make the present terminus available for the Annapolis road. This question had engaged the attention of the Government and he was not in a position to give a definite answer respecting it, but the Government had every desire to prevent, as far as possible, the invasion of private rights. The eminent engineer who had been engaged on the Annapolis line had declared that the accommodation afforded by the present terminus would be inadequate, unless the unoccupied portion of the ground were reclaimed, and this could only be done at a heavy expense.

Mr. CHURCHILL said he had no idea that a second station ground would be required. Only about a quarter of the ground taken up originally was now in use and the expenditure of any more money was therefore unnecessary. He was aware that a good deal of pains had been taken in the location of the road, and he believed as far as that was concerned the people of Windsor were very well satisfied.

Mr. KILLAM said that this was only the commencement of the difficulties which had originated in the over-anxiety of the Government to have the road built. The policy of constructing the railways by companies was most unwise under the circumstances of the country. The mismanagement in connection with the Pictou Railway had also grown out of a desire to bring into operation too speedily a work of great magnitude.

The Government, for the purpose of fortifying themselves in their position, had placed the country in this embarrassment.

Hon. PRO SEC'R said that the hon member was quite right in saying that this question was under discussion because the Government were anxious and determined to provide for the construction of railways before the close of the existing legislature. But for their earnest desire to keep faith with the country and the house the subject would not have required discussion. He would tell the hon member however that the time had arrived when, owing to the obstructive policy which he, Mr. Killam, had pursued from the first day of his public life, his views had about the least weight of any member's in the legislature. When the construction by Government was proposed by Mr. Howe, Mr. Killam having used every means to obstruct the railway policy brought forward and urged with all his energy the folly of government undertaking to construct railways, and having been defeated on that point the first thing he did was to put his name to a document which he sent to England to convince the capitalists that the money they invested in our debentures would never be repaid, but he had lived to see the day when the same man who thus vehemently denounced construction by the Government as ruinous to the country had declared that our lines of railway could be extended to Pictou, Annapolis, Canso, Yarmouth and New Brunswick. Under these circumstances could the hon member claim any other position than that of the obstructor of progress of every description. When Mr. Howe had brought forward a project for building the Intercolonial line the hon member had stated that while he was convinced that the country could not grapple with that undertaking, he thought it would be safe to extend to Pictou, and he promised so to instruct his constituents, but what had placed him in opposition? It was because the Government whom he then supported, pledged as they were to carry the road to Pictou, were true to their promises, and asked Parliament to enable them to redeem their pledges to the country. The hon member had made that an excuse for violating his own recorded pledge and going into the most determined hostility. The only pretence upon which this action was founded was that the revenues of the country would not permit the extension by the Government without stripping the other services of the country, and he had now declared that no extension by companies should be encouraged, and that our revenues were ample to build the road to all the termini before mentioned. With such words on record for every man to see and hear, he would ask if it was of the slightest consequence what the hon member said? The old credit which the member for Yarmouth could claim was that of being the consistent obstructor of every improvement, and other men who had received his opinions, seeing from the results that they were wrong, and that the policy of progress was the true one, had abandoned the hon member, and left him almost alone. The hon member had given to every principle he had enunciated, in the course of his public life, a more

emphatic contradiction than any one else could give.

What estimate had he formed of the House and of the people if he had no respect for the House when he had ventured at the close of his public career, and under the circumstances which had placed him in opposition, to say that it was unwise to give to a company the means of expending half a million of their own money to carry on the road because the work should be done by money borrowed on the credit of the Province? The policy of extending the railway to the Gulf of St. Lawrence was regarded by every intelligent man as sound and judicious, but what position would the country have been in if the member for Yarmouth had been allowed to prevent this being accomplished? On the other hand there were few men even in the remote eastern sections who did not believe that the extension to Annapolis was going largely to increase the prosperity of the Province. Local difficulties would of course occur, and he knew well that instead of a Government having anything to hope for from an energetic railway policy it was the reverse, and that the county clamoring most loudly for extension is the one that would first turn its back upon the Government. That had been the experience of other administrations but that consideration had not prevented the present Government, and he trusted that it would prevent no future Government from going forward in a statesmanlike manner. This was the answer he gave to the constant snarling and cavilling of the hon. member, whose only cause of complaint was that the Government, instead of holding office merely for the benefit of its members, had shown a determination to advance the interests of the country.

Mr KILLAM said it was true that he had objected to government construction, and the Provincial Secretary had taken that view himself but notwithstanding his opposition that policy had been adopted and therefore should be adhered to. As to the statement that he had abandoned the Government because they were determined to go on with the Pictou extension he asked if the whole house did not know his reasons for going into opposition? His idea had been that the extension should not have been undertaken in the first session, and it should be remembered that the Government held their positions because they pledged themselves to reduce the public expenditure. He, Mr K., had helped them into power on that policy, and feeling under deep responsibility for the stand he had taken, he pressed on the Government to show to the country that they were disposed to carry out their pledges. They had refused to do so, and he gave that as one of the principal reasons for his opposition. What would have been thought of him as a public man if he had adopted any other course? He had advised the government to go on slowly and surely, but they went recklessly on, giving as an answer to his remonstrance that the people had amply supplied the treasury with money. Was there not as much need of retrenchment, though such was the case, when such large ex-

penditures were being incurred in connection with the public works? These were his reasons for leaving the Government side, and he did not regret his action, for no man could say now that he held one policy before and another after his election. The assurance came from every quarter that his policy was sustained and approved by the country. No doubt after the policy of construction by Government had been adopted it should be pursued, but the work should be done cautiously. It did not require any financial skill to see that our revenues would at some time enable us to extend our railways to the points mentioned, and the credit for that fact was not due to the Government, but to the honest and hard-working people of the country, whose toil had put the money into the treasury — to the producers throughout the Province. He could claim, as a producer, to have done his share towards the general prosperity, and no man could charge him with selfish interest in his public conduct. The Pro. Sec. had said that that the object of the Government was not so much to hold office as to go on with the public improvements, but upon that point there was a difference of opinion, and the Government had put it out of the power of the Province to carry forward its works, and had given its revenues to hands with more weighty objects to undertake.

After Confederation had been secured, the Government should certainly have made some better bargain in reference to our railways. If inconsistency was to be the subject of enquiry, it would not be hard to astonish the people at the course of the Government. The Provincial Secretary had enquired, a few days ago, what authority the people's delegates had for going to England: was not the authority of the majority of the people a good one? The hon gentleman had also ridiculed the idea of the petitions being sent; but after 1859, when he was disappointed at the elections, and after two gentlemen thought proper to change their views the Provincial Secretary went dancing down to the westward to get up petitions to displace them, and afterwards contended that the Governor should dissolve the House because these two gentlemen had chosen to change sides. Was the charge of misrepresenting their constituents, which was made at that time by the hon gentleman, to be compared with the misrepresentation of the thirty-two gentlemen who gave their support to Confederation, while almost every man among them admitted that their constituents were hostile to the measure? Two members could not change the fate of the country, and if the government of that day had been defeated, the dissolution which would have followed would have given the people an opportunity of reviewing their action; but by this measure of Confederation the whole face of the constitution was changed and the revenues of the country given away.

The Provincial Secretary had thrown contempt on the resolutions passed at the large meetings held throughout the country last summer, but the resolutions which he had obtained some years ago in two constituencies were thought sufficient

to effect a dissolution of the House. Like other work done in this country, the signing of the petitions against Confederation was no doubt cheaply and roughly done but the signatures were quite as genuine as those obtained on the previous occasion. One of the members against whom the Provincial Secretary had raised that agitation retired from public life, and the other returned to his first love; but in this instance the men who had effected the change would not dare to face the country, for there could be no doubt as to what the result in a few months would be. There was a "still small voice" being heard everywhere, and the Provincial Secretary would find that he would not be able to mould the opinions of the whole people as the potter does his clay, but that the electors would stand up and speak for themselves. This occasion had been referred to as the close of his public life; it might be the last occasion on which he would address the Legislature, and he would therefore say that if, in the course of his public conduct, he had misjudged or spoken harshly in any instance, it was a matter which he regretted.

It was evident that, whatever the talents of members of the Government might be, they had not the training to deal with the large financial questions which they had undertaken to manage, as the mismanagement in the public works would show. The Pictou road showed mismanagement on a large scale, while in the different departments the ordinary duties had not been attended to; public officers were allowed to withhold the public moneys until they became defaulters, and the whole efforts of the Government were to keep themselves in power. This had been denied, but the people knew the facts, and the actions of the administration would speak louder than their words. The country had for the last four years been rising and increasing in prosperity,—there was no reason to be dissatisfied with its progress, but its revenues had now been taken away leaving nothing which could be relied on hereafter for local improvements. If his advice had been taken, matters would not have come to that point, and the Government would have been in a position to which the people would be glad to restore them, when the time came for ascertaining in whom the confidence of the country was reposed.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that on a petition from Hants being presented, asking for a change in a certain law, the hon. member for Yarmouth had taken the opportunity to attack the railway policy of the Government, and to get away again from that subject to Confederation. He reminded him of a professional gentleman who, while waiting for a case to come on would repeatedly sleep in court, and his anxiety about an absent witness prompted him to cry out repeatedly in his doze, "Crier, call John Rowe." So the hon. member for Yarmouth seemed to go asleep, and on waking up to call "Confederation."

The hon. member had promised himself that the people would back up his policy,—they must find out what it was; his policy seemed to change to suit every emergency. When he wished to obstruct the Intercolonial road, he

pitted the Pictou road against it; and when the Annapolis extension was proposed, he argued that it should be built out of the Provincial funds. After preaching the inability of the Province to build the railways for years, he had "out-Heroded Herod" by going beyond any one else in his ideas of extension. The hon. member was as well known in the House as elsewhere, and how many men of any party could be got to support him? He had been jiggling from one side to the other until he hardly knew where to find to find himself,—and after saying that railway construction would be ruinous, he had proposed an outlay of thirteen million of dollars in their extension.

Getting away from this question, the hon. member had referred to the petitions got up some years ago, but there was this difference between them and the Confederation petitions, that the former were presented to those to whom they were addressed, while the latter never saw the light of day. The hon. member had talked about a "small voice" that was being heard; he was inclined to think that with such a history of inconsistency, the voice that would be heard in support of the hon. gentleman would be very small indeed. When the hon. member excused himself for leaving his party by saying that the Government refused to redeem their pledges of retrenchment, did he forget that when retrenchment in the salaries of certain officers was proposed, he had opposed the Government, repudiating his private utterances to the Government, and placing himself in a position to be contradicted by his own handwriting?

As regards the question of the Windsor terminus, it should be remembered that under the law the company were to be controlled by the Government, and it might safely be expected that no more privileges were exacted than would be required. He had spent a day at Windsor investigating with respect to the terminus, and had no doubt that arrangements could be made for avoiding a single dollar's unnecessary expense. Windsor having already paid £4000, and it being true that the benefits of the road would not result immediately to that township, some consideration should be bestowed upon the mode in which the tax should be levied, though he did not think that the difficulty would be fairly solved by imposing an equal pound rate on the county.

Mr. KILLAM said he would now meet the charge of having moved in Committee of Supply for retaining the salaries of certain officers, after urging retrenchment upon the Government. The Provincial Secretary's original proposal had been to effect a saving of \$79,000 by a reduction of the salaries of the principal officers of the Government; but in the proposal to which the Attorney General referred a saving of \$400 was contemplated in the salaries of the Collectors of Customs at Pictou and Yarmouth. Because he had objected to that reduction, he had been accused of going back from all he had previously advocated. It was small economy to attempt in that way to save \$100, when the original scheme was for \$79,000, and to make a charge of inconsistency out of his action was, to use a homely phrase, "small potatoes."

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that when, in their first attempt at retrenchment, the Government

found the "Yarmouth School" walking across the floor to assist their opponents in defeating the project, it was a slap in the face that was not anticipated, but that might be passed over as a trivial matter in view of the fact that when, after years of arduous exertion, the Government obtained leave to retrace their own salaries, and save \$30,000 per annum, the hon. member for Yarmouth showed the same deadly antagonism as on the question of the \$400. The hon. member's attitude on the question would show the sincerity of his expressions, and show whether he was in the position to taunt the Government with incapacity in the management of the public finances. In that respect, no Government ever stood in a position in which they could so fairly challenge the confidence of the country.

Mr. MCLELAN rose to speak to the question, but as the usual hour for adjournment had arrived, the debate was adjourned.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SECY. presented the petition of Mr. John Campbell, asking an investigation into his claim to be the first discoverer of gold. He said that Mr. Campbell was a gentleman who, by the application of unusual mental attainments, had placed himself, as a scientific man, in a high position before the country, and he felt impressed with the belief that the claim now made was a just one, for Mr. Campbell, before the discovery of gold at Tangier, had shown him gold dust which he had procured from clay at Dartmouth.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON, from the committee on city bills, reported three bills relating to the city of Halifax.

Mr. BILL introduced a bill to legalize the appointment of certain trustees of schools.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. laid on the table the petition of C. W. Fairbanks, asking remuneration for services performed. It was referred to committee on Mines and Minerals.

House adjourned to half-past 10 o'clock the next day.

SATURDAY, April 27.

The House met at 10.30.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PRO. SECY. laid on the table the report of the Commander of H. M. S. *Lily* on the fog trumpet at Sambro, this report having been omitted from the journals of last session.

Mr. HILL presented a report from the Penitentiary Committee, which was received and adopted.

Mr. PRYOR reported a number of bills from the Committee on private and local bills.

The House then went into Committee on bills and passed the following bills:

To incorporate the Halifax Asylum for the Blind.

To incorporate the Victoria Harbour Pier Company, Brown's Brook, King's.

Relative to assessment in the City of Halifax.

To legalize the appointment of certain trustees of schools in King's County.

To provide for the improvement of a road between Guysboro and Canso.

To provide for the improvement of roads in Colchester.

To provide for the building of a bridge across the Wallace River.

To incorporate the Merchants' Marine Insurance Company.

To change the name of River Phillip Settlement, Cumberland.

To change the name of Petite Passage, Digby.

To authorize the Sisters of Charity to sell certain property.

To incorporate the Bays of St. Lawrence and Fundy Canal Company.

To amend the act for the improvement of agriculture.

To provide for the construction of a new bridge at Liverpool.

To amend the act relative to Poors' Asylum, Halifax.

To amend the act incorporating the Boston and Bridgeport Coal Company.

To naturalize certain aliens.

To amend the practice of the Supreme Court.

The Committee rose and reported the foregoing bills.

Mr. MILLER introduced an act further to amend the act incorporating the R. C. Episcopal Corporation of Halifax.

Mr. PRYOR reported up a bill to divide a polling district in the county of Guysboro.

Mr. ANNAND introduced an act to change two polling places in Halifax.

Hon. FIN. SEC. introduced an act to provide for certain roads in Pictou.

The bill providing for the better protection of the Inland Fisheries was read a second time.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON, from the committee on City Bills, reported an act to amend the act incorporating the City of Halifax.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the bill in reference to the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, but the bill was not proceeded with in the absence of some gentlemen who were interested in it.

Hon. FIN. SEC. introduced an act to provide for the defraying of certain expenses of the civil government of the Province.

BILL RELATING TO SURVEYORS.

Mr. HILL moved the second reading of the bill he had introduced on a former day to amend Chap. 36 R. S., relative to Crown Lands.

Mr. MILLER opposed the bill as not demanded under the existing state of things. The Government had now the power of preventing incompetent persons being appointed surveyors.

Mr. HILL said that any person who wished to become a surveyor would, under the bill, have to undergo an examination as to his qualifications, and attain a certificate. Such a measure was certainly required.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said the second clause would show how stringent was the character of the bill: "No person shall be appointed to make any Crown Land survey in the Province until he shall have attained the age of twenty-one years, and shall have gone through a course of geometry and map drawing, and shall be also officially acquainted with spherical trigonometry, in order to enable him to ascertain the lati-

tude and draw meridians lines, and he shall have to undergo a competitive examination before a Board appointed by the Governor in Council." He did not think the condition of the country warranted such a measure; few officers were, on the whole, more efficient than the present staff of surveyors.

Mr. HILL said that there were notoriously many men acting as land surveyors entirely in competent. Plenty of men would gladly avail themselves of the provisions and requirements of the act.

Mr. COFFIN said that the bill was evidently intended to turn out the present surveyors, and put in new officers.

Mr. HILL said that the bill did not interfere with the present country surveyors.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that there was no doubt that the incompetency of many surveyors led to a great deal of litigation, and that some measure was necessary to require higher qualifications on the part of those exercising such important duties. He alluded to cases where surveyors had given the most insistent reports of surveys they had made. The measure was an important one, and should not be passed without due consideration.

Mr. KAULBACK said that no such cases had come under his notice in Lunenburg County. The regularly appointed surveyors had their qualifications tested at the Crown Land Office, and every confidence could be reposed in them. He thought the change would be arbitrary and unwise.

Mr. ANNAND thought that the evils complained of were chiefly owing to the vicious system which deprived heads of departments of the right to appoint their subordinates. By throwing the responsibility on the heads of all the departments, he believed that far greater efficiency could be attained.

Mr. WHITMAN said that a large portion of the difficulties requiring investigation by the Crown Land Committee arose from the incompetency of surveyors, and a standard of qualifications seemed therefore desirable, but he thought the bill too restrictive.

Mr. KAULBACK moved that the bill be deferred.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that a person who could not come up to the standard mentioned in the bill should not be employed in surveying, and to meet another objection, a clause could be inserted to prevent the bill operating on persons now engaged in the business. There were too many cases in which, from the incompetency of a person holding himself out as a surveyor, parties had lost all the improvements which they had made upon lands they considered their own.

Mr. S. MACDONNELL said that the bill opened up a new principle, and there was just as much reason for applying it to every other profession as to surveying.

Mr. MILLER asked if anything had occurred in the management of the Crown Lands to require this change. In the four years experi-

ence which he had had as a member of the Crown Land Committee he could not charge his memory with more than one or two cases in which blame was attached to the surveyors throughout the country. The difficulties alluded to by the Attorney General had frequently arisen in connection with well qualified men, and he had seen some first class surveyors giving evidence in some of the litigated cases in the eastern counties. It would hardly be supposed that any man desiring his lines run would employ a person so grossly incompetent as had been described. It was well known that some of the best school teachers had been unable to pass an examination under the educational syllabus, while others far less competent obtained certificates, and so it would be with many of the most practical and qualified surveyors. Some evidence of the necessity of the bill should be presented before the house should be called on to pass it.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE said he was inclined to think that such a measure would be exceedingly beneficial, because it would protect not only private individuals but the treasury from the losses occasioned by the inefficiency of surveyors. He thought that any man possessing the training proper for his business could pass the proposed examination.

Mr. KAULBACK thought that many of the difficulties referred to arose from the want of proper plans. The bill would throw out of employment a number of practical and efficient men. He believed that all the surveyors in his county were capable of doing the duties they were called on to perform.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that his remarks had no reference to the Government surveyors—on the contrary, these officers were being injured by the competition of inefficient men. Where a dispute arose in connection with land it was quite common for some person to go out and run a line different from that previously given, and then go into court to sustain it. The motion to defer the bill passed—27 to 9.

INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION OF 1868

Hon. ATTY. GEN. moved the second reading of the bill in reference to the holding of an Exhibition at Halifax, in 1868.

Mr. S. MACDONNELL said it was true that a resolution was passed at the last session to provide for the holding of the exhibition, but circumstances transpiring since then might fairly induce the house to look at the matter in a different view. The bill for the Union had, to a great extent, transferred the department of Agriculture to the Dominion of Canada, and this was a ground on which he thought the House would be justified in rescinding the resolution. It would be said, no doubt, that the House was pledged, but he asked, to whom? No agreement had been entered into, and nothing had occurred to make the action which he proposed unwarrantable. He was of opinion that such an exhibition as was proposed would be of little or no value to the counties in which it was most desirable to promote Agriculture. What

benefit could Cape Breton or even Lunenburg and other of the counties excepting two or three, derive from the exhibition? The vote of \$6000 would only be the beginning and would probably soon be swollen to £6000, and he would remind the house that this money must come out of the local revenues. The cost of the Exhibition would probably be equal to £200 for each of the Agricultural counties, and how much better would it be to devote this money to the importation of improved stock. He gave the Board of Agriculture credit for what they had accomplished in that direction, and would be willing to vote for further appropriations for the same purpose. While he did not look so despondingly as some upon the future of the country, he felt that we must economise and not incur any lavish expenditure. He trusted that the House would reconsider its action, and not vote money which the country could get no benefit from.

Mr. BLACKWOOD said he was aware that exhibitions were generally advantageous to the country in bringing people from the different sections to see what progress was being made, but at this juncture he thought it would be unfair to the country to incur an expenditure such as that proposed. As the principal resources of the country had been given to another country, it was incumbent on us to nurse our remaining revenues in the most careful manner. It was probable that his county would receive considerable benefit from the exhibition, but the more remote sections would gain little or nothing by it. It had been found necessary to borrow on the credit of the road moneys of Colchester county, and as it was very uncertain what the grant of next year for that service would be, he felt it would be wrong to make the draw on our resources which the bill proposed. The \$6000 which the Government proposed to appropriate had been given for the purchase of a stock farm and should not have been diverted.

Mr. ROSS said that there could be no doubt economy would have to be carefully observed in the management of our revenues, but he regretted in this age of improvement to hear any person express himself opposed to the holding of an exhibition which would do more good than could be foreseen or explained. The citizens of Halifax had taken a deep interest in the matter, and would no doubt contribute largely. The \$6000 had been already voted, and was lying in one of the banks. He entirely dissented from the idea that Cape Breton would receive no advantage from the exhibition. What was there to prevent the people of the Island from bringing down their coal and fish and every thing they manufactured.

Mr. KAULBACK reminded the member for Inverness that the proposed exhibition would be not only agricultural but industrial, and that every class of our people and every branch of industry would be represented. He believed that the Cape Breton Counties would not be backward in the competition, and he knew that

Lunenburg was ready to compete in in every branch.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the utility of exhibitions had been too satisfactorily proved in every part of the civilized world to require any lengthy vindication. They had been held in the Province since 1851, and had been regarded by every class of our people as a stimulus to skill and enterprise of every kind. It could not be wondered at that Nova Scotia was not better known abroad when her capabilities were not fully known to her own people. He could not understand the calculations of the hon. member, who said that the cost would be equal to £200 to each of the agricultural counties. These counties surely could not complain of the expenditure. The fishing population would be largely benefited by the exhibition of fish, which, no doubt, would be made, and every class of the people would receive advantage excepting, perhaps, the lawyers, who had nothing to exhibit, and should be the only persons to complain.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE said that fifteen or sixteen years had elapsed since an exhibition was held for the whole Province, and during that time we had been spending largely to secure representation in exhibitions, abroad. There was a vote of \$20,000 made last year for the Paris exhibition. At last session the house had pledged itself to provide the necessary funds for the project under consideration, and steps had already been taken on the faith of that pledge. Since our last exhibition, New Brunswick had held three or four, P. E. Island had done the same, and Canada held one every year. He feared that the discussion which had taken place would go far to repress the energies of gentlemen who had shewn a deep interest in the undertaking, and if that were the case the other Provinces could reproach us with having been unable to bring ourselves into competition with them for fifteen years.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL considered that the House was fully pledged to provide funds to a reasonable extent, and the fault he had to find was that the grant proposed in the bill would be barely sufficient. Unless a sufficient sum were provided, the great object of the expenditure would be defeated, and instead of our resources appearing in an advantageous light their estimation would be only detracted from. He was not aware whether it was the intention to carry out the idea of purchasing a model farm, but if not the \$6000 was well appropriated by the bill before the House. Gentlemen of influence and position had taken a lively interest in the exhibition, a public meeting had been held in Halifax, committees had been appointed and subscriptions solicited. It would be very unfair for the House now to recede from its position and repudiate its pledge. When once the legislature had taken deliberate action it should not depart from its decision without very urgent reasons.

Mr. S. McDONNELL said he had listened with attention and amusement to the attempts of gentlemen to show what benefit would result

from the exhibition. The Atty. General had said that it would afford an opportunity for the men of the different counties to come together, —was it then intended to be an exhibition of men? It might be true that it would afford an opportunity for a grand entertainment, but he did not feel inclined to call on his constituents to pay for that. It was quite true that international and intercolonial exhibitions were very advantageous in making one country acquainted with the resources of another, but here it was only proposed that we should exhibit ourselves to ourselves. No benefit was to be expected from that, because those who had capital to invest in the development of our resources were foreigners, who would be none the wiser after the exhibition was over. County exhibitions also were useful, because they would be attended by persons who could not come to Halifax, and they led the farmers of the country to compare their grain and cattle and various products. The Halifax exhibition would be a grand opportunity for those who had money to spend it in their own gratification, but the country generally had little to expect from it. He did not think there was anything in the argument that the vote was due to the citizens of Halifax, who had interested themselves in the matter, for he saw by the notice of the meeting that it had been called to take into consideration the propriety of holding a Provincial exhibition, it would only have been courteous for the citizens to have awaited the final decision of the House. The entire change which had taken place in the relations of the country was, he considered, ample reason for the House to review its previous decision on the subject.

Mr. TOBIN regretted to hear the remarks of the previous speaker. He had been on three commissions in connection with exhibitions, and had been convinced that great benefits resulted to the Province from the efforts that had been made to represent her abroad. But a provincial exhibition was of far higher importance. It was expected that a subscription list would be opened, and the citizens would have to bear a very large portion of the burden. Dr. Forrester had first mooted the question of exhibitions in this Province, and had detailed their importance in every hamlet in the country—the result was the exhibition of 1852. All our energies should now be put forward in order that our products and resources might be made known,—he trusted that the inhabitants of the other Provinces and of the United States would be invited. The capabilities of Nova Scotia would thus be displayed advantageously. Some of our products would compare favourably with those of any other country—he had seen apples, pears, peaches and grapes grown in the valley of Cornwallis as fine as any grown in Europe. Every farmer, mechanic and miner would have something to exhibit. The progress we had made was shown by the support given to the undertaking: in 1852 the Province could only vote \$4000, and the community

which then could contribute £1800, he believed, could now subscribe £3600.

Mr. ANNAND regretted that the discussion had arisen, for the house was already pledged. The difficulty he saw was that the grant would be quite insufficient unless the citizens contributed largely from their private means. He looked upon this as an inter-County exhibition; the products of our mines, our orchards, our fisheries, and every branch of industry would be displayed, and who could doubt that great benefits would result. He understood that the \$6000 voted for the purchase of a model farm was still at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture, and if so it would not be inappropriately expended if applied to the Exhibition. The proceeds of the sale of the articles purchased for the exhibition at Paris might likewise be given.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that he had felt disposed to oppose the vote, but the speech of the hon member for Inverness had convinced him to a contrary course. The fact that our position was soon to be changed was the very reason why we should compare our resources with those of the other Province. Although the county of Victoria might not immediately derive any advantage from the exhibition, yet it would feel the benefits eventually.

HON. ATTY. GEN. said that the arrangements for the purchase of the model farm had been completed, but the owner had unfortunately had a wife who had refused to join in the conveyance. That matter was still in abeyance and he did not wish the present grant to be considered a substitution. As far as the exhibition grant was concerned, it would be a libel on the city of Halifax to say that it would not, deeply in debt though it might be, if the necessity arose, contribute to such an object the whole sum which was now asked for from the whole Province. The facilities of inter-communication throughout the Province, were increasing and the people of Inverness could in one day come down to Halifax with their cattle and products for the exhibition.

Dr. HAMILTON was glad that the discussion had taken place, for it had drawn from a number of gentlemen remarks which were creditable to them. The hon. member for Inverness would certainly have been convinced if he had been present at the recent public meeting. This Province had certainly been behind the others in the matter of Exhibitions, and he hoped that on this occasion a creditable effort would be made. He was happy to be able to say that King's County was not in debt for the road and bridge service, so that no difficulty could arise on that score.

Mr. PARKER said that a general Exhibition was much required; he would like to see Cape Breton sending down her products to compete with the other districts. Canada had been exceedingly benefitted by Exhibitions, and the want of them was greatly felt in Nova Scotia. In going to the warehouses of the city, one saw that we were entirely dependent on other

countries for all our agricultural implements, and the manufactures which we did possess were almost unknown. Every class in the country was interested in the promotion of agriculture, and every class would be benefitted by the Exhibition. In Canada it was found that American farmers brought in their stock to compete at the Exhibitions, and this induced the Canadians to put forth every effort to excel. Instead of making such efforts to secure a representation at Exhibitions abroad, we should have commenced by exhibiting our products at home; the plan of working from the large down to the small was not one that he had learnt. A few years ago we had hardly an iron foundry; now we could carry on that manufacture for ourselves, and we should try and show the world what we had done and could do. It was found when our young men went abroad that there were none cleverer, but unfortunately we had nothing in which to engage them at home. He believed that under Confederation we would have a market of four millions of people, and that the change would be most beneficial in this respect.

The bill passed.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. JOST presented the report of the committee on Public Accounts. It was allowed to lie on the table.

Mr. TOBIN introduced a bill to incorporate the Halifax Omnibus, Express and Conveyance Company.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table a return showing the state of the accounts of the various Collectors of Customs throughout the Province, the return having been asked for by Mr. McLellan.

The House adjourned until 11 o'clock, a. m., on Monday.

MONDAY, April 29.

The House met at 3 p. m.

ROAD SCALES.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL called attention to the fact that he had not been consulted in reference to the preparation of the road scale for the county of Guysboro'. He understood that, at the instance of his colleague, it was being prepared by a subordinate officer in one of the departments. He was very unwilling to think that the Government was any party to this course of procedure.

Hon. PRO SEC. denied all knowledge of the transaction. It was not unusual for members to employ subordinate officers in making up their road scales. For instance he, and his colleagues had employed Mr. De Wolfe to make up their own scale, but of course the transaction was of a purely personal character. The usual course, he believed, when members disagreed as to the preparation of their scales was to refer the matter to a committee.

The subject was accordingly referred to the following committee, which Mr. Campbell said he was quite willing should be entirely drawn

from the opposite side of the house, viz: Allison, Donkin, Whitman.

Mr. ANNAND enquired whether it was the intention of the Government to allow the members for Halifax county to divide the special grant, or was it to be left at the disposal of the Government?

Hon. PRO SEC. enquired how the ordinary road grant was divided.

Mr. ANNAND replied according to a scale agreed between the members for East and West.

Mr. TOBIN said that he and the hon. member had never disagreed as to the mode of dividing the road moneys. As he understood the matter, the special grant was at the disposal of the Government.

Hon. PRO SEC. considered it the best course to leave these special grants, which were intended for exceptional services, at the disposal of the Government. Of course the Government would always listen to the suggestions of hon. members in respect to the disposition of such grants.

Mr. FRYER said that the special grant had always been in the hands of the Government, and he and his colleagues had applied to them whenever they required money for any important service. Last year they had had expended a large sum in constructing a road from Halifax to Prospect, around to St. Margaret's Bay, making a circuit to Halifax again.

Mr. ANNAND said that the division of the ordinary road grant depended in a large measure upon that of the special grant. He thought he and his colleagues should meet together and agree on some mode of division.

Hon. PROV. SEC. hoped that the hon. gentleman would make the division without reference to the special grant, which should be kept for particular services.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. WHITMAN reported from the Committee on Crown Lands a bill to make void certain grants.

A call of the House was had, and a number of bills were read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON reported up an Act relative to rag and junk shops in Halifax.

The House adjourned until 3 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The House resumed at 3 o'clock.

Mr. HEFFERNAN introduced an Act to divide a polling place in the county of Guysboro'.

THE PRESBYTERIAN UNION.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the bill to amend chap. 68 of the Acts of 1862, concerning Presbyterian Church property.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL thought it would be as well to have a division at once, as the same question had been before the House in previous years.

Hon. PROV. SEC. hoped, as a member of the House, that the bill would not be read a second time. He had hoped that the subject would not have come before the House at all during

the present session. If the bill passed it would create trouble. When the same question had been before the House some years ago, he had stated at some length his views, and he considered it unnecessary to go into them again.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL was surprised to hear the sentiments that had fallen from the hon. Provincial Secretary. The bill had been before the House several times, but it was never rejected. Last year the bill was sustained, and he only withdrew it when influential clergymen of the Presbyterian Church came forward and promised to settle the difficulty amicably. A committee was appointed by each side, and they met in Halifax. The result was that the committee of the Presbyterian Church acknowledged that they had no power to act in the matter, after having met the committee of the Church of Scotland several times. He held in his hand the act of which the petitioners complained, and the preamble of which was as follows:—

“Whereas the two bodies of Christians known as the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia and the Free Church of Nova Scotia were in the year 1860 connected by the name of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, and in consequence of this union certain enactments are necessary with regard to the property of the congregations formerly in connection with such churches.”

The present bill did not interfere with the union, but with the act passed two years subsequently, and the preamble of which he had just quoted. What the petitioners complained of was that the house had passed an act of a most tyrannical character. The present bill was not intended to disturb existing institutions, but simply to perform an act of justice. The complainants were determined to obtain their rights, and would never cease agitation until they were successful. He had sent to the Rev. Mr. Grant that morning for a copy of the report in which the proceedings of last summer were set forth, but it appeared that they were not reported in the *Record* of the Presbyterian body, nor even in the *Presbyterian Witness*. Mr. Grant stated that they did not report the matter, because they felt that the circumstances that took place at the meeting were not to their credit. He (Mr. C.) hoped justice would be done to the petitioners. He had brought the subject up very reluctantly.

Mr. PARKER said it was a great pity that this matter should be brought up year after year. The hon. member was now attempting to destroy a union which was working most admirably—a union which would not probably stop with the two churches it now included, but would take in other denominations in the course of time. He would be glad if congregations in other parts of the Province would always enclose their cemeteries, as was said to be the case in parts of Cape Breton whence complaints had come to the House.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that there was no attempt to repeal the union. The act of union and the act of spoliation were two very different matters. He had felt it his duty to bring up the subject and place it in its true light be-

fore the House. The petitions were signed by respectable magistrates and others, and required the most serious consideration from the House.

Mr. ROSS called attention to the fact that the majority of the signatures were all written in one handwriting. He was well acquainted with the handwriting of some of the magistrates referred to, and he believed that two of them at least had not signed the petitions.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that it was nothing less than an insult to the House for the hon. member to have presented such petitions. It was quite clear, in fact, that the matter ought never to have been brought up at all. The ordinary courtesy that should be extended to any gentleman interested in a particular question should have induced the hon. member to wait till either he (Mr. A.) or Mr. Blouchard, or Mr. McLellan was present before pressing the measure. The bill had only been read the first time on the 23d of April, and now its second reading was asked for. The circumstances of the question, as far as he could remember, were briefly these: the hon. member was at one time a member of the Kirk of Scotland, and attended the church, of which the minister was the Rev. Mr. Farquharson. It would be remembered that church difficulties occurred in the parent country, and had their influence in this province. The congregation of which Mr. Farquharson was the minister became connected with the Free Church, which had no existence until these difficulties had occurred. The time came, however, when a union took place between the Free Church and the Presbyterian Church in this Province. This union was effected by the entire consent of every ecclesiastical authority—more than that, with the consent of every member of the laity. The hon. member for Victoria got tired of the Free Church and reconverted himself to the Church of Scotland, and thereupon came forward and asked for a contribution from the church he had left. The hon. member ought to be ashamed, if it were possible for him to feel that emotion, to make such a demand as he had session after session. It was complained that the cemetery was enclosed; so all such places should be; but as respects the one in question there was no lock upon it. The Presbyterian Church and the Free Church had agreed to unite in the most solemn manner, and yet the hon. member would attempt to mar the harmony and integrity of that union which was working so admirably. Every Presbyterian throughout the Province would consider the action of the hon. member as insulting to his church. He knew that there was every desire on the part of the authorities of the Presbyterian body to settle the difficulty in any reasonable manner. The hon. member, however, it was very evident, had no other desire except to keep up an agitation on the subject to suit his own ends.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL, regretted that the hon. gentleman should have thought it necessary to exhibit so much passion in the remarks he had addressed to the house: but he did not intend

to follow a similar example. He wished to argue the question dispassionately and on its merits. He had not acted clandestinely; every opportunity had been given to gentlemen to deal with the bill. Mr. Blanchard had been present when it was first introduced, and its second reading had been deferred until that day in consequence of the absence of Mr. Archibald and other gentlemen who were stated to be interested in the measure. It was not true that all the clergy had agreed to the union.

Mr. PARKER—All but one.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL—Well, one man sometimes might be worth a great many others. It would have reflected more credit upon the hon. member for Colchester if he had attempted to argue the question instead of indulging in mere assertions. What was complained of was that certain parties had been unfairly denied of their rights, and in that case it was the duty of the Legislature to give them redress. As respects the petition, all he could say was that he believed they represented fairly the views of the persons whose names were appended to them. He had been glad to find that so many of his constituents were able to write so well. Last year he had made a written offer to the hon. member for Colchester to bring the matter to arbitration. The hon. gentleman referred the subject to his clergyman, but no answer was given. The same offer was made to Mr. Blanchard, with the same result. Last session a pledge had been given by a leading clergyman that the difficulty would be settled amicably, but as he stated previously, the promise given had not been kept. Having referred to the letter of the Rev. G. M. Grant on the subject, he would now ask permission to read it.

THE MANSE, HALIFAX.
April 29th, 1867.

My Dear Mr. Campbell,—

I send you the number of our *Record* in which the Minutes of the Committees of the two Churches on the C. B. disputed matters are. Those Minutes were certainly not published in the *Presbyterian Witness*, and, as far as I know, not even printed in the *Record* of the P. C. L. P., probably because their Committee did not feel that they would be very creditable to their good sense, moderation, or justice. Note two or three points:—(1.) Their Committee acknowledged that, in equity, our people had rights both in the Middle River and Lake Ainslie Churches; yet, if no bill is passed, they will not get those rights. (2.) They implicitly acknowledged that we had rights elsewhere, but would allow us no equivalent for them, though we offered to take what they could have given without inconvenience to themselves: and, with regard to our offer, one of the two members of their Committee present at the last meeting said, "If we don't accept that, we ought to." It was not accepted, chiefly, I believe, from pique against yourself, though the acceptance of it would have put an end to all the unseemly contentions in Cape Breton. They would not sacrifice an inch of their pride for the sake of the "common Presbyterianism" they talk so much about, nor for the sake of our common Christianity. But the fact was that their Committee had no authority, and the members composing it pleaded that. Our Committee had full power; its members took the trouble of coming up to Halifax from various parts of Pictou County. Not one of the Country members of their Committee attended, and not even all the city members, although both time and place were fixed by their committee. These things show which party was most anxious for an equitable settlement.

I have only to say that had I known that it was your intention to bring in your bill this year, I would have written out a statement of the proceedings of the joint Committee, and sent it to one of the newspapers, that the public might be acquainted with the facts of the case. I learned, or rather inferred from the wild talk of the *Presbyterian Witness* on Saturday last, that you had brought in your bill; and as I suppose the affair will be settled to-day, all I can do is to allow you to make any use you please of this note.

Believe me,

Ever truly yours,

G. M. GRANT.

Thus it appeared that the very proceedings were so condemnatory of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia that neither the *Presbyterian Witness* nor the *Record* of the body published them. It was only necessary to refer to the Act of 1862 to see what great injustice it had inflicted on the complainants. That Act had been passed without their consent, depriving them of their cemeteries and other Church property. The petitioners under such circumstances, felt that they had a right to be heard. Great difficulties, even bloodshed, had occurred in consequence of the deprivation by the people of the rights they so dearly valued. It was quite certain that these difficulties would continue to arise until the question was set at rest by the House coming forward and granting that justice to the petitioners which it was the duty of every member to afford.

Mr. Ross referred to the petition from Boulderville; the clergyman there, who had officiated since 1836 or 1838, had come to the country as a Free-Churchman. Instead of all the petitioners having built churches, the very first name on the petition was that of a man whose subscription had been to a church that was reduced to ashes, and several others had signed who had not contributed anything to the existing churches. There had only been one such disturbance as his colleague had referred to, and if no encouragement were given, there need be no fear of its repetition. There was nothing to affect the scruples of conscience which the petitioners avowed,—there was no compulsion; but the object of the agitation no doubt was to get possession of the property which, by law, belonged to those who entered into the Union. By passing the bill the Union would be virtually destroyed, and the property in Cape Breton would be handed over to the Free Church, a body that did not exist. If the people had been left to themselves these complaints would not have arisen. As far as the Middle River property was concerned, the Crown Land Committee had suggested a reference to arbitration, and when Mr. Archibald had brought in a bill in connection with the report, his colleague stood in opposition to it, and eventually defeated the settlement, although an arbitrator had been appointed on the other side.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that he had never been able to make up his mind that injustice had not been done to some of the people of Cape Breton in connection with the church property. Shortly after the passage of the act of 1862 he had been applied to by numbers of

these persons as to what should be done, and he had advised them to lay petitions at the foot of the throne praying that the act should not receive the royal assent until their rights were investigated. That advice had not been followed, but applications had been coming in to the House ever since. It was a principle of legislation that private rights should be protected, and no disinterested person would fail to agree with him that if the rights of minorities had been interfered with some redress should be given. It was maintained that between two religious bodies whose differences were so small the legislature had a right to step in and say: "you must unite or your property will be handed over to others." A man putting his money into a church had surely a right to be consulted as to his form of belief and could not constitutionally be legislated out of his property. No one could say that the differences of belief were unimportant because many persons attached great importance to what others considered trivial, and they certainly should not be coerced into any change. It might be true that where the Union was assented to the property could be fairly transferred, but how could the legislature hand over to minorities the property of majorities who refused to unite? If the constitution made these parties the judges of their own conduct it was unconstitutional to take away their property because they chose to adopt a certain course. As regards the Middle River dispute the complainants said that they had the legal title and could not be dispossessed, but that if the other side would throw into arbitration some of their doubtful property they would consent, but that an arbitration should not sit only upon a property to which they had a clear right. It was admitted that there were parties on both sides having equitable claims, and the only question was how redress could be given. No person regretted the dispute more than himself, and he had been delighted last year at the prospect of a settlement. The present bill had been introduced with moderation by the member for Victoria, and no doubt from a sense of duty, and he should therefore have been exempt from personal attack. It frequently happened that among parties very closely associated small differences growing up made the most determined enmity, and however deeply he regretted these unhappy differences, he felt bound to support some measure which would do justice.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the question in dispute at Middle River had been referred to the Crown Land Committee, who reported that a settlement should be made by arbitration, and on bringing in a bill in accordance with that report he had been opposed by the member for Victoria, so that there had been every desire upon his (Mr. A's) part to do justice and to forward a settlement. It appeared that there were 114 shares in the property at Middle River and that 92 of them were held by those who had acquiesced in the change, so that the parties complaining of injustice had only one fifth

of the property, and yet they had refused to accept anything less than a half,—a third had been offered and refused. The House was asked to interfere without knowing the facts and without having time at that period of the session to cause an investigation by committee.—When the bill of 1862 was introduced objections were made as to some congregations in Cape Breton and they were at once exempted from its operation, and now the House was asked to repeal the act as regards all Cape Breton. If the principle were sound why stop there? The Legislature would next be asked to interfere with the rights of the other congregations throughout Nova Scotia.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL denied most emphatically having thrown obstacles in the way of a settlement by arbitration, but the principle of the bill had nothing to do with the Middle River dispute. Those who concurred with the hon. member for Colchester were willing to arbitrate upon the title which they did not possess, but not upon cases in which there was actually a dispute.

Mr. BLANCHARD said he had thought that after the hon member had brought in his bill for three years in succession and been compelled to abandon it, he would have allowed the matter to rest. The hon member no doubt thought that he was doing his duty; but he could tell him that he was not doing his duty, but was doing more to stir up strife and discord than all the clergymen in the church. The clergy were willing to exchange pulpits and to promote peace and harmony, and the responsibilities which had arisen were mainly upon the member for Victoria. That gentleman had denied having opposed the arbitration, but had he done anything to forward it? There was not a word of complaint that he knew of in Inverness until after the hon member got a seat in the House, and commenced this agitation, which was kept up by a few litigious persons in the Island. The act had been passed without a division, and everything asked then was freely yielded by its promoters.

HON. ATTY. GEN said that complaints had been made to him on the subject very shortly after the passage of the bill by numbers of most respectable and influential persons in different parts of Cape Breton.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that he was taken by surprise at the introduction of the bill this session. Only a week ago the hon member for Victoria had solicited and obtained from him a subscription for the erection of a Kirk Church, and after securing that he had recommenced the attack.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that in giving the subscription the hon gentleman was only making a partial recompense for the injury he had done. As far as the church in which he was interested was concerned, he was willing to let it go, but the burial ground he would not yield.

Mr. ROSS called the Prov. Sec.'s attention to the fact that the people of Middle River had nominated their arbitrator to the Government,

and that the Government had been unable to proceed owing to the friends of his colleague refusing to act on the report of the committee.

Hon. PROV. SEC. confirmed this statement; he had both written and telegraphed to Mr. C. J. Campbell, urging the appointment of an arbitrator, but he had refused. There might be some ground of complaint, but he thought it would be unwise to destroy confidence in the action of the house by disturbing the existing legislation.

Mr. BILL said that he had hoped that the agitation would cease after the efforts which had been made for a settlement. The name of the Rev. W. Murray having been mentioned, he said that he would go that gentleman's bondsmen that he would fulfil whatever promise he had made in the matter. He hoped the hon. member would withdraw his measure.

The amendment deferring the bill passed, 22 to 27. The bill was accordingly deferred.

For the amendment—Messrs Pryor, Allison, Heffernan, Perker, Balcam, Lawrence, Tohin, Jost, Rill, Blackwood, Bourinot, Robertson, Longley, Shannon, Blanchard, Ross, S. Campbell, Archibald, Killam, Ray, Robicheau, Pro Sec.—22.

Against—Messrs McFarlane, C. J. Campbell, John Campbell, Colin Campbell, Moore, Brown Atty. Gen.—7.

HALIFAX STREET RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON, from the Committee on City Bills, reported a bill to amend the Act incorporating the City Railway Company. He said that the Committee had struck out all the clauses but the first and had framed that so as to prevent the use of the snow plough after a fall of snow of the depth of twelve inches, and had prohibited the use of salt entirely.

Hon. PRO. SECY. said he could not agree with the report of the Committee. Parties had come to the legislature and obtained an act of incorporation under which a large sum of money had been invested. He was not competent to say whether the charter authorized the use of the plough and of salt or not as that was a question of law, but as he would presently show this was not the principle to be discussed. He knew how much feeling had existed and how much inconvenience had been inflicted upon a large portion of our citizens by the Railway, and therefore regretted deeply that care had not been taken to introduce guards and checks in relation to the powers of the Company. As far as he could ascertain it was not correct that the House had altered the bill as sent up from the City Council in the clause relating to the paving of the streets. The Act had passed during the administration of the late government and a good deal of credit was due to them in the matter, but greater care should have been taken in the legislation to protect the interests of all classes. Coming however to the first principle of the measure, it was immaterial whether the charter authorized the use of the plough and salt or not. If it did the House had no right to interfere with the privilege granted. If it did not, then the

parties could apply to a court of law for redress and should not come to the legislature for an interpretation of the Act. He felt a great difficulty in dealing with a question where the conflicting rights of parties were so deeply involved, and on which so strong a feeling existed, but he had a duty to perform as a member of the legislature, and that was to adopt such a course as would be consistent with the true interests of the country and with the true position of the House. If the House were to limit the privileges under which a large amount of capital had been invested it would strike a serious blow at the confidence which it was desirable that capitalists abroad should entertain. It would be wiser to allow the rights of the Company to be tested in a court of law; if it were there decided that they had no right to use the plough and the salt the legislature would be relieved from the difficulty,—if on the other hand it were decided that they had the right it would become a question whether the legislature should not buy up the rights so conceded, and remedy in that way the wrong inflicted.

HON. ATTY. GEN. concurred with the Prov. Secretary. The charter should not be so interfered with as to occasion pecuniary damage to the company without a recompense being given. The citizens, no doubt, were delighted with the prospect of a street railway at the time the Act passed and the same care had not been taken which is usually exercised. No great amount of convenience could be given to a people without their being obliged to suffer in another way, and so in the country, after agitating for the railway for years, many people thought it was not such a fine thing after all. At the origin of the measure all the considerations should be fairly weighed, but when once the Act was passed it became a matter of principle and not of bargain. The question of law involved was exceedingly difficult, and probably if referred to a committee of lawyers they would not agree in opinion, and the Judges of the Supreme Court would perhaps be divided on it. The legislature should certainly keep faith with the company. The loss to the company and the inconvenience to the citizens who had been accustomed to use the cars should be taken into consideration before the bill was passed, for it would have the effect of stopping the cars for a great part of the winter.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL said he was surprised to hear objections going to the principle of the bill urged after the bill had been sent to committee. He did not recollect having ever served upon a committee charged with a more onerous task than that in connection with the bill. On one side were the interests of the public and on the other those of the company. The citizens had the freehold of the streets, the company had obtained an easement, but could it be pretended that they had the right to create a public nuisance? The use of salt and the plough certainly perpetrated a nuisance. The charter could not authorize the company to do injury to those who had prior rights. The bill had embraced several restrictions as to the number of tracks, pavement, and so forth, but these the committee had struck out, believing that the questions involv-

ed in those clauses were not such as the legislature could fairly deal with, but the remaining questions were open to decision, and the House was only asked to declare what the law was. His views were in favor of prohibiting the use of the plough from the strong impression of the public inconvenience which it caused. The loss which would ensue to the company by the alteration would not at all be commensurate with the loss to the citizens if matters were allowed to continue as during last winter.

Mr. TOBIN said he did not entirely concur in the report of the committee, although they had doubtless spent a great deal of time in investigating the rights of the company as well as those of the citizens. It was quite proper that a company which, under a charter had expended their money in laying rails and placing cars thereon, should have every legitimate protection. At the same time the citizens had rights which should be fully considered. The committee reported that salt should not be used, but they gave the right to the company to use the plough until there were twelve inches of snow upon the ground. He had seen winters in which there was never at any time so much snow upon our streets, and therefore he did not think that the committee had effected anything as far as the snow-plow was concerned. There were times when there was but a light fall of snow, and the plough might be used without injury to any one. When he went abroad and visited cities in the United States and Canada, he found that the cars were placed on runners in the case of a heavy fall of snow. If the house had the right to legislate at all—to say that the salt should not be used, and the ploughs stopped under certain circumstances—then they could make what regulations they might deem most advisable. He questioned the right of the house to take that course, and thought it would be best to ascertain, in the first place, the legal rights of the company in the Supreme Court. If, after judgment was given, the rights and privileges of the people were still interfered with, then he thought that the house should step in and give such compensation to the City Railway as might be deemed proper for interfering with any rights they might have under their charter. If, on the other hand, it was determined that the report of the committee was allowable—that the house could deal with the matter—then he would propose in amendment that no salt should be used, and that the plow should be discontinued from the first of December to the first of March.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that a thing might be a public nuisance and a public benefit at one and the same time. It might be a nuisance to some particular class or individual, inasmuch as it interfered with their rights in some way or other. The House, however, found it necessary sometimes to give large privileges to a company for the sake of promoting the benefit of the many. The Gas and Water Companies had been allowed to open up the streets, and they were perpetrating a nuisance in doing so. The question, however, for the House to consider was how far it had given the company the right to use all the ordinary appliances necessary for the prosecution of their enterprise. The charter gave them the right to run the cars not for six or nine months,

but twelve months. He held that the cars were a great convenience, not only for the rich but for the poor, and therefore for all classes. The undertaking must, therefore, be looked upon as a great public benefit. No one could deny that the company had the right to clear the snow off the track with shovels; and if they did so, they would create fully as great a nuisance as they were now said to create by the use of the plough. The proper mode of dealing with the question was no doubt to investigate the rights of the company in a court of law—where evidence could be taken as to the practice in other places.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON concurred with Mr. Campbell's remarks; this was not the time to discuss the principle of the bill. There were two parties interested, and the committee had made a compromise which the house, he thought, would be disposed to accept when the position of the question was fully explained.

The bill was referred to committee of the whole house.

COW BAY BREAKWATER.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said he had not received a reply to his question about the wharfrage collected on the Cow Bay Breakwater.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that he had made inquiries, and found that the Government could not obtain a return of wharfrage collected. The wharf was a private enterprise, and distinct from the breakwater.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the gentleman interested in the mines in that locality had contributed \$40,000 of his own money to the breakwater, which was very valuable, as affording shelter to the vessels resorting to the mines.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL did not see why this wharf should be on a footing different from that of other enterprises to which the Province made large contributions. The public money was only granted for public purposes. It appeared that high rates of wharfrage had been charged, and he could not understand why this should be allowed on a public work. He thought it wrong that any individuals should receive large sums of the money contributed to the treasury by the hard working fishermen and laborers of the country. Last year he had made an application for a grant to a breakwater on a coast sixty miles in extent, and though a small grant was given during the last year, it was discontinued this year.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that the hon. gentleman would have to make an appeal to some other quarter than to the fishermen, for the sole object of the Legislature in giving the grant was to protect those engaged in seafaring pursuits. The Bay was largely frequented, there being sometimes a hundred sail in it, and as the place was exceedingly dangerous, a great destruction of shipping and great sacrifice of life had taken place there. The grant had contributed to make it a place of safety. True, it was in connection with an enterprise in which Hon. T. D. Archibald was concerned in the shipment of coal, but this gentleman by his enterprise in connection with the mines had largely contributed to the revenues of the country, and had contributed thousands and tens of thousands of dollars of his

own money to the work. The grant had not been given with any political view whatever, but because the public necessities demanded it. He would be quite prepared to face any hostility that might arise from this expenditure of the public money.

Mr. ROSS said that the breakwater in question was one of the most useful works in the Province. As far as shelter was concerned, it afforded accommodation to every vessel. Mr. Archibald's wharf was a distinct property, and was one of the finest in the Province. Some one had to exercise authority over these works and hence the small charge to merchants whose goods were loaded there. He regretted his colleague's want of success in his application for a grant for the other breakwater added to, and thought that his usual perseverance could not have been exercised. The grant to the Cow Bay breakwater could not be viewed as a personal or political matter, and was a most useful expenditure.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said he had made the inquiry from a sense of duty, and not with a desire to show hostility to the Government. Instead of sheltering hundreds of vessels, the breakwater would not shelter a dozen. It gave shelter to the vessels at Mr. Archibald's wharf, and from that a large revenue was being derived. He felt that the government should have control over the work to which they had so largely contributed. Other individuals had, at their own cost, built wharves further outwards than Mr. Archibald's was.

Hon. PROV. SEC. replied that Mr. Belloni, one of the gentlemen who had built a wharf further out, had joined with Mr. Archibald in the application to the government for the grant.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the locality in question was an open roadstead, in which the sea came with such violence that no vessel could lie in it. The breakwater gave a shelter to all vessels resorting thither in case of a storm; many shipwrecks had already been prevented by it. It would be a good investment for the Government even as an accommodation to the coal trade, for they were receiving handsome returns from the mines of the locality. Previous to the building of the breakwater the navigation of the bay was being greatly impeded by vessels discharging their ballast in the shallow water. The attack in connection with this work came very suspiciously, after the discussion of the afternoon, and he would say to the member for Victoria, that if returns were to be asked for, the Government might be required to lay on the table some information of a very interesting character.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL denied that the breakwater could afford the shelter described. Vessels could not make for it in a storm, and he doubted the truth of the assertion that shipwrecks had already been prevented by the work.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that if gentlemen of the Opposition would turn their attention to some other instances of public expenditure they might find the Government worthy of support in them also. The Government had never decided that

the proprietors had the right to collect wharfage; the question had never been presented to them. The attack which had been made on the Administration showed how anxious the Government were to sacrifice their own interests in advancing those of the public.

Mr. BALCAM said that he had been for many years familiar with Cow Bay, and knew it to be a most dangerous locality. If it were not for the breakwater the mines there would be almost useless, for it was very unsafe for vessels to go there excepting in summer. At present, vessels could anchor a mile or a mile and a half above the breakwater, and the year before last many of them were saved by running into the shelter which it gave. If the Government had made no worse expenditure than this, he would have little fault to find with them.

The House adjourned.

TUESDAY, April 30.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

The Legislative Council announced that they had agreed to the bill for the better encouragement of education.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE presented a petition from M. Chapman and others, against the bill to amend the law relating to dyke and marsh lands.

LAW AMENDMENTS.

Mr. ARCHIBALD, from the committee on Law Amendments, reported favorably of the bill relating to offences connected with the army and navy. A petition from Pictou had asked the return of certain fines and expenses inflicted on them for the sale of intoxicating liquors without license, and asking also that the sessions be compelled to grant licenses. The petitioners represented that the custos refused to put the question whether the licenses should be granted, although the grand jury had recommended them. The answer of the custos was that the sessions had not the power to grant licenses where a majority of the rate payers were opposed to it; and a paper protesting against the granting of licenses, signed by a majority of the ratepayers, having been presented, the right of the sessions to grant licenses was taken away. The committee were not disposed to reward parties for violating the law, nor were they disposed to change the policy deliberately agreed upon, some years ago, giving the control of licenses to the ratepayers. The committee reported favorably of the bill to amend the law relating to coroners, and recommended that the bill relating to the medical profession be deferred, as its provisions were too restrictive.

Hon. PRO. SEC. was under the impression that the last mentioned bill would have the effect of improving the status of qualified practitioners, and would place unqualified practitioners in no worse position than at present.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the bill proposed a penalty of \$20 for every day on which a person, not having passed an examination before the college of physicians to be established, should practice.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that this was further than he would be disposed to go. The bill which he had introduced in the first session in

which he had a seat, provided that to be a legal practitioner a physician should register his credentials in the office of the Provincial Secretary, thus giving the public an opportunity of knowing who were qualified according to law.

BILLS.

Mr. PRYOR, from the committee on private and local bills, reported the bill to incorporate the British and American Telegraph Co. He said he differed in opinion from the majority of the Committee on this bill.

Mr. PRYOR introduced a bill to amend the act relating to the Militia.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill to incorporate the Union Copper Mining Company. Also a bill relating to support of the Poor, providing more effectually for the appointment of a Clerk to the Overseers. Also a bill to amend the Election Law, its object being to confirm the list of electors which had been revised, in order to prevent technical objections being taken. He said that he would soon introduce a clause to provide for the application of the revised lists to the alterations which had been made in polling districts in several of the counties.

The House then went into committee on bills, and passed the bill to defray certain expenses of the Civil Government; the bill further to amend the act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Halifax; the bill to add an Electoral District in the County of Guysboro'; the bill to amend the act to incorporate the Acadia Coal Mining Company; the bill to alter the polling places in two electoral districts of the County of Halifax; the bill to provide for the inspection of coal oil and petroleum; the bill relating to offences connected with the Army and Navy; the bill relating to the protection of the River Fisheries; the bill to incorporate the Halifax Omnibus and Express Company; the bill for the preservation of useful Birds and Animals; the bill to amend the act relating to the Militia; the bill to incorporate the Union Copper Mining Company, and the bill to amend the act relating to the settlement and support of the poor.

Mr. ALLISON said he thought that the clause in the bill for the preservation of game, preventing the killing of moose during January and February, could not be carried out,—the present Act said March.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. thought the restriction most important.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE said that if the indiscriminate slaughter of the moose was carried on much longer the animal would be extinct.

Hon. FIN. SEC. hoped that the penalty would be enforced. In some instances he had known fourteen or sixteen men to be killed by one party for sport by means of traps and other appliances. The bill passed.

The committee adjourned.

Mr. ANNAND suggested that as a supplementary estimate was to be brought down it would be well in view of the change that would take place in our local affairs soon after the dissolution to include those votes in the civil list bill instead of making them a vote of credit to be redeemed next session.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said that the margin allowed in the estimated revenue would be more than sufficient to cover the supplementary estimate.

He thought that the usual course had better be pursued. The items in the supplementary estimate would only be for such services as would remain under the charge of the local legislature.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the new legislature coming in would be bound by the pledge given as much as if the same House had continued.

Dr. BROWN obtained leave for Mr Killam to return home after Wednesday.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that though the company engaged in the extension of the railway to Annapolis had appropriated five or six acres for an additional station ground, an arrangement had been made by which a portion of the property at present paid for would be made available. The original plans had therefore been abandoned, and new plans, under which only the track through Windsor would be taken, had been prepared. He introduced a bill to authorize the transfer of a portion of the property referred to. As to the assessment of damages for the right of way, he said that when the original railway act was passed, there was but one court of sessions in the county, and as there were two now, there was no authorized body to apportion the damages. It had been proposed to leave the matter to commissioners not resident in the county, and he introduced a bill to effect that object. Two of the members of the county had assented to that proposal, and two of them thought that the apportionment should be made by the two courts of sessions, which should be united for the purpose; but the latter suggestion would involve very intricate legislation, and would be surrounded with a great many difficulties.

Mr. HILL thought that the adjustment which the bill proposed was the fairest mode of meeting the difficulty.

Mr. MCLELLAN laid on the table the road scale for the county of Colchester.

Mr. LAWRENCE laid on the table the road scale for the county of Hants.

The house adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, May 1.

The House met at 3 p. m.

POST OFFICE REPORT.

Mr. BURINOT submitted a report from the Post Office Committee. Having submitted to the House his report as Chairman of the P. O. Committee, he desired to remark that the Committee had had under their consideration no less than 181 petitions—an unprecedented number—and which had resulted in their recommending the establishment of 46 subordinate offices and the increase of the salaries of 48 subordinate officers.—But with regard to the four couriers whose salaries were recommended for increase, in no instance had it been done unless the Committee were satisfied that extra or special services had been performed by them and not provided for in the original contracts, 41 new mail routes, the extension of a few, and extra mail accommodation had been recommended. Many applications were not of course entertained. They gladly recommended an increase in the salary of Mr. Passow, a gentleman who had a strong claim to it,—not only for the length of service

but the great satisfaction he had ever given to the public. The hard worked clerks had been placed on a fair footing, and their salaries would be \$800 each respectively. He said that as a large increase of mail accommodation was recommended, some doubt might exist as to the sufficiency of the revenue of the department to bear such an increase in the expenditure as would result; but the increase of the Post Office revenue had been such as would surprise any person not acquainted with the figures. Ten years ago the number of subordinate offices in existence was 342, while the present number was 555. The number of contracts for mail conveyance had increased since 1853 from 153 to 263, twenty-five mail contracts having been established during the past year. Notwithstanding the large increase in accommodation during the last ten years, the deficit in 1857 was \$25,000, while at present it was only \$17,116—the revenue being in 1857 \$38,000, and in 1866 \$69,000. These facts showed how largely the mail accommodation was being made available, and how the diffusion of education and the facilities of accommodation promoted the progress of the department. The effect of establishing the proposed way offices would undoubtedly be to increase the postal revenue. He could not avoid calling attention also to the money order system, which was introduced in 1861, and had been affording increased facilities year after year. The amounts of orders issued since its establishment were as follows:

In 1861,	\$67,000
1862,	100,000
1863,	125,000
1864,	246,000
1865,	379,000
1866,	861,000

Shewing that the amount of issues for last year was greater by eight times than in the first year of the system. The money order department had contributed to the revenue \$2,384 during the past year. Before he resumed his seat, he felt bound to draw attention to the portion of the report which acknowledged the merit of the Postmaster General. That that officer was entitled to the encomiums passed upon him no one would deny; and the usefulness and prosperity of the department were, he believed, largely owing to the good management of its head.

REPORT ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. JOST moved the adoption of the report of the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. McLELAN said:—It will be in the recollection of the House that some days ago I asked for a return shewing the amounts due from the collectors of customs throughout the Province, and I then said that as a member of the committee on public accounts, I applied personally at the office of the Financial Secretary for information of a later date than the accounts laid before us. By the report of the committee it will be seen that the amounts paid in by collectors up to 30th Sept. left a balance of \$11,000, but from the return furnished to me by the Fin^l Secretary, I find that the real balance due from the collectors is \$27,000. It certainly appears to me to be contrary to the privileges of the committee that its members should have to apply in the House for information which is required, and that their business should be delayed until formal re-

turns are laid on the table. The information which I applied for could have been furnished to me in half an hour at the Financial Secretary's office. In all cases it should be the privilege of the committee to have access to the public books, for we are called on to examine accounts six months old, and are unable to see what the state of things may be up to the time of investigating the matters laid before us. It would be most desirable to know what our financial condition was at 31st March, and the return shewing that has not yet been supplied although asked for by the hon. member for East Halifax. The report shows that our revenue is in a prosperous state, and has been increasing year after year in a very marked manner. In 1866 the customs and excise revenue was \$1,231,902, while that of 1863 was only \$830,126, shewing an increase of \$401,776, or nearly fifty per cent. in four years. This fact should be very gratifying to every Nova Scotian as shewing that we have a country vigorous in prosperity, and possessing largely increasing revenues with a tariff lower than that of any other country on the continent.

This proves that had we retained the control of our revenues we would have been able to develop all our resources and foster our public improvements. But large as has been the increase during the past four years, the public debt has been increasing at a still larger rate, for when to the debt of \$6,032,000 already existing, the liabilities recently contracted are added, it will be found that our debt will exceed by nearly half a million the amount which we are entitled to under Confederation. With the large increase of our revenues, it is evident that if our means had been wisely husbanded, there would have been no necessity for our going into confederation with a debt thrown on the local revenues. Instead of the local revenue being called on to provide for the interest of a surplus debt, we should have had an income by going in with a liability of less than eight millions. As to the Annapolis railway, I agree with the hon. member for Yarmouth, that the Government exhibited undue haste in entering into the contract for the completion of the work this year under existing circumstances. The delegates have declared to us that we are to receive our just proportion in the distribution of the general revenues of Canada, and if that be true, we had no stronger claim on the General Government than the construction of this railway, for it is a subject that has been agitated widely for eight or ten years, and there was no other public work which had the same claim to consideration. If, then, they believed that we are to receive a fair share of the general revenues, the Government should have retained that strong claim, and should have insisted on the work being done by the united government. As I have said, if there had been ordinary economy, the local revenues would not have been charged with an excess of debt. It is plain that the Government are not entitled to credit for the prosperity to which I have referred, for they continued the tariff which they found in existence. Deducting from the increased revenue the amounts given to roads and bridges and education, there will remain a large sum for which they must account as having been appropriated in excess of the ordinary appropriations of the year, notwithstanding that they

came in on the cry of retrenchment. Allowing \$56,000 for navigation securities, there would be \$200,000 to be accounted for.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—The hon. member has not allowed for navigation securities half the amount given.

Mr. MCLELAN—I have allowed \$56,000 and still there is \$200,000 to be accounted for. The House will be prepared for these facts because the financial returns showed a large over-expenditure in all the public departments. The Fin. Sec. attempted to justify the over-expenditure by saying that as the money belonged to the people it was the duty of the Government to expend it among them. If there were great public works requiring to be carried forward, for which advances were necessary, the over-expenditure might be justified, but it would be remembered that the extension of the Insane Asylum and the construction of the public building were being carried on by an increase of the debt of the Province. The debt mentioned in the report is \$6,452,922 and after deducting the asset it will be \$6,032,017; while in Dec. 31st, 1862, it was only \$4,913,689, making an increase of \$1,119,323; while, to the knowledge of the Committee, there have been issued since the 30th Sept. \$35,000 of Provincial notes. The public improvements then have not been made out of the increased revenue, but by enlarging the public debt. As I stated before, there has been a large excess in the expenditure over the estimate of last year. In several of the departments the over-expenditure must be considered wholly unnecessary, in view of the fact that they were about to be transferred to the General Government. As an example I take what I consider the unwarranted expenditure on Government House. It is not improbable that the gentleman who will be appointed Lieutenant Governor will not deem it desirable to occupy that building, and, as it would in that case, become almost useless, I think that a large expenditure on it should not have been made. So extravagant and lavish an expenditure has not been made upon it before to my knowledge, although an outlay has been made every year. The furnishing of one room alone cost last year \$2000 the hangings for the windows of that room costing \$420. Under the circumstances I think that such an expenditure was wholly unjustifiable, and this is a sample of the extravagance which has been practiced.

I rose more particularly to move for information respecting an account, presented by a public officer, which I am unable to understand. I find that about \$22,000 has been drawn by a member of the Board of Works on his own bills and at his own prices, shewing the necessity of the act introduced last year to prevent an officer of the Government contracting with his own department for the furnishing of supplies. I find that Mr. John Pugh has drawn for supplies, on his own bills, \$21,864, large portions of these are articles in which that gentleman does not appear to deal. If these supplies have been furnished at his own prices, and are not such articles as Mr. Pugh deals in, then there is every reason to believe that an injustice has been done to the country, and the Government have been lax in their duty. I see by the heading of an invoice that Mr. Pugh is a dealer in West Indian goods, wines, liquors, &c., and this one invoice is for sundries

furnished to the *Druid*, to the amount of \$4004, including 1500 weight of manilla, and also canvas and several articles not in his line. But I find that in this account Mr. Pugh puts down the articles at a higher price than they could be obtained for in Halifax at six months credit. The manilla is charged at 16 cent cash per pound—the price in Halifax being 15 cents, at six months credit. I find also in this gentleman's account numerous charges for "small stores,"—in July and August his charges for small stores being \$1600. This is surely not the way in which a public officer should render an account. Why should they be put down as small stores when I find specifically charged in another part of the bill two pounds of pepper and a box of mustard? What could be smaller than these articles unless it be the faith which could be placed in the correctness of the account and in the good intentions of the Government? If these small stores are, as I believe them to be, liquors and cabin stores, and we add to them the other liquors charged by Mr. Pugh, as furnished for excursions in the steamer *Neptune* and other purposes, we will find that the charges for wines and liquors supplied are \$2000. Another matter upon which I wish information is as to the prices and quantities of the articles supplied. We have no assurance whatever that these quantities have been delivered, and I observe that a chest of black tea has been charged at 122 lbs. I do not think that a chest of tea of that weight has ever been imported into Halifax.

Mr. TOBIN—It may have been the gross weight

Mr. MCLELAN—If it be the gross weight then we are charged for the wood and lead the price for tea. Under the head of quarantine service I see supplied by Mr. Pugh 102,000 feet of lumber and 75,000 shingles. This is almost a ship load of lumber delivered, at his own prices, by a gentleman who deals in West India produce, and wines and liquors. These supplies should certainly have been put up to tender so that the public interests would be guarded. The price at which the lumber should have been charged would of course depend on its quality; but I see in the account a charge for two sheets of zinc, \$27.80, while it can be obtained for \$2 or \$3.50.

Mr. McLelan concluded by asking the Government to lay on the table the invoices of all purchases for the *Druid* and *Daring*, and for the quarantine service, and a return of small stores and cabin stores supplied.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—We have just had from the hon. member the long threatened attack upon the financial policy of the administration, and I fancy that after exhausting his quiver full of arrows the hon. gentleman cannot congratulate himself on having produced an astonishing effect. The country will hear with astonishment that he, having as a member of the Committee on Public Accounts the fullest access to financial information and the fullest opportunity of investigating our financial policy, after all the threats and insinuations which have been thrown out, has fallen down to the comparatively trifling and not proven charge of incompetency in a subordinate officer. He has not been able, and I now challenge him and his friends to lay their hand upon a single item of reckless and ill advised expenditure by the Government, but what does he lay before

the house as the sole ground of complaint? He has availed himself most unfairly of his information as a member of the Committee, because if he intended to challenge the conduct of any department he should have given notice of his intention, instead of rising unexpectedly to expose by means of the information so gained, the conduct of a subordinate officer, and to insinuate what he was unable to prove and what does not exist: that the officers of one of the public departments had robbed the government and the country. To be consistent the hon. gentleman should have gone further than he ventured to go, and told the house that Mr. Pugh had combined to defraud the country with two other gentlemen in the same department whose honor and character are above suspicion. Is he prepared to say that Mr. Frederick Brown, who is connected with a gentleman intimately associated in opposition with the hon. member has availed himself of his position to practice fraud? Because he cannot say that Mr. Pugh obtained these moneys improperly without charging Mr. Brown, the chairman, and Mr. Fairbanks, the co-commissioner, with disreputable conduct in the appropriation of the public money. I do not stand here as Mr. Pugh's defender, because he needs no defence, but I know that he could not if he desired, rob the treasury of one cent without the complicity of the gentlemen to whom I have referred. Assuming the charge to be true, although it is not true, I ask if the hon. member acted fairly in preferring it without giving us an opportunity of arraigning our officer and asking him if it was true that it laid in the mouths of any member to make such an accusation.

Mr. McLELAN—I applied to the house for information, because I could obtain in no other way.

Hon. FIN SEC.—The hon. member could not complain of want of information, for he read from the invoice, or a copy of it, which was before the committee. As to having been refused information in the public offices, he asked for what he had no right to. The committee are sent but to examine the accounts for the financial year, and neither in right nor in courtesy could he ask for information as to any other period. He was treated with more than courtesy, and every facility afforded him, but he made an unusual request, for the sole purpose of affording opportunity for a financial attack on the administration. As to the general state of the public accounts, I do not know that the hon. member's observations are deserving of any consideration, because he failed, excepting as far as it could be done by a few declamatory sentences, such as the house will appreciate, to challenge our financial administration; but he has ventured to follow—very haltingly and feebly, it is true,—the track of the press respecting his opinions. He ventured to say that we had made such over-expenditures as should expose us to the censure of the house and the country for reckless extravagance. He stated, with more latitude than I took, the principle which I laid down the other day: that a government engaged in the prosecution of great public works, like St. Peter's Canal or the Hospital for the Insane, which had repeatedly received the sanction of a vote of the Legislature, should, if the vote of credit was found insufficient to carry them forward as rapidly as possible, ad-

vance such further sums as could be spared from the treasury. The government hesitating to do so would be guilty of a crime before the country; and if we had not made those advances to forward the contracts for the public works, and to take the precautions against the introduction of disease and contagion which will appear in the quarantine account, we would have been liable to severe censure as being faithless to our trust, in failing to expend for the public necessities the funds with which our energy in the connection of the revenue had supplied the treasury.

But let me turn the hon. member's attention to the conduct of the Administration which he supported to the very extreme of consistency, and I will show that he went further than we are asking gentlemen to go in our support. That Government not only expended every dollar which came within their reach, without regard to the vote of the Legislature, but on more than one occasion they expended far more than they possessed. The country would understand the hon. gentleman's attack, if, instead of spending the money in our treasury in the advancement of most important public works, and having after all a balance of more than \$100,000 in the chest, we had been obliged to go on our knees and beg forgiveness for having plunged the country \$150,000 in debt. Then only would he find a parallel between my conduct and that which he sustained. In 1860 the friends of the hon. gentlemen came into power with a balance in the treasury of \$14,492, and in their very first year they spent \$146,731 more than had been estimated, and \$125,177 more than they collected. I am not going to pick out of those gentlemen's accounts a bottle of wine, or a box of pepper, nor to ask whether their Board of Works committed a fraud and robbed the country—I am content with the broad fact that his friends expended nearly \$150,000 more than had been estimated, and went in debt for the purpose \$125,000. I think the hon. member would hardly have made the speech which we heard if he had remembered what was done by the men to whom he gave his support. In 1862 those gentlemen did what, if we had done, would have given the hon. member a card to play at the election—they raised the *ad valorem* duties to 12½ per cent. I need not ask what eloquent declamation we would have heard if our extravagance had obliged us to take that step. Under that increased tariff they obtained sufficient revenue to pay their debts; but in 1862, with all their horror for over expenditure, they over-expended \$300,926, the estimate being \$957,000, and the payments \$1,257,934 without any of the reasons which it has been in our power to advance. In the next year, also, they over-expended by \$94,605.

With what force then can the hon. member rise to challenge the administration for following a course which was not only essential to the good government of the country, but which was consistent with the course pursued by the gentlemen with whom he co-operated. (Mr. McLelan:—The government which preceded the one had over expended \$400,000, and that had to be paid.) That charge had been fully met and repelled, but I think it will be well for the hon. member to confine himself to the consideration of the matters which happened since he and I entered public life. Let

me now turn attention to another circumstance with which he stands responsible. In 1863, the year in which they went to the country, his government over expended \$94,605. The revenue that year had been collected under the 12½ per cent tariff, and the estimate having been made under that tariff, they lowered the duties to ten per cent., and made a very large over expenditure for electioneering purposes, and on the eve of an election, and having reduced the tariff from 12½ to 10 per cent., estimated a larger expenditure than the previous year, which the present government on coming into power were obliged to meet.

We were told that if ordinary economy had been practised we would not have had our indebtedness so high as the eight millions with which we are entitled to go into Confederation, but every man throughout the country knows that the cost of the two lines of railway would bring it up to that amount, and the hon. member's own report verifies the conjecture, because it says that the debt, including the cost of the Picton extension, and the amount of the Annapolis subsidy will be nearly eight millions, not eight and a half or nine as was alleged. But the hon. member failed to tell us wherein our want of economy rested, and I trust he will yet enlighten the house on that point. It is true he seized upon an item of five or six thousand dollars expended upon Government House, but every one knows that that outlay was essential—the buildings and outhouses were in a ruinous condition and were disgraceful to the country. He must have been hard up for a grand attack when he took up that item instead of turning attention to those large services which really do absorb the revenue.

Let me now refer to a few figures in connection with these services. The hon. member admits that, under our Administration, the revenue increased fifty per cent. in four years. In giving us the rates of increase of the revenue, it was said that the Government was not entitled to any credit for the increase. Now, I do not think that I can be charged with having claimed undue credit in connection with our finances; but it is not long since we were told that the logic of facts was exceedingly strong, and no men in the world were readier to claim credit for an increase of revenue when they were in power than gentleman opposite. They said nothing about their over expenditures, but whenever there was a little surplus they were ready to jump up and say, "See what able financiers we are!" The argument applicable to one side is surely applicable to the other. A government cannot do more than see that every opportunity is afforded for the development of the country's industry, and we can claim credit for having devoted large sums of money to develop and foster our resources in the highest degree, not only by an energetic conduct of the public works, but by the encouragement of general industry, aiding the introduction of capital. As far as these measures have gone to improve the position of the country, we are entitled to credit for the increase of revenue. And what extravagance have we been guilty of? I contrasted, the other day, the expenditures under our administration and that of the gentlemen who preceded us, in the various de-

partments, and I will now recall it to the recollection of the hon. member. These gentlemen, in the three years 1860, 1861 and 1862, with all their frugality and vigilance, only gave to the roads and bridges \$324,000, while we in 1864, 1865, 1866 and 1867, have given \$1,015,000, or more than three times their grant. And yet we are told, in the face of these facts, that we have \$200,000 to account for. As to education, we find that in their three years they spent \$199,000 while in our past three years of government we have given \$505,305, or three times as much as they gave. Then we will take navigation securities, for which they spent \$10,283, against \$171,620 which we have spent, and which, added to the grant of the present year, will be \$194,620.

These are the departments in which we have been charged with extravagance,—the departments connected most closely with the dearest interests of every section of the country. Can it be supposed the people will begrudge the expenditure upon such public improvements as we have carried on, the most important of which has received from us the sum of \$199,000 against \$10,283, which they granted? I ask if the hon. member does not blush at the comparison which he obliges us to make? In the Militia department—and I may say that in this service I do not desire to claim credit for expenditure because it is not so popular, but is the result of necessity, and was authorized by the unanimous vote of the legislature—in that department they only had to spend \$36,000, while we had to extract from the treasury \$191,000. As far as these services are concerned, it will be seen that our expenditure kept pace with the increase of the revenue, but let the hon. member take up the reports of the Committee of Public Accounts, and he will find that in the Revenue department, while we collected more revenue by one-half than they did, the increase in the expenditure has not amounted to 5 per cent. We have, in that service, observed the strictest economy, and have never allowed the expenses to exceed the fair cost of collection.

The Board of Works having been selected as the only department with which fault could be found let me turn attention to the fact that the expenditure in that department could not have been avoided. The outlay of \$20,000 in the quarantine service was essential, and that the "Daring," being engaged in operations connected with Sable Island made eighteen or nineteen voyages saving an enormous amount of property, of course cost much more than if the "Daring" had been allowed to lie at the wharf until the season when the light houses were usually visited. The extension of the Hospital for the Insane was a measure of necessity, and two or three new light houses had to be erected.

The Penitentiary expenses depend on the number of criminals sent from the various courts, and that is a matter over which the government could have had no control. The expenses of Sable Island being \$11,000 were larger than in any previous year because a number of men were living on the Island for the purpose of saving wrecked property. So that in the very service on which the hon. member has laid his hand I have shewn that the expenditure was not of a character that could be avoided, but was es-

sential to the proper administration of our public affairs. Before the hon. member for East Halifax rises to address the House as he probably will, I would turn his attention to one or two matters to which outside of the House he has called the public notice by means of the journal under his control.

In the "Morning Chronicle" of April 26th I see the following paragraph:—

"In order to ascertain the truth of this report Mr. Annand asked of the Financial Secretary a return containing the date of Delaney's appointment to office, the money he had collected, and the portion of it he had paid into the treasury in each year. This was a demand especially aggravating to the Government, as the communistic philosopher was a near relative of the "Premier," and had been by him installed in the office of Collector, from which an irreproachable incumbent had been summarily ejected, for political reasons. After a totally unnecessary delay of some weeks, the document was produced. It consisted of four or five lines, which showed that in the space of little more than three years Mr. Tupper's nominee had converted to his own use \$18,997.87 of the Provincial money. This return lacked, however, what the public would most desire to see—the amounts received at Amherst in each year, and those paid in, so that a fair judgment might be formed as to whether there was any complicity between the Government and its defaulting officer. For if Delaney, in his first year of office, failed to account for the moneys he had received, he should have been at once dismissed, unless his interests as a relative of Dr. Tupper could have been proved of more importance than those of the Province. The adroit Financial Secretary, however, would not let the public into the whole state of the relations between the Collector and the Government, and the inference is plain that these were most discreditable to the latter."

In connection with that let me read the question which the hon. gentleman did actually lay on the table:

"Mr. Annand asked for a return showing the date of the appointment of James W. Delaney as Collector of Customs Duties at Amherst—together with an account of the amount of duties collected by that officer and paid into the treasury from the date of said appointment to the 31st Decemr last."

In this request there is not a single word said of annual payments or quarterly payments or monthly payments, and at the time he or his underlings wrote that article, carrying an entirely false issue to the country, he had the return in his hands and had not ventured to ask for an amended return, but went to the secrecy of his editorial chair and penned a violation of the truth. With regard to the defalcations of the Amherst Collector of Customs I may say that the government greatly regret the loss which has arisen, and as the Prov. Secy. being one of the representatives for the county might be suspected of indulgence, it is but fair to say that the deficiency of Mr. Delaney was brought to my notice on my return last spring and my colleagues left for England with the distinct understanding that unless Delaney made arrangements for payment he should be dismissed. I then went to Amherst, made an investigation, and finding that matters were not getting worse, that the collector was paying the duties he was collecting and that the probabilities were that by allowing him to remain in office the chances of getting the amount due would be greater than by peremptory dismissing him, I took the responsibility

of allowing Mr. Delaney to go on, and on the return of my colleagues, finding that that officer had not availed himself of the indulgence to put his affairs in a better condition, he was summarily dismissed. I make this explanation in order that the position of the Prov. Secy. may not be misunderstood, and to show that the responsibility of Mr. Delaney continuing in office rested with me, and I have the gratification of knowing that my leniency resulted in no further loss to the treasury. With that explanation let me call the hon. member's attention to another escapade of the "Morning Chronicle," and this is a matter that should not be lost to the country. Some time ago the hon. member for East Halifax undertook to review in severe terms a very able and admirably written pamphlet entitled "Confederation considered on its merits." The contents of this pamphlet were represented as very foul and as wholly unworthy of belief by the country, but I wish to call attention to the fact that in writing an article on our local resources the hon. member has taken the liberty of copying three pages of that pamphlet as his own production. I think the hon. member would do a public service if he went to the same source oftener and if he doled out to his readers in the country more liberally the productions favorable to Confederation. By the comparison which I now make it will be seen that a part of the pamphlet has been copied verbatim with the substitution of the word Nova Scotia where Canada appeared and where the change was appropriate:

The pamphlet says:

"In 1834 Belgium was without a railroad system, and was dependent for inter-communication upon the old-fashioned resources. The Government initiated a system of railways which, within twenty years, formed a network stretching, altogether, to nearly one thousand miles. Let the result be marked. In 1835 the whole value of her exports and imports was \$10,760,000 stg. In 1845 it had arisen to £27,000,000; in 1855 to £47,760; in 1860, to £72,126,000; and in 1864, to £97,280. This immense trade, therefore, which still continues to expand, Belgium owes to the fact that she is a coal-producing country, and that she now possesses railway communication with the most important points on the continent of Europe. Within thirty years, a country scarcely larger than Nova-Scotia, and with a population not greater than that of the British Provinces, has increased its trade tenfold, by adopting and carrying out that very policy which the Union party in this Province have just brought to a successful termination. Here, then, is a country, which, within less than a generation, has by means of its railway

The Chronicle says:

"In 1834 Belgium was without a railway system, and was dependent for intercommunication upon the old-fashioned resources, as we were ten or eleven years. The Government initiated a system of railways (as was the case in Nova-Scotia), which, within twenty years, formed a network stretching altogether to nearly one thousand miles. Let the result be marked. In 1835 the whole value of her exports and imports was £10,760,000 stg. In 1840 it had raised to £27,000,000; in 1855 to £47,760,000; and in 1864, to £97,280,000. This immense trade, which still continues to expand, Belgium owes to the fact that she (like Nova-Scotia) is a coal-producing country, and that she now possesses railway communication with the most important points on the continent of Europe. Within less than thirty years Belgium increased her trade tenfold, by adopting and carrying out that same policy which we also adopted long ago, and are now carrying out with like successful results. She employed her

system—by the development of its mineral resources, built up a trade four or five times greater than that of these United Provinces at the present time.”

“The path of duty, therefore, is plain before us, and it lies happily in the same direction with that of our honour and our interest.—No man who is not a Republican at heart but will indignantly resent any interference with our liberty of action as a people, or even the shadow of dictation on the part of a foreign power. Our policy is one of peace—of industry—of good neighbourhood; our desire to gather in and consolidate our power—to utilize our resources, and assimilate our constitution as far as possible with that of the Empire of which we form a part.”

“A noble inheritance is now at our disposal; let us not be tempted, like the thoughtless or credulous prodigal, lightly to cast it from us. Isolation has found and kept us weak, and battling for mere existence till the present hour. Union opens up to us fresh fields of enterprise and profit, offers us a tempting and honorable present, and assures us of a glorious future—a future which will, within the lifetime of the present generation, witness Halifax as a first-class city, with its noble harbour crowded with shipping from every part of the globe; will find Cape Breton dotted with mines, and her fertile fields in the highest state of cultivation; will see the mineral resources of the Eastern Counties expanding themselves into manufactories of every description, while the fertile valleys and meadow lands of the West will supply the market of the capital, and bring a wealth and comfort to their owners which they never knew before, rendering them independent of foreign tariffs.”

It is quite right that the hon. member should quote from each a source, but it would be only fair for him to give credit for it and to say that having read the pamphlet his eyes have been opened and his opinions changed.

Mr ANNAND said:—The Financial Secretary in his concluding remarks referred to an article which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*, written by one of the staff of that paper, but which he attributed to me. Let me say that the great excellence of that journal is that its editors are legion, and although I may be the sole responsible editor,

revenues in building her railways and developing her mineral resources as has been done in Nova Scotia for some time past, and thus built up her trade, as we are building up ours.”

“Determined to maintain our freedom, the path of duty is plain before us, and it lies happily in the same direction with that of our honour and our interest. The policy of the Nova Scotia party is one of peace—of industry and good neighbourhood;—their desire to gather in and consolidate our strength—to utilize our resources, and to assimilate our constitution as far as possible with that of the Empire of which we are proud to form a part, and not with that of the neighboring Republic, as the Unionists are so earnestly striving to do.”

“A noble inheritance is now at our disposal; let us not be tempted, like the thoughtless or credulous prodigal lightly to cast it from us.—Political isolation combined with commercial union, have already largely benefitted our little Province and assure us of a glorious future—a future which will, within the lifetime of the present generation, witness Halifax as a first class city, with its noble harbour crowded with shipping from every part of the globe; will find Cape Breton dotted with mines, and her fertile fields in the highest state of cultivation; will see the mineral resources of the Eastern counties expanding themselves into manufactories of every description—while the fertile valleys and meadow lands of the West will supply the market of the capital, and bring a comfort and wealth to their owners which they never knew before, rendering them independent of foreign tariffs.”

that it is sustained by an array of talent worthy of the great body of the people whose views and wishes it reflects. In reference to the article in question, my attention was called to the fact that the concluding passages of a pamphlet on Confederation had formed part of a leader of that paper. The writer of the article had evidently been reading the production supposed to be inspired in the hon gentleman's own office, and had probably intended to mark the passage which he quoted with inverted commas, but I am happy to see that the remarks which the hon member was pleased to term eloquent, were so applicable to the condition of Nova Scotia if allowed to retain her revenues and separate government. The Fin Sec has made a violent attack on the late administration. I do not know why I should be called upon on all occasions to defend their policy in the presence of a gentleman, himself the leader of that government, and I am surprised that that hon member does not spring to his feet out of regard to the gentlemen with whom he was associated, and to the government of which he was a distinguished member, although he has changed his position in this house, and is no longer leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ARCHIBALD—I prefer to leave the defence to the financial officer of the late government.

Mr ANNAND continued—Then I am quite prepared with the defence. I was surprised to hear the Fin Sec address the house in the tones which he assumed, and I was amused to hear him make a number of statements which are contrary to the fact. He said that the late government over expended \$300,000 in 1862. I tell him that the statement is largely inaccurate. I hold the Journals of the house under my hand, and I find that while the estimate was for \$957,008, we paid out \$982,653, making an over expenditure of \$25,646, not \$300,000 as asserted by the hon member. I give that as a specimen of the general accuracy of the Fin Sec, and I tell him that he never rises without so bungling the facts and confusing himself as to make me feel ashamed that the country should have an officer so remarkable for his inaccuracy and ignorance of the affairs of his own department. He says also that in 1863 we over expended a large sum. What are the facts? In 1863 we estimated as is shewn by the Journals \$1,031,174, and we expended \$1,072,274, making an over expenditure of only \$41,100.

In 1861 our total liability for over expenditure including the large liabilities left us by our predecessors was \$136,000, and by our financial policy—by imposing an additional duty of 2½ per cent, for a single year we were enabled to clear off that liability and to show a moderate surplus in the treasury. We promptly surrendered the reins of power when the issue of the elections was known, and it cannot be laid to our door that we increased the public debt one penny during our term of office. Now let me tell him what the present state of matters is as well as the information which I can obtain for myself will enable me; because the return which I asked for on April 11th has not yet come down. By the report of the Committee of Public Accounts read to-day it ap-

pears that our liability on 30th Sept., six months ago, was \$6,032,017. Add to that the amount due for the Picton Railway, and the new liability for the Annapolis Railway, and you have \$8,376,000 without counting the \$35,000 of treasury notes recently issued. At the present moment then, I feel justified in assuming that the indebtedness of the Province is half a million at least over the eight millions, with which we enter into confederation. There are large liabilities which have been incurred to which our attention has not been directed by the government, for reasons known to themselves. I refer especially to the liabilities which have been incurred in connection with the new Provincial Building, the Hospital for the Insane, for St. Peter's Canal and other public works, which fully justify me in assuming that our debt on the 30th June next, when our chief revenues are to be transferred to the Dominion of Canada, will amount to \$8,500,000.

Hon FIN SEC rose to correct a statement which had just been made, but was called to order.

Mr S CAMPBELL said it was most unbecomingly for a member of the government thus to interfere with the discussion.

Hon PRO SEC thought that a mere correction on a question of fact should be allowed.

Mr ANNAND continued—I would hear the explanation, only the Financial Secretary has invariably refused the privilege to me. It will be remembered that this discussion was commenced by an inquiry from Mr McLellan with respect to certain stores furnished by a member of the Board of Works. We are now on the eve of a general election, and I am not surprised at the desire of the Government to cover up the transactions of the past, and their evident anxiety that their culpable waste and extravagance during their term of office may be hidden. I was, therefore, glad to see my friend rise, and with the public accounts under his hand, make the inquiries which he did. And what have we heard to-day? We had an account read containing charges of such amounts as \$51 for "small stores." Now surely the public business should be done as a private merchant would like to see his own affairs managed, and I ask what man would be content to receive a grocer's bill charging him with \$51 worth of stores without specifying what the supplies consisted of? If such a course would not be pursued in private business, was it right for the Financial Secretary, the officer charged with watching over the public expenditure, to have passed these accounts without ascertaining what the particulars are? We are going to the country, most of us, and it is important that the people should know what a brilliant set of financiers they have had for the past four years—how economical they were of the public moneys—how thrifty the Government are; and I hope that when my friend from West Halifax (Mr Tobin), who sits smiling beside me, and his colleague opposite (Mr Shannon), who very seldom smiles, go down to my old constituents, among the farmers of Musquodoboit and Gay's River, that they will tell them of the expenditure on Government House. I hope they will tell the fishermen, in their humble dwellings on the shore, that we have a splen-

did Government House in Halifax; and although it is soon to be transferred from our control, in the very last year of their management, so plentiful was the money, so perfect are the roads and bridges, so thoroughly have the people been educated, that the Government could afford to spend \$420 for the damask hangings of a single room. Think of that for an election cry for the two gentlemen—that the fringe for the curtains is charged at \$16 per yard, amounting to \$108 for two or three windows. What will the electors of East Halifax say when they are told that \$2200 has been expended in renovating a single room in Government House—a sum sufficient to build the largest bridge that they require? What will they say at finding that \$850 have been spent for fenders alone in Government House, to keep the ladies' dresses from being scorched in the ball-room? I imagine the hon and learned Speaker going down among the Acadians of Clare, and asking them to justify such an expenditure.

The Fin Secretary was pleased also to refer to another article in the *Morning Chronicle* commenting on a certain return which he laid on the table. In the hurry of writing the request which I made for the return, I may have neglected to ask for full details; but after all that was not a serious omission, and, if the Fin Sec had done what he should have done—if he had nothing to conceal, he would have come down with a full and ample return, and thus have disarmed the newspaper in its attack. Instead of doing that he comes down and makes a charge of want of truthfulness. Now, without applying for any further information, than that which is under my hand, because it seems that the department does not like to give information, let me speak of this defalcation. The Fin Secretary says that in July last his attention was called to the large sum due by the Collector at Amherst. I ask him why the attention of the Government was not called to the matter before? By reference to the Journals I find that in 1865 the amount collected by Mr. Delany was \$12,448, while the sum paid in was only \$2295, leaving a balance of \$10,153 at the end of the financial year. The matter then must have come to the notice of the Government on the 30th Sept., 1865 and the Fin Sec did not leave on his delegation until long after that, and the duty of the Government was to put Delany's bonds in the hands of the Atty General if the arrears were not paid up. But the arrears went on to end of 1866, and the accounts then showed that in 1863, 1864, 1865, and 1866, the collector at Amherst received \$37,950, and the amount which he paid in was only \$33,019, making a deficiency on 30th Sept 1866, of \$14,931. The action of the Government, as I understand it, was taken not last year but since the beginning of the present year, and the important enquiry is, what chance has the government of receiving the large balance due. Are the persons who signed Delany's bond liable for the amount of the deficiency, and if so, are they able to pay? If not, I charge it upon the Government that they have been recreant to their duty, and they should be called on to replace the sum lost through their own negligence.

The Financial Secretary referred to the large

sums which have been expended in the different services during his term of office. I have not checked his figures, but I can only say that I am glad the Government have been able to expend such large sums on education, navigation securities, and roads and bridges. It is gratifying to know that our trade is so elastic and prosperous that they could afford the expenditure. But are we indebted to him for that increase and for these grants? Is it not well known that a large number of the members of government have been absent from the Province for months together, and the revenues would have poured in just as well if they had been the whole of their time out of the country instead of a part of it? The revenue came in under a tariff bequeathed to them by their predecessors. And if the members of government, one and all of them, had been in Jerusalem or Jericho, we would have had the money to expend. On a former day, in making a return of the fines and forfeitures imposed by the Board of Revenue, the Financial Secretary took the opportunity to say that the present government had collected more money in that way, and that more money had gone into the treasury as the result of their vigilance, than under the rule of their predecessors. I took the trouble to dissect his return and I give him the result. In four years the late government imposed fines to the extent of \$10,919, and paid into the treasury \$5,819—a trifle over one-half. The Financial Secretary propounded the principle that the true test of vigilance and ability was the *net* amount paid into the treasury. I have shewn that we paid in a larger amount, and his own official return places his government in a most unfavorable comparison. But let me tell him more: those fines are not imposed for the purpose of getting money paid into the treasury, but to check illicit trade, and it was part of the policy of the late government to reward their officers for the vigilance they displayed. I believe it would be good economy to give every penny of the fines to the officers, because the revenue is thereby swollen largely over the amount of outlay. Am I then not justified in saying that the late government were more vigilant than their successors?—and I sum up my proof on this point thus: I have proved that we imposed a larger amount of fines for infringement of the revenue laws, and I have further proved that we were more vigilant than the fact that \$14,000 have been lost through the carelessness of the present government—a charge which cannot be laid against the previous administration. I therefore challenge the Financial Secretary to rise and again hazard the assertion that the government have been more vigilant than their predecessors. The Provincial Secretary, in speaking of delegations, referred to the time when Mr. Howe went to England, some ten years ago, and took £500 for his expenses, and that under the Johnston administration but £300 was charged; but it will be found that the members of the Howe government, immediately preceding the present, only took £300; and what is more, that the gentlemen now in power again increased the amount to £500, and paid that sum to each of six delegates during the past year. But let me turn

attention to another fact. The Howe government spent in delegations during the four years they held office \$4,080,—how much have the present government spent? In making the calculation, I assume that the Provincial Secretary charged the same sum as his colleagues received; and I find that while our expenditure for delegations was \$4080, they have spent in three years \$30,997, making a difference of \$26,917. This is a specimen of the economy and retrenchment which these gentlemen have displayed.

Hon PROV SEC.—What about the result of the Delegations?

Mr ANNAND continued—Yes, sir, I am prepared to compare the results. One of the precious results of the recent delegation is, not to put on the paltry tax of 2½ per cent for a year, to which the Fin Sec referred as being imposed by us, but to impose an increase of fifty per cent in the ad valorem duties for all time to come, and a further tax upon four articles of general consumption as was shewn the other day to the extent of more than \$300,000 per year. These are the results of his delegation, as compared with those of the delegations which cost \$4080. When this House is about to expire I think it is high time to enquire what has become of retrenchment,—to ask how the promises of the Provincial Secretary have been redeemed. I spent an hour or two in looking through the Journals, and in summing up, first the promises which were made and the expenses which had been incurred since, I have been able to put the whole subject into a nutshell, and to shew what each department cost in 1862 and what now. Under the celebrated scheme of retrenchment the Lieut Governor was to be compelled to disgorge \$12,000 of his salary, but the mover of the resolution knew or should have known before he made his proposal that the salary of that officer could not be touched. The Judiciary in 1862 cost \$14,850,—it now costs \$18,050, so that in this department we have had an increase of \$3200 per annum during the past four years instead of the saving of \$2000 which were promised, making a difference between the intended retrenchment and the actual increase of \$5200. The Provincial Secretary's office in 1862 cost \$5600, and in 1866 it cost \$5800, being an increase of \$200; but I find in addition to this that there has been a new charge of \$222 for telegrams, so that since 1862 the increase in that department has been \$422. So that instead of cutting down the expenses \$930, the hon member's own department costs \$1322 more than he said was sufficient in 1862. In the Fin Sec's office a saving of \$500 was proposed in 1862, and one clerk was then considered sufficient, but additional clerks have been added until the expense has grown from \$3700 to \$4900, making a difference of \$1200 there,—the difference between the proposed saving and the increased cost being \$1700. I am not, in making these observations, to be understood as saying that the salaries of these departments are very extravagant, but I wish to call the attention of the House to this question because the Government came in on the cry of retrenchment, and it is desirable to see how nobly they have redeemed their pledges. In the Receiver General's

department it was proposed to reduce the expenditure from \$4200 to \$4050; but I find that the expenses remained the same. In the Crown Land Department it was proposed to reduce the salary of the Commissioner and the number of clerks, and I find that instead of the expenses being curtailed they have been increased by \$1120—the difference between the proposed saving and the actual increase in the Halifax office being \$2670.

And this is the way the pledges of the Provincial Secretary and his friends have been redeemed. In 1862 it was proposed to abolish the Board of Works, and by amalgamating it with the Railway Department effect a saving of \$4061 a year, instead of which that department has been increased in cost to the amount of \$1070. In the expenses of the Legislature a saving was proposed which would reduce them from \$32,299 to \$26,355 instead of which they have been raised by \$16,705 over the estimate of 1862. As to the Revenue Department, there was a motion to cut off \$4410 from the expenses of that service, but at the present moment the cost of collection is \$20,224 more than in 1862. In that year the cost of the Halifax office was \$26,000, against \$38,173 in 1866, making an excess of \$12,173. Instead of the number of clerks being reduced, half a dozen have been added. The Militia grant has been increased by \$92,000; and the Normal School, which was to have been amalgamated with Dalhousie College, and a saving of \$6,965 effected, has been raised by \$2860.

The result of all this is as follows: The proposed saving in 1862 was \$79,648, while there has been an increase in the cost of the public departments in 1866 of \$143,420, making a difference between the proposed saving and the actual excess of \$223,000, nearly a quarter of a million more than the sum estimated as sufficient at the time these gentlemen rode into power.

I trust that the return asked for will be furnished; and I can only say that if ever an example of extravagance and want of vigilance was furnished to any people, it was furnished by the accounts referred to by my hon. friend from North Colchester. It may be said that a member of the Board of Works tendered for, and furnished to the Board, certain articles under the late Government, — but here we find an officer furnishing articles which he did not tender to supply, and which he does not deal in, to the extent of \$20,000 in a single year. I hold that this is a great abuse; and I consider it a misfortune, if not a crime, that the bill introduced by the hon member for Colburne last session, to debar members of public Boards from competing in contracts for supplies, had not been passed.

I trust that, before the House rises, we will have laid before us a return showing the public indebtedness — our assets and liabilities — on entering Confederation, asked for by me on a former day. If, by our indebtedness being increased to the extent of half a million of dollars, the small pittance which we are hereafter to receive is to be reduced by \$25,000 a year, it is due to the country that the fact should be known.

Hon FIN SECY:—The hon member declined to

allow me to interrupt him, to correct a statement of facts. I will read from the documents signed by the hon member himself, recorded on the journals and the House will be able to see whether his statement or mine is deserving of most credit. I do not want to indulge in any vituperation but I have some regard for my reputation for candour and straight-forwardness as a public man, and I am therefore anxious that I should not commit an error of fact. I ask the hon gentleman to look at his own estimate for 1862 and he will find that the sum estimated was \$957,008 and the Receiver General's account shows that there were paid in warrants \$1,257,934 making an excess of \$300,926. I submit then whether I was not correct in my statement or whether the hon member did not make a reckless and unguarded assertion. I will not go into a general reply to the hon member's speech because it is a mere rehash of what we have heard before and what has been explained over and over again. I leave it to the intelligence of the country to decide the issue of the question and I am willing to give the hon member the benefit of whatever effect his statements may have.

Mr. ANNAND:—If I wanted an illustration of the hon member's want of knowledge of his own accounts I could not have a better one than that which has just been given in the remark we have heard. If he understands the public accounts he must know that the Receiver General's account does not exhibit the cost of the services of the year. There might have been nearly \$30,000 paid in 1862 for the liabilities of the previous year. The comparative statement of revenue and expenditure is the source from which alone accurate information can be obtained, and a reference to it will show my statement to be correct.

HON FIN SEC:—The charge made against the government was that we had paid a much larger sum than was estimated and I have shewn that in the year mentioned the actual expenditure was \$300,000 more than was authorized. Let the hon member explain it if he can.

Mr. ANNAND—The expenditure in the various departments and the estimate of the preceding year were just what I stated them to be as fully appears by the Journals under my hand.

HON PRO SEC said he would have had pleasure in replying to the hon member for East Halifax, but the hon gentleman had talked the House out.

The debate was adjourned.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill to amend the Act concerning the city of Halifax, the object being to reduce the numbers of the City Council to twelve, and to authorize the payment of the Board to the extent of \$2000.

HON FIN SEC said that there was no excuse for the bill being brought in at that period of the session.

Mr. HILL said that the Committee on City Bills had bestowed a great deal of time and attention on the city legislation, and he thought that such a change as the one proposed would relieve the House of a great deal of labor.

The bill was read a first time.

Hon PROV SEC laid on the table a copy of the bill authorizing the guarantee for the Intercolonial Railway, as it passed the Imperial Parliament.

The House adjourned.

THURSDAY, May 2.

Speech of the Hon. Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER rose and said :—Mr. speaker, in rising to move that the House go into Committee on Bills, I hope that the House will indulge me in making a few observations in reply to those which fell from the hon. member for East Halifax yesterday, in reference to the management of the public business. I feel that after the very full and satisfactory answer given by my hon friend, the Financial Secretary, it would be unnecessary for me to make any very lengthy observations at present, were it not that the hon member for East Halifax, in view, as he frankly admits, of the fact that this Legislature is very soon to terminate its existence, and that an appeal will be made to the people, has felt it his duty and has availed himself of his privilege, as a member of the Legislature, on several occasions, to make very pointed and personal allusions to myself—not personal as regards my private position, but personal in relation to my connection with the government of the country, and the course which, as a public man, I have taken in public affairs.

If ever there was a government able to claim credit from the country for the position which it occupies in relation to the mode in which the public business has been conducted, it is the government of which I have the honor to be a member. I do think that the annals and the records of the proceedings of any legislative assembly, in any part of the world, may be searched in vain to find a parallel to the present case. I think, sir, it would be difficult to find any instance in which any gentleman had the temerity to challenge the conduct of an administration which has been so eminently successful as the one that now administers the public business. The desperate necessities of the hon. member—his anxiety to find some political capital with which to agitate the country, has induced him to venture upon a ground on which I can only say I am most happy to meet him, for I feel that the government can triumphantly sustain their claim to the confidence of this House and of this country.

BOARD OF WORKS.

Whilst I thus gladly avail myself of the opportunity of discussing this question with the hon. member, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, on the general conduct of the public business of the country, I will admit that there is one subject brought to my notice by gentlemen opposite, which I am not, at the present moment, in a position fully to justify, and I make that acknowledgment frankly and decidedly. The statements brought forward by the hon. member for North Colchester, in reference

to the Public Works department, took me as much by surprise as they could have any hon. member in this House, and I regret very much to be obliged to make such a statement as that to this Assembly; but I would remind the late Financial Secretary that, however much ground there might be for cert in statements presented to the House yesterday being made the subject of some animadversion, I think it scarcely becomes honorable gentleman, who formerly had charge of the financial department of this country, to make the statement which he did in relation to the matter yesterday. I will only say that the practice of allowing members of the Board of Works, who are unpaid officers, to tender for and supply certain articles for the use of the public service, was not one which was adopted by the present government.

From the time that the Board of Works was first constituted down to the present time, it has been invariably the practice not to exclude gentlemen who are connected, as unpaid members of the Board of Works, from furnishing for the use of the public departments anything which they might have an opportunity of supplying. I must say, after the statements which were made yesterday, that there is some ground to question whether it is advisable that such a state of things should be allowed to continue; but the present Government did not feel justified in altering or changing the system which had been in operation since the Board of Works was constructed. I mentioned a year ago, when the subject was brought before this House—when a bill was introduced for the purpose of attacking the department, the passage of which would have been to admit that there were grounds for the attack—I mentioned at that time that the Commissioners of the Board of Works, under the late Administration, had been in the habit of supplying articles for that department. I mentioned a gentleman in this city (Mr. Gibson)—a gentleman of responsibility and standing, as having, when a member of the Board of Works, supplied the department with various articles of merchandise. The late Government, with which the hon. member for East Halifax was connected, never censured that course, and had never considered it necessary to bring in a bill in reference to the matter. It was not pretended yesterday that any of the articles furnished were at a higher price than they could have been procured in the market at the time. I think that the hon. member for Colchester did find some case where some article had actually cost one cent more than it could have been obtained, he believed, at that time in this city. I do not intend to open up old questions, but I think it hardly becomes gentlemen opposite to talk about the excess of a single cent. There may be something in the fact that a member of the Board of Works was in the habit of supplying articles in which he was not in the habit of dealing; and if the Board of Works was to be continued under the administration of the Government, the question might very legitimately

arise whether the members of that department should not be excluded from tendering for the supplies it may require for the public service.

It will be remembered that when the gentlemen opposite were in power, they undertook to construct a Lunatic Asylum, and I brought forwards the papers to prove that, not in a case where articles had been furnished to comparatively small amounts there had been an overcharge, but that the Government had actually made a contract which bound them to pay prices for lumber which, when stated in this House, astonished nobody more than the Government themselves. They had made a contract under which they paid the contractor £35 per thousand feet of spruce floors.

I was also surprised to find the entries made under the head of "small stores," and as I think the Committee of Public Accounts had a right to know what the expenditure is on everything that is furnished for the public service, upon the request of the hon. member for North Colchester, I immediately directed the Chairman of the Board of Works to supply the most minute information. I may say something with reference to one account to which the attention of the house is drawn, and that was, an expenditure in connection with a quarantine station. On that question I feel bound to assume my full share of the responsibility. It is well known that this city was perfectly panic-struck last Spring, in consequence of the steamship England having come into this port with cholera, and of a large number of persons having fallen victims to that fearful disease. Under these circumstances, the attention of the Government was directed to the necessity of providing a quarantine station, and I so reported the fact to the Government.

I may say the expense was to be borne by the City conjointly with the Province, and the Mayor and other parties connected with the Civic Government also concurred in that selection; but when it became known that Lawlor's Island had been chosen, some excitement was created in the city, and a large number of merchants and others expressed themselves against the choice, and represented that it was in every way unsuitable. Under such circumstances the Government thought it necessary to take the steamer Neptune and obtain the co-operation of a number of citizens to examine this and other places, and see whether it was, or was not, suitable for the purpose proposed. I therefore requested the Board of Works to take his Excellency the Governor and General Doyle, both of whom had had experience of cholera in other places, and medical and other gentlemen who, I supposed, took a deep interest in the question, and would satisfy the public mind. I found that this examination would occupy the entire day, and therefore requested the Board of Works to provide luncheon for the gentlemen who were invited to assist in selecting a suitable quarantine station. If there has been any large expenditures in connection with matters of this kind, outside of the two occasions on which the Government visited Sambro and different

places, for the purpose of providing a quarantine station, I am not aware of the fact. I would remind the hon. member for East Halifax that he can scarcely have forgotten that it was but a few years ago when the fact was brought to his notice that over £300 had been expended on providing a luncheon and the necessary wines and liquors on the occasion of opening one wing of the Hospital for the Insane.

Mr. ANNAND.—It was only \$320.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—I am glad that the memory of the hon. member on the point is so minute; but I believe my recollection of the amount is as good as his own, and that the sum was as large as I have stated it. It may also be remembered that the second clerk in the Provincial Secretary's office had actually under the regime of the hon member and his friends, spent this large sum of money which had been charged to the Board of Works, in connection with this public entertainment. It will also be known that when some nine miles of railway were opened, a considerable sum was spent in a public entertainment.

Mr. MCKAY.—Only three miles.

Dr. TUPPER.—I am glad of the correction of the hon. member. I feel as respects expenditure for such matters the present Government can challenge comparison with their predecessors. The present Government have opened up not three but over one hundred miles of railway, since they came into power, without expending a single dollar for a public entertainment, such as the hon. member and his friends gave when the insignificant length of railroad that I have mentioned was completed. The Government have, indeed, been censured—have been called mean because they went to no expense in laying the corner stone of the Provincial Building opposite. They have not built one wing only, but the centre of the Hospital for the Insane, and completed other great public works, and yet have never given the entertainments which the gentlemen opposite indulged in on every possible occasion. I will bear, however, as equally as I can the censure of my countrymen for having been too economical, and not having that regard to *eclat* which all governments generally like.

With reference to the large expenditure to which attention has been called in reference to the Board of Works, I may say that no person was more dissatisfied than were the government when they found that that department had expended so large a sum of money on this service. But I must add that when I saw the hon. member for South Kings (Dr. Brown) smiling complacently while the character of his brother was at stake, whilst it was placed in a position the most humble man would shrink from, I began to think that there was reason to suspect treachery in reference to that officer. When I knew that this hon. member had always opposed the Government—when I found him thus sustaining gentlemen in making this attack upon his own brother, who is the chief and responsible officer of the Board of Works, at a time when he was about appealing to the country, and was desirous of having political capital to take to the people, I felt that the time had come when no government would ever venture to have any public officer so closely identified with a gentleman who had determined to break them

down and destroy their reputation. (Hear, hear.) I felt if ever there was a gentleman who occupied a humiliating position it was the hon. member for south Kings, who could sit here and see his political friends make statements, which, if true, would prove his brother unworthy of the slightest confidence—which would prove him guilty of having used the public funds for which he is mainly responsible, and wasting them upon extravagant and uncalled for services. I can only say that I have felt bound without saying a word as to the truth of these allegations, to demand the most explicit information from the Chairman of the Board of Works. More than this, the moment the attention of the government was directed to the lavish expenditures in the public works, the chairman was called upon and told not to expend one dollar on any public service without the express authority of the government.

"UNAUTHORIZED EXPENDITURES."

The hon. member has referred to what he call "unauthorized expenditures," as if they were made without the authority of this house. The Financial Secretary has given the most ample refutation of these assertions; he has shewn that the expenditures have been for services that have received the sanction of this Legislature. The house will recollect that gentlemen on both sides, last session, gave a vote of credit to the government, and authorized them to spend the last dollar in the treasury for the defence of the country. Yet in the face of this fact, this expenditure has been brought forward by gentlemen opposite as "unauthorized." It is also known that the St. Peter's Canal is being constructed under an act of the Legislature. The Insane Hospital is being enlarged by the express authority of this house. A large sum was voted for the protection of the fisheries. All these authorized expenditures for most important public services have been brought forward and charged against the government as being unauthorized. Such is the way in which gentlemen opposite presume to trifle with the intelligence of this house and country.

THE POSITION OF THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT.

I shall not travel over the ground so ably trodden by the Financial Secretary, when he shewed that there was never a government that stood in a prouder position than the present, in relation to the administration of public affairs. Do we not all remember when the late government came down to the House, and in a public document claimed the support of the Legislature on the ground that there had been an increase in the revenue of £20,000? If, as gentlemen opposite would now pretend, an increase of revenue has nothing to do with the government of the country—has no connection with the mode in which the public business is conducted, or with the confidence that is felt among men of enterprize and capital who are developing our resources in consequence of the administration of public affairs,—if this be the case, how could they then dare to come down and ask from the people their confidence, because there had been an insignificant increase in the revenue of £20,000? But let me ask these gentle-

men how is it from the moment the present government assumed power, there has been a steady increase in the revenue from all public services? The hon gentleman (Mr Annand) has said it was his tariff that did it, but he knows that he has not the shadow of a claim to that tariff; it was put on the statute book by the Attorney General when the present party were in power, and the only specific alteration that it underwent was at the hands of J. J. Marshall when Financial Secretary, who arranged it on its present basis. Let the hon gentleman only claim paternity for what belongs to him. He can lay claim only for having come into this Legislature and declared that a ten per cent. duty was not enough to carry on the ordinary business after giving the most paltry amount to roads and bridges—and therefore proposed to saddle the people of this country with an additional duty of 2½ per cent, raising our taxes twenty-five per cent. over what they had ever been before. Under a tariff of 10 per cent he had sunk this Province into debt without grappling with a single important public service—without building a single mile of railway—without constructing a public building—to the extent of thirty-eight thousand pounds.

Now let me show what followed the change of administration,—when the public business was taken out of the hands of the hon member for East Halifax, and placed in those of the present government. I have no hesitation in saying that my hon friend, the Financial Secretary, if he were to leave public life to-morrow, would be able to point his fellow-countrymen with pride to the record which he would leave behind of the manner in which he had managed the public affairs. There is no man who has a child to be educated—who requires to use a public highway—who does not owe a debt of gratitude to my hon friend and his colleagues for the management of the financial affairs of this Province. I will glance, for a short time, at the position of the country, and contrast the three years we have been in power—leaving out 1863, which was divided between both governments—with the three years our predecessors managed the public business. Now take the leading services, and what do you get from them?

The revenue received from customs and excise, light duty, railways, crown lands and licenses, gold mines, coal mines, fees and hospital for the insane during the three years—1860, '61 and '62—under the late Financial Secretary, Mr Annand, was \$2,808,300.48, while the revenue collected from the same sources during 1864, '65 and '66 under the present government was \$4,428,433.25, shewing a balance of no less than \$1,620,132.77, in favor of the present Financial Secretary, yet the hon member for East Halifax ventures to challenge a discussion as to their relative claim to public confidence. I ask now does it become the late Financial Secretary—whose only credit to public support is that he increased the ten per cents. to 12½ per cent—to challenge the financial management of the present government. Let me remind the House that this 12½ per cent. passed away with the hon member's retirement from office. It will be, therefore, seen

in making the comparison that I give the gentlemen opposite credit for all the money derived from the burthen of 2½ per cent that they imposed upon the people over and above the ten per cent duty under which we have collected such an enormous revenue.

Yet it is in the face of figures like those I have given that the hon gentleman has presumed to make the statements he did. The man who took credit for a paltry increase of \$80,000 in the revenue during one year he was in office—an increase which he attributed to the vigilance and superior management of himself and colleagues—now comes in and challenges my hon friend with being incompetent because he can show nearly two millions of dollars in three years over and above what the ex-Financial Secretary was able to collect.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

When you look at the condition of every department of the public service, you will find the same vitality and progress exhibited. During the three years the gentlemen opposite were in power there was a complete stagnation in enterprise, and I ask them to point me to a single act which entitles them to the slightest claim as men of progress. The railway made no progress—they left it where they found it. No public works were constructed, except, I believe, the pier at Digby, which the tide washed away the other day. What is our position? The moment we came into power, and confidence was restored among men of capital and enterprise, the tide of prosperity again flowed back, and has gone on, until we now close the Legislature and go to receive from the people their verdict in the most triumphant attitude that ever public men stood in a country before. What do you think was the total amount of imports during the three years of the administration of the hon gentleman—when confidence was shaken from one end of the country to the other, under the inefficient and paralyzing effect of the financial management of the member for East Halifax? The total amount was \$24,113,708. During the three years of the present Administration these imports have increased from \$24,000,000 to \$41,000,000, the exact amount being \$41,367,312.

The exports show a similar state of things, though the trade returns, as it is well known, give the most feeble exhibit of the actual exports from the country. If we added the amounts derived from our shipping, in ships sold and the amounts which come back in bills of exchange, and from other sources of wealth, the exports would be really beyond the imports. The exports rose from \$18,000,000, under the administration of the honorable gentleman, to \$24,000,000 under the present Government. I give these facts as an evidence of the confidence that is inspired in trade the moment men have charge of the public affairs in whom the country has faith.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.

Then the customs and excise rose from \$2,089,898.77 to \$3,299,335.32 under the present government. Here is another evidence of the vigi-

lance and efficient management of public affairs by men who have labored earnestly and zealously for the promotion of the public service.

THE CROWN LANDS DEPARTMENT.

Take the Crown Lands Department, and what do you find? Upon what does the prosperity of a country depend? Is it not upon the inducement that is offered to men to come in and open up the waste lands and make them valuable? Under the management of our predecessors the Crown Lands Department only collected in the first year \$22,168.63. In the next year it fell to \$17,363.63c. What does that mean? It means that no sooner did the late Financial Secretary get into power than the people of this country opened up no more wilderness lands, for they had no confidence in the administrative ability of the hon gentleman. More than that, during those three years there was a complete system of retrogression in all the elements of wealth and prosperity. In 1862 the receipts from the Crown Lands went down still lower, to \$16,601.69. The total Receipts during the three years were \$56,132.95. I ask the House to contrast that exhibit with the record we shall leave behind. During the three years we have been in power, the receipts rose to \$136,579.01. Thus under an improved administration—under one in which the people had confidence—the receipts more than doubled.

THE MINES.

Take the gold mines again, and what do you find? The hon member only collected, down to 1863, \$47,650.52 from this source, whereas under the three years of the present administration \$69,108.33. Was it to be expected that men of capital and enterprise would willingly develop the resources of this country, after the position that the hon member for East Halifax had taken with reference to the mining interest of this country? I am proud to exempt the late Attorney General (Mr Archibald), who, with a spirit of patriotism which has also marked his conduct on another great question, stood forward and gave to the party in power his hearty co-operation in effecting the most valuable change that was ever made in connection with the development of the industrial resources of the country. Regardless of the ties of party, Mr Archibald united with Mr Johnston and his party, for the purpose of throwing open the mines and minerals of this Province, so long under a complete monopoly, to the capital and enterprise of the world. If Mr Archibald had no other claim to public consideration, this alone would be sufficient to entitle him to the eternal gratitude of Nova Scotia. When the arrangement that had been made by the delegates in London—an arrangement most favorable to this Province—came to be ratified by this Legislature, what position did the hon member for East Halifax take? Why, he placed himself in direct hostility to this great measure, which has conferred such untold benefits upon the people of this country. Therefore, I say, when the capitalists of Europe, the United States, and of this country saw that the man who had been so obstructive—who had shewn that he was the enemy of progress

—was placed in the position of Finance Minister, they naturally shrink from investing their money in this country. It is not therefore surprising that during the three years the hon. gentleman held power, the receipts from the coal mines were only \$95,036.07. Let me show the record that was exhibited when the hon. member was relieved from the responsibility of dealing with the finances of this country, and a new administration, in whom capitalists and men of enterprise had confidence, came into office. The returns from the coal mines rose to \$188,716.03. I give that to the hon. member as one of the fruits of the fact that he was not in a position to obstruct the prosperity of the country.

THE RAILWAYS.

The hon. gentleman made a strong appeal for the confidence of the country, before he went out of office, on the ground that there had been a small increase in the revenue of the railway. Nobody ought to have been surprised that a railroad in its third year would have a larger revenue than its first year, and when it had not time to develop itself. Now we have received \$562,831.59 for the receipts of the railway against \$376,767.26 when the department was in the hands of the hon. member and his friends.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE POSITION OF FINANCE MINISTER.

The importance of having the public finances managed by able hands cannot be over-estimated. In England, the great Liberal party have only one man to whom they look as their master in finance.—The great Conservative party, the moment they take office, entrust the financial management of the country to one man above all others. In England, as in every country, the intelligent public look with greater interest to the ability of the man who is to fill the position of Finance Minister than they do to all the other ministers put together. They know that unless he has the capacity to understand the trade of the country, and to grasp the subject of finance in all its details, there is no security for industry and enterprise. Then I say it was not strange that when the man who had shown himself the enemy of all progress—as the obstructive of the best interests of the Province—had become Finance Minister, trade and enterprise should have languished.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PUBLIC MONEYS —ROADS AND BRIDGES.

I have now shown the House what prosperity evinced itself in every department the moment the present government came into power. This prosperity occurred, not under what we may call the "Annand tariff," the highest ever known in this Province, but under a tariff twenty-five per cent lower. The question now occurs, what was done with all this money? Let any one look over the face of this country and he will see the way in which the public moneys have been expended. What was given by the gentlemen opposite for the road and bridge service—in which everybody, from the highest to the lowest, feels so deep an interest—on which depends the ability of the people to communicate so freely with one another, and take their produce to market. All

that they gave for three years for this important service was \$324,100; but what do we find when we come to look at the claims of the present administration to support in this particular. We have put against the sum given by our predecessors the magnificent amount of \$805,676. Is not that a fact which should enable my hon. friend, the Financial Secretary, to go into any county in this Province and ask its support and confidence. Not only have we thus generously dealt with the road and bridge service, but whenever there was a great and stringent necessity for some important undertaking we freely lent it our assistance.

EDUCATION.

Another most important service is Education. We all feel that the entire progress and prosperity of the country depends upon the means the people have of educating their children. Men sprung from the lowest ranks of life have been able to become the ornaments of their country, because, in their growth, they have been afforded facilities for educating and maturing their minds. I ask then what is due to a Government who grappled vigorously with the question of education which the Census of 1861 shewed to be in a most deplorable condition. What is due to the men who, with a single eye to the best interests of the country, and regardless of popular feeling, came forward and gave the country the blessings derived from Free Schools—who gave to the children of the poor the means of obtaining the best education the country could afford. Instead of the \$199,800—which the hon. member for East Halifax was able to give during the three years he was in power—the present Administration have given no less a sum than \$355,305 for the same service. I do not claim for the present Government the entire credit for the system of education. The hon. member for Colchester occupied on this question the same patriotic position that he did in respect to the Mines and Minerals and the Union of Colonies. Regardless of the ties of party he assisted the Government to put the present law upon the Statute Book. So it may be said of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Blanchard); but the hon. member for East Halifax did his utmost, in the press and elsewhere, to embitter the public sentiment of this country against the measure and to obstruct the enlightenment of the intellect of the people.

NAVIGATION SECURITIES.

Then there is the service of navigation securities—a service which has such important connection with the shipping interest of this country—that interest which has done so much to add to the wealth of the country. The total amount given to that service during the three years that the hon. member was in power was \$10,283. On the other hand, during the three years we have been in office, we have granted to this service the sum of \$171,620. I give that as the claim we have to the favorable consideration of all those persons interested in the shipping interest of this country.

THE DEFENCES OF THE COUNTRY.

But there is another service which is, perhaps, more vitally important to the country than roads and bridges or navigation securities; it is not as popular a service, but it is most important—I mean the defence of the

country. Who is there that does not know and feel that if you wish to invite capital and enterprize into your country—if you wish to encourage men to expend their money in the development of its resources, you must give them a guarantee that the results of their labors will be preserved and protected. Now, I would like the House to look at the position which the hon. member occupies in comparison with that of the present Finance Minister in relation to this question. Now, I tell the House that the great Power with which we are connected requires that the people should show that they are prepared to come forward, and by means of the public treasury and personal service, prove that they are desirous of perpetuating the connection. Who is there that does not know that this expenditure on our part is still more important as inspiring the great Power upon which we lean for protection with the confidence that the great sacrifices they have made in the past, and they are prepared to make in the future, will be appreciated by us, and will be met by corresponding exertions on our part? Just before leaving England my colleagues and myself had the honor of an interview with His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, the Commander-in-Chief, with Gen. Peel and the Colonial Minister, and when we explained what this and the other Provinces had done, and were prepared to do, in reference to the defences, the Minister of War (General Peel) said: "I am glad, gentlemen, that you have stated these facts so fully, for I can go down to Parliament and ask for the large grants that will be required in connection with the defences of British North America, because I shall have evidence to show that these loyal Provinces are ready to put their own shoulders to the wheel, and give such co-operation to the British Government as will, in case of conflict, prevent it being humiliated by any Power."

Now, we have to put against the \$36,000 given by our predecessors no less a sum than \$191,000. I give this as an evidence that, without an additional shilling of taxation imposed upon the people, we are able to give this handsome contribution to the public defences. And if the comparison was drawn between the amounts actually paid, it would be found that whilst the late Government expended \$31,619.55, we paid actually \$197,413.07.

THE FOREGOING RESULTS SUMMED UP.

Now, if we take all these important services I have enumerated, we find that we have a balance against the late Financial Secretary of

\$481,576—Roads and Bridges.
161,337—Navigation Securities.
155,505—Education.
161,413—Militia.

or a total of \$959,831—or nearly a million of dollars that we have expended more than was given by the late Financial Secretary.

RETRENCHMENT.

The hon. member also referred to the question of Retrenchment. That question has already been so fully explained that it seems almost trifling with the house to go into it at present. I would direct the attention of the hon. member to the fact that when I proposed a system of Retrenchment I did so—and the hon. mem-

ber's own journal will prove it—on this ground: that when the hon. member came to confess that under his financial administration the entire revenue of the country with a 10 per cent. duty—after giving a mere pittance to the Road and Bridge service—had not met the expenditure to the extent of £38,000, and that he was obliged, under these circumstances, to propose to tax the people 1½ per cent.; then I resisted the proposal and argued that in the depressed condition of the country the public expenditures ought to be brought, if possible, within the revenue, instead of imposing additional burthens on the country. But, sir, in the presence of the country I declared whilst proposing reductions in the salaries of certain public officers—and I refer the house to my speech as reported in full in the journal owned and edited by the hon. member,—that I based my entire demand upon the depressed condition of the country, and instead of saying that salary of the office thus held by my predecessor was too high, I stated frankly that I had held it for three years and had gone out of it a poorer man than I went in; and in addition to this I pledged myself, the moment the circumstances of the country warranted it to restore the salaries I proposed to reduce in consequence of the existing urgent necessity, to their former amounts.

The next year, it is true, there was not the same necessity for retrenchment, and I did not move the same resolution; but I proposed an inquiry into the public expenditures for the purpose of finding whether it was not possible to make such reductions as would enable us to give larger grants to the roads and bridges and public schools. Now, I ask the hon. member whether, when we came into power, and we were able to give such enormous amounts to roads and bridges, education, and other public services, we were in a position to make reductions in the public expenditures which had only been proposed at a time of a great public emergency, and which were only to continue as long as that public necessity existed. Besides, it should be remembered that the Civil List could not be touched; for, when I proposed my scheme, the leader of the Government applied to England and obtained the declaration from the Imperial Government that they would not consent to have the civil list reduced. But I can say that I have in reality held office since I came into power at a hundred pounds less salary than was enjoyed by my predecessor. Is there any one acquainted with Halifax who does not know that the cost of living has largely increased within four years—that the £600 which I proposed to give the Provincial Secretary in 1862 was a larger salary than £700 now. Take rental and every article of living and it is obvious that the present administration have held office at much smaller salaries than those enjoyed by their predecessors. The moment, however, we obtained permission, under the Act of Union, to deal with the Civil List, we brought forward a retrenchment measure which will save in salaries and the expense of the Legislature over thirty thousands dollars per annum.

THE COST OF DELEGATIONS.

The hon. member, in his speech of yesterday, admitted that I could claim credit for having reduced the cost of delegations to one half of what it had been, under himself and friends. The

first time I was appointed delegate to England, instead of drawing the £500 which my predecessor had always drawn, I reduced the amount to £300. I give that first to the hon. member as a proof that this was an economical and retrenching Government. He says that my predecessor, on his last delegation, only received £300; but to whom is the saving due? Is it not to those who made the reduction, and rendered it impossible to exceed the amount? The hon. member says that the late delegation received £500 apiece. Is there a member who would question the propriety of £500 being given for services which extended to some seven or eight months residence in London and were of so important a character! But I am in a position to relieve the hon. member's fear that the treasury of this Province is to suffer in consequence of having a large sum of money drawn for this service. By one of the resolutions of the conference, it was decided, that every dollar taken from the revenues of the several Provinces should be refunded by the General Government, for it was considered an expenditure affecting all the Provinces that were united.

But the hon. member says that I have not abandoned the practice of my profession which he says was worth, when I accepted office, from one to two thousand pounds a year. Now, I will give him time to make a very simple calculation: how much money have I put into my pocket by receiving £500 for eight months' absence from the country, when I was in the enjoyment of a private practice of between one and two thousand pounds a year? I admit frankly that the hon. member did not overstate the position that I occupied as a professional man in this city, when invited to become Provincial Secretary. When I was called upon to accept office, I admit that I did so at an immense personal sacrifice. Although it was impossible to shake myself clear of my professional duties—although I have given a certain amount of my time to such duties—yet it is well known that none of my predecessors gave more time to the public service than I have; and when I went to Prince Edward Island, Canada, and England, the amount of compensation I received was entirely insignificant in comparison with the loss I sustained. When I went to Canada, in connection with the delegation, I only received from the treasury the sum of \$400 for the service. It appears, from a memorandum from the Fin. Secretary's office, that my predecessor drew \$600 for a similar service. I do not say that my services were equally valuable, but I can say that the fruits of the delegation were not so useless. The only valuable feature of the delegation of the hon. gentleman was a speech he delivered at Port Robinson, in which he pledged himself in the most emphatic manner to the Union of the Colonies. Mr. Howe went on a delegation to Canada and England in 1861, and again in 1862; and it was not altogether without its fruits, for it resulted in the appointment of himself as Fishery Commissioner, with a salary of £1000 a year. I forget the excuse for that delegation—

MR. ANNAND.—The Railway.

HON. PROV. SEC.—The railway that is not to pay the price of the grease for its wheels! Altogether, then, he drew from these delegations \$4000. Now I will show that the total amount

that will be borne by our treasury for the services of your humble servant was little more than one-half. I went to Canada for the purpose of organizing a survey of the Intercolonial Railway. This survey has never cost this Province a dollar, and it resulted in proving that there was a thoroughly practicable line through the centre of New Brunswick, 50 miles shorter than the North line. The entire amount I drew for travelling expenses whilst engaged on that service was \$200. I drew but \$160 for the delegation on the Union of the Colonies to Charlottetown, authorized by this House, although it occupied some considerable time in connection with the conference which has led to such important results.

Then this House passed a law under which they authorized the construction of a trunk line of railway to connect Truro with Moncton, in case we could get British capitalists to come into the field and do the work. The International Contract Company, with whom correspondence had taken place on the subject, asked that a delegate should be sent to England in order to enter into negotiations on the subject I went, at an expense of \$40, to New Brunswick, to confer with its Government, as the line would run in both Provinces; and it was there arranged that a joint delegation should go to England. For that delegation, which occupied some months, I drew the sum of \$1500. I then went to Ottawa in relation to the fisheries, and to carry out arrangements for the delegation to England, accompanied by a gentleman from the opposite side. The entire amount drawn for our travelling expenses was \$200. Now, the whole amount the Province will have to pay for the important and fruitful delegations in which I have been engaged during four years is only \$2300.

It is true that the company with which we made a contract during the delegation of 1865 failed to keep their engagements, but this arose from the financial embarrassment that prevailed, and which led to the stoppage of companies like Overend, Gurney & Co. That delegation was at the same time charged to apply to the Imperial Government with reference to the position that this Province occupied as to the negotiation of commercial treaties with the United States. The result was that a status was given to the Maritime Provinces that they never enjoyed before. Mr. Howe had, on this floor, denounced in the most eloquent terms the manner in which this Province was treated when the Reciprocity Treaty was ratified. That treaty was closed with the Government of Canada without this Province being even able to reach Washington. I felt that this was a position which the Province ought not to occupy, and therefore my colleague and myself made such a statement to the Imperial Government that a despatch was sent immediately to Sir Frederick Bruce, requiring him not only to consult with the Province of Canada, as he had been instructed before, but with the Maritime Provinces as well. The Imperial Government, for the first time, authorized the appointment of a Colonial Conference for the purpose of negotiating treaties in which the Provinces were interested. If I had done nothing else, I did

more, on this single occasion, to elevate the status of Nova Scotia than all the previous delegations. The Conference was held at the call of the Governor-General, and although the measure of the Union must render it hereafter unnecessary, yet it has led already to important results. A commission was sent to the West Indies and the Brazil in order to see if new lines of communication could not be opened up with these countries. The hon member for East Halifax has challenged the expenditure for this service; but it should be remembered that the delegates had to go first to England, and place themselves in communication with the Imperial Government, in order to receive the authority necessary to deal with this question. On the mission my hon. friend was detained for very many months. Information of the most valuable character was obtained—information which is going to increase trade and stimulate intercourse between British America and these Southern countries. As soon as the Confederate Government is formed a line of steam communication will be opened up with these countries.

The hon member also referred to a matter which is rather of a personal character, and that was, that I held the office of Medical Officer of this city at the same time that I was Provincial Secretary. I do not complain, however, of the reference made to me on this point; for I feel that the people are entitled to every information in respect to their public men. When I was not a member of the government, the City Council did me the honor of electing me to this important office, although the remuneration is merely nominal. Its emolument is perfectly insignificant—some £60 a year, but I was not reluctant to take the office, because I had seen that the condition of the diseased poor in this city was not creditable to Halifax or to the country. I endeavored in the discharge of the duties of that office to make a change for the better in this particular. The first report I made propounded a scheme, by which the city could obtain the services of the best medical men without a single shilling of expense, and proposed to abolish the office I held. From that day until I gave up the office, I labored earnestly to carry out the reforms I considered so necessary. I always felt that if I had given up the office before I did, an additional barrier would be interposed to carrying out the scheme that I was determined should be carried out—by which the City Hospital could have the benefit of the best talent amongst us. At the last session I was able to get an Act passed by which the diseased poor were enabled to receive that attention which previously had been denied them, under which a poor person can come from the most remote part of the Province, and be treated in a hospital that is worthy of the name. As soon as this was accomplished I at once resigned that office. As respects the character of the office, I can only say that it is one connected with the honorable profession to which I belong, and requires high attainments and a knowledge of that which is of the most

vital importance, and that is, the best means of promoting the public health of the country.

THE PUBLIC DEBT UNDER CONFEDERATION.

I shall now refer, in conclusion, to the remarks made by the hon. member in respect to the debt with which we shall enter the Confederation. I can only say that should the debt exceed \$8,000,000 by \$500,000 it is provided for. There is a clause in the Imperial Act which will at once relieve the province from any charge in connection with the additional amount. This clause provides that in case the debt of any province exceeds the amount stated in the Act—\$8,000,000 for Nova Scotia, \$7,000,000 for New Brunswick, and \$62,500,000 for Canada—that province shall be charged 5 per cent. by the general government on that portion of the debt in excess of its proportion; but, on the other hand, it is provided that the Assets represented by that debt shall belong to the province. For instance, £50,000 will have been expended in the erection of the Provincial Building opposite, and if our debt exceeds the \$8,000,000 by the amount required for that building, then it becomes our own property. If the general government used it for a Post Office they would have to pay the rent into the treasury, thus relieving the province from the charge of a single dollar.

The hon. gentleman concluded by apologizing to the house for the length of time he had occupied its attention, but he felt compelled, in justice to the government and to its friends in and out of the Legislature, to give the fullest explanations he was able in answer to the strictures of the gentlemen opposite.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. HEFFERNAN introduced a bill to enable the members for Guysboro to borrow \$400 on the credit of the road grant for that county, for the completion of Salmon River bridge. He also moved the second reading of the bill to divide a polling district in the county of Guysboro.

The bill was read a second time.

Dr. Brown said—It will be expected that I should say a few words in reply to the hon. Pro. Sec. remarks in reference to the Chairman of the Board of Works,—and I must say I was surprised at the tone and manner of those remarks. I cannot see why I should be attacked because that department has been accused of malpractices. Whether those accusations are true or false, surely, situated as I am, sixty miles away, I could use no supervision, and could not prevent it: I say, if they were true, but I presume they are not true; I do not for a moment believe that anything extraordinary has occurred in that office to deserve the censure of this house and the country. It seems to be an old practice in the Department of Works, existing ever since it was created, and in other departments as well, for members of the board to purchase goods and supplies for the use of the various institutions under their charge. I do not think this is a good practice, and I so expressed myself last winter, when the hon

member for Shelburne introduced a bill to put a stop to it. Mr. Pugh was only following the example of Mr. Gibson. It is not true that I approved of the attack on the Chairman of the Board of Works. I did not smile on and encourage that attack, as the hon. Prov. Sec. has said. I felt sorry it was made; I regretted it, both on his account and my own: I had no reason to suppose such an attack would be made. It is true I was a member of the Committee of Public Accounts; but the Accounts of the Works Department were not submitted to my examination, and I heard no remarks made relative to them before the committee, nor was there any mention made in the report of the committee; therefore I could not foresee that such a charge was to be made. But if this charge be true, and the Board is guilty of the waste and fraud imputed to them, brother or no brother, I cannot afford to sustain him in it. I am not here to encourage any practices of the kind. But I do not believe it. I know he was honest and faithful when he came here, and as every man is innocent until proved guilty, I shall continue to disbelieve until an investigation is had and the public verdict is given. The hon. gentleman is angry because I do not sustain him in all his measures, especially his Confederation scheme. Does he place me so low in the ranks of men that I am to have no mind of my own—that I must blindly follow him wherever he leads, because I happen to have a brother in a subordinate office? As long as I have had the honor of a seat here, I have endeavoured to act consistently and conscientiously, and I trust I shall continue to do so in future.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that in the discussion on the Presbyterian Church Bill, which took place a day or two ago, he found from the report the Prov. Secretary made an assertion which surprised him. The Prov. Secretary had said that he had both written and telegraphed to him (Mr. C.) asking the appointment of an arbitrator in the case of the Middle River dispute. He asked the Government to lay the papers on the table, and denied having ever obstructed the settlement of the dispute.

Mr. ANNAND said:—In continuation of the adjourned debate, I feel called upon, even at this late period of the Session, to make a few remarks in reply to the very animated, and I may add, excited speech of the Prov. Secretary this morning. I was glad to find that in addressing the House he did not attempt to justify the action which was called in question of a member of the Board of Works. I was glad to hear him say that it was the intention of the government to have all the facts enquired into instead of attempting to justify anything which appeared like abuse or corruption. In justice to the hon. member for South Kings, who has just spoken, I must say that, to the best of my belief, not a single fact which was brought to the notice of the House was communicated either by that gentleman or his brother, the Chairman of the Board. Mr. McLelan was a member of the Committee on Public Accounts,

and I may explain that the committee are accustomed to divide the labour among the several members, each gentleman taking up a department, and that hon. member took charge of the accounts of the Board of Works. In the discharge of his duty he made a searching enquiry and brought the result to the notice of the House without any previous intimation either to the member for South Kings or to the Chairman of the Board. The Prov. Secretary has been pleased to refer to the management of the Board, under the previous administration, when Mr. Gibson was a member. It is true that on one occasion that gentlemen tendered to supply flour or meal, and obtained the contract; but it never was pretended that his tender was not the lowest, and that his prices were not the lowest in the market. But mark the difference between the two cases; here we find an officer not tendering for a few barrels of flour or meal, but furnishing supplies of goods amounting to some \$20,000, many of them being articles in which he is not a dealer, but, which he, no doubt, purchased in the market. When the account is examined it is found that the original invoices are not before the Committee, and that the prices are in excess of those for which the article could be obtained on six months credit, while Mr. Pugh was receiving cash. That is the distinction between the two cases, and we see now what a misfortune it was that the bill which would have prevented this abuse was rejected by the Government at our last session. The Provincial Secretary has undertaken to justify the expenditure in connection with the quarantine service, telling us that the Lieut. Governor, the General, and a number of private gentlemen visited the proposed station with him. My view of the way in which that duty should have been performed is very different from his. If the Government were anxious to select a suitable site they should have secured the advice and attendance of members of the medical profession and other gentlemen of sound judgment and practical experience, instead of converting the whole affair into a mere pleasure party to visit the island.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—We did that.

Mr. ANNAND continued:—It should have been done independently of the trip to which I referred, and, instead of having a grand entertainment on board the steamer, at which liquors and champagne flowed like water, I maintain that the matter should have been gone into as a business transaction.

But the Provincial Secretary has also referred to a time when the members of a former Government spent £80 in an entertainment when laying the foundation stone of the Lunatic Asylum, and he therefore thinks it wrong that we should complain about the expenditure on the quarantine service; but what did he do on that occasion? When the account of that expenditure was produced, did he not denounce it as a piece of gross jobbery and corruption? and yet we find him spending hundreds if not thousands of dollars in a pleasure excursion—for it was nothing else—to McNab's Island. He referred also to the small expenditure on opening the first section of the railway. If an outlay could be justified upon any occasion, it would be when, for the first

time, railways were introduced to the Province, and we witnessed the iron horse running over our roads. It is unfortunate that he should have thus drawn into comparison an entertainment warranted by the circumstances and occurred in by all parties, which he had not the courage to assail at the time. Then he told us that the present Government have opened a hundred miles of railway. I am glad of it; I am glad that the revenues and credit of the country will admit of such large public works being carried on. But does any one think that the Government can fairly take credit for the extension of our railways? The tariff under which those large sums of money were collected was the tariff of their predecessors. It is true that it was remodelled by Mr. Marshall in 1858; but when they charge us with having, for one year, raised the duties from 10 to 12½ per cent., they should remember that the Attorney General and Mr. Marshall, and not the Government of which I was a member, increased the tariff from 6½ to 10 per cent.

The Provincial Secretary claims credit, also, for expending large sums on the roads and bridges, and education, and navigation securities,—but what credit are they entitled to? Were they to allow the money which flowed in under the tariff bequeathed to them by their predecessors to accumulate in the treasury? We added 2½ per cent, it is true; but before we left office we reduced it again, contrary to the wishes of gentlemen opposite, and under that tariff of 10 per cent. the revenues of the past year came in. And, sir, would not the treasury have been as full as if those gentlemen had never been in existence—if their clerks, without their aid, had conducted the public business? But the late Government, on the other hand, were entitled to credit. When they came into power they found the Halifax revenue department completely demoralized; there was no organized water-side arrangement, no night watch, and under their rule the system was entirely remodelled. Stringent oaths were substituted for declarations, and stringent vigilance adopted in all parts of the country; and under that system, continued by our successors, the large revenues we have enjoyed have been brought.

The house was told that, as the result of our second year's administration, we had a debt of £38,000; but the Provincial Secretary is wrong again. I refer him to the Journals, where he will find that it is only £34,000—a small but characteristic mistake on the part of that gentleman. We are also told that when the late Financial Secretary came into office, at the very mention of his name every branch of industry was suddenly paralyzed—that our imports and exports immediately fell off—that capital ceased to flow into the country—that people shrank from working our coal and gold mines, and purchasing our Crown lands—that the traffic and travel on the railway was sensibly diminished—and that even the necessary daily consumption of the people was reduced when it was discovered that the office of Financial Secretary was conferred on the gentleman who filled that post under the late Government.

The time is not very distant when the Pro. Sec. and his friends never lost the opportunity to depreciate the ability of the late Financial

Secretary,—if he wrote a pamphlet in London, or a brilliant article appeared in his paper, the Pro. Sec. on every occasion, tried to make it appear that the writer was an insignificant individual, without talent or influence, and that somebody else wrote the pamphlet or editorial; but here, to-day, for the first time, we have heard that the gentleman who last held the seals of the Fin. Secretary's office was an individual of so much importance that his appointment affected the imports and exports of the country—affected the working of our mines and the sale of our lands, and that such was the terror of his name that intending emigrants were deterred from finding a new home in this Province. The late Financial Secretary claims no such distinction; he has up to the present time taken a comparatively subordinate part in public affairs, and if circumstances have recently led him to assume a more prominent position, it was because of the desertion of other gentlemen whom he would have preferred to follow. We were told of the great evils inflicted on the country in relation to the settlement of Crown Lands when the late Financial Secretary held office,—I was under the impression that the Crown Land Department was managed by the same officer, and under the same regulations, then as now. As every one knows, the American civil war was the cause of the falling off in the revenue in 1861, but the revenue rose rapidly when trade found new channels. I thought also that the railway was managed, not by the Financial Secretary, but by a distinguished individual, then a warm opponent; but now the fast friend of the Pro. Secretary. Over and over again have I heard the Provincial Secretary rise and assail the late Commissioner of Railways, who was considered too exacting and parsimonious, and was generally believed to have carried the system of retrenchment too far. If there was one officer more than another that made the government unpopular it was the late Commissioner of Railways, but I apprehend that his management had no effect in diminishing the traffic over the lines. I remember, when the scheme of railway retrenchment was brought down in 1860, the question was put to me: "What amount do you propose to retrench in the Revenue Department?" My answer was that I believed the officers under my charge were not over paid, and that if we reduced their salaries we would impair the public service. I said: "Gentlemen, if you intend to carry out the system of retrenchment, begin with your own salaries, and then I will be prepared to apply the pruning knife to the Revenue Department," that was my reply; and I believe it would have been better if the commissioner had allowed the officers on the railway to enjoy the salaries which they fairly earned.

We were told that immediately on the change of government our revenues came up. It is true that our imports and exports did increase, and with them the products of our mines and sales of crown lands, by which large sums were placed at the disposal of the government;—all that did take place, but the tide of prosperity had commenced to flow in long before the change of government. On the 31st Dec. 1861, the balance against the treasury was \$136,000, and by putting on the additional 2½ per cent. we were enabled to pay off that debt and shew a surplus in the treasury.

Hon. PRO. SECY.—The hon. member's returns shewed in the last quarter, with the additional 2½ per cent. a falling off of \$17,000 as compared with the previous year.

Mr. ANNAND continued:—The hon. gentleman is quite right and the explanation which is simple is this: The alteration of the tariff was no secret in the community, and knowing that the duties would be reduced in a few days the merchants did not withdraw their goods from warehouse until after the close of the quarter. The hon. gentleman would have us believe that on the change of administration his new-born Fin. Secy. worked a marvellous change, but he forgets that the gentleman who fills that office made his first appearance after the elections as Commissioner of Railways, and if there be any credit attaching to the increase in our prosperity during the first year, it is due to his predecessor Mr. Levesconte, but as I have already said the tide of prosperity commenced to flow before we left office, those gentlemen found a balance in the treasury, and the revenue which they collected in 1863 and since that time was obtained under a tariff bequeathed to them. Does the Pro. Secy. mean to tell me that because one Financial Secretary was taken from Isle Madame and his successor from the backwoods of Pictou, that larger sums of money flowed into the treasury? Does he mean to insult the intelligence of the country by such an assertion? As I said yesterday, if every one of these gentlemen had been in Jerusalem or Jericho the money would have come in. But the Pro. Sec. told us that under our administration the people were leaving the country;—they spent \$20,000 last year on immigration, with how much effect the report of the department will show, the greater part of it unauthorized by the House, which might as well have been thrown into the sea.

Where are the immigrants now? They were brought into the country, and their passages paid,—the greater number making this a half-way house to the United States. But we are told that the moment the present government came into power, and the present Financial Secretary was entrusted with the seals of office, the public began to import more and export more—that the work in the mines increased—that there was a rush for the crown lands. These were the results, as we were informed, of my leaving office and his succeeding me. It is a great pity that the marvellous abilities of the Financial Secretary should be limited to so small a sphere—that a gentleman whose mere appointment to office should cause the revenues to swell so suddenly, and induce men to rush to the mines and seize the crown lands, should bury his talents under a Nova Scotia bushel. We have heard of the Galts and other eminent financiers of Canada, but I think it would be well for the Canadians to import our Financial Secretary. Who knows but in that extensive field for the exercise of his great financial ability, he might convert deficits into surpluses, and so increase the trade and credit of that country that its government and people might be able to hold up their heads in the market of the world, and obtain the money they require on equal terms with New Zealand, the Cape and the Australian colonies. I can perfectly understand the references which we heard this morning to the Fin'l Secy. After the exhibition of yesterday, it was necessary

that something should be said in his behalf—that some one should come forward to rescue him from the difficulties in which we saw him floundering, and in view of the election which must soon come off in the county of Pictou, where all the eloquence of the Provincial Secretary and all his energy will be required in the support of his friend.

As regards the mining monopoly, the gentlemen with whom I was associated did all in their power to break it up, and I believe at this hour that better terms should have been obtained than those which were eventually secured. The movement against that monopoly commenced with the old Liberal party, and the obstructive party in the House was not that led by Mr. Young and Mr. Howe, but that which followed the present Judge in Equity, who, as the paid agent of the General Mining Association, offered every obstruction year after year, and but for his efforts the monopoly might have been broken up years before.

The Prov. Secretary dwelt at length upon the large grants to roads and bridges and education. The large increase in the revenue is not due to the government, but to the consumption of dutiable articles—to the industry of the people—to the exertions of the men who go into the woods, fell the timber and build ships—to the men who work our mines—to the men who till the soil and beautify our country—to the sturdy fishermen who draw wealth from the bosom of the deep—to men in every branch of business who are promoting the industry of the Province. And in this connection I would ask, under whose administration was gold discovered in this Province?

Hon. PROV. SEC.—Gold was discovered during the term of office of the government of which I was a member.

Mr. ANNAND continued:—Well, I can only say that the first practical illustration of the value of our gold mines was given by the late government, and we might as well claim credit for the sums added to our revenue from that source as gentlemen opposite can claim credit for the general increase of revenue during their term of office.

The House will remember that in a former session the gentleman who was recently the Leader of the Opposition, and who held the position of Attorney General under the late Government, was violently assailed by the Prov. Secretary on a charge of making an improvident bargain in connection with the mines at Lunenburg, and the charge was repeated over and over again in the press and in the Assembly;—with his usual vehemence the Prov. Sec. assailed the government of the day for the ignorance and mismanagement which he charged them with displaying in the purchase of property there; but what do we find these gentlemen doing? Down at Tangier, within the last year, these gentlemen, through one of their departments, conveyed a lot of land, which did not belong to the government, and after the lessee had expended a large sum of money in buildings and improvements, he was dispossessed by the owner, who brought a suit in Court, when the Government had to step in, and at the cost of \$2000, reimburse the party for the lease which they had made contrary to all law. I give this as a specimen of the blundering of gentlemen opposite, as an illustration of their mode of conducting the pub

lic business during the last four years. But I find there has been another improvident bargain made within the last few days. I refer to the contract made for supplying wood on the Pictou Railway, which, I understand, has been entered into, extending over a period of five years. Here is a railway running to the mouth of a coal mine, and just on the eve of its being opened, we find the government entering into a contract for a supply of wood, which is necessarily far more costly than coal, for five years. I give that as another illustration of the administrative ability, skill, and economy of these gentlemen. I should like to hear that act defended in the presence of skilled engineers who know the difference between the consumption of coal and wood as regards cost.

We were told that the press under my control obstructed the educational measure. Let me remind the Provincial Secretary that, whatever the merits or demerits of his scheme of education, I always voted with him; and the strictures in the press to which he alludes were the strictures made before the paper fell into my hands as responsible editor, by a gentleman with whom he is now closely allied. I may remind him also that the gentleman who was formerly leader of the Opposition (Mr. Archibald) vehemently opposed the construction of the Council of Public Instruction, and the paper under my control, in that particular, only endorsed the language used by gentlemen whom the Provincial Secretary himself, within a few hours, has highly eulogised in connection with that measure.

Then the hon. member took credit for the large sum given for defence. I never objected to any vote for that service; and I must remind him that the Government of which I was a member brought down a grant of \$20,000 at the very time when there was a deficiency of \$136,000 in the treasury, and we were obliged to borrow money and levy an additional tax. And so little did the Provincial Secretary then value the character of the country and its credit abroad—so little loyalty and patriotism did he then possess, that he moved a reduction to \$8,000. If it be true—as I believe it is—that the granting of money for defence has the effect of inviting capital into a country, how was he so unpatriotic in 1862 when he proposed to cut down the grant to \$8,000?

Hon. PRO. SECY.:—When the government brought down the proposition for a grant of \$20,000 it was without any measure having been submitted in connection with the expenditure, but after the bill was introduced I withdrew my opposition.

MR. ANNAND continued:—The hon. gentleman claims credit for having voted for the bill, but if he had succeeded in his motion there would have been no money to put into the bill;—that is the reply I give to his explanation.

The Pro. Sec'y. reminded us this morning of the grand scheme of retrenchment which he proposed in 1862, and he told us that on the pages of the press under my control would be found the pledge which he then gave, that if the revenues again came up he would be prepared to restore the salaries which he proposed to reduce. But he forgets that in 1863, when the indebtedness was paid off, and there was a surplus in the treasury, we find him coming down to the house and using language which I

will quote, not from the *Morning Chronicle*, an authority so objectionable to him, but from that influential, creditable and respectable paper the *British Colonist*, which never ventures on misrepresentation, and which was then edited by himself. What do we find in that paper of the 24th March, 1863:

“I still entertain the same views that the expenditure of this country will permit a very considerable reduction without at all injuring the public service.”

That was after the revenues had come up, and a year after retrenchment was unnecessary if his explanation be true. Again he says:

“I now intend again to invite the attention of the house to the subject of retrenchment.”

“The expenditure of the Government of this Province has constantly and steadily increased of late years, and is, in my opinion, unnecessarily extravagant.”

It will be remembered that in 1865 there was so close a division of parties, that the Government only held their positions by a majority of two or three and the leader, Mr. Howe thought proper to treat with gentlemen opposite to see whether a coalition could not be formed, so that the base of the government might be widened, believing that there can hardly be a greater misfortune than a weak government, liable to be improperly, often perhaps unfairly, pressed by its own supporters. This was the remark of the Pro. Sec. on the subject of these proposals:

“But I told him (hon. Prov. Sec.) it was impossible for me to combine with him after the course he had taken in reference to the question of economy and retrenchment. Therefore I gave the country the best proof of my sincerity that ever can be given, when I determined to forgo any personal advantage in the service of the people. Sir, I have placed my hand to the plough, and I and those who sustain me are determined never to look back. We believe that there is extravagance in the public expenditure that ought to be retrenched, and we are prepared to co-operate only with those who will aid us in that work. The resolution which I am about to offer to the house must command the support of every man who has not made up his mind to resist all economy and refuse to consider the propriety of effecting any reduction in the expenses of the Government. If this resolution passes I am prepared to propose large reductions in the estimate, which I believe may be effected, without in the slightest degree impairing the efficiency of the public service.”

This, it will be remembered, was after the revenue had come up, and the debt had been paid off; and yet this gentleman went to the hustings on his resolution of 1862 proposing a retrenchment of \$79,000 and used the language which I have just read, in the closing hours of 1863. He went to the country preaching retrenchment at every hustings, and upon that cry his large majority was returned. I ask him again how has that pledge been redeemed? Has he made any attempt to curtail what he styled “the extravagant expenditure of the country.” Yes, sir, there was a commencement in 1864; his government proposed to cut down the salaries of the collectors of Pictou and Yarmouth, and I do not wonder that Mr. Killam, when he found that the retrench

which was to effect their own salaries was to be limited to four hundred dollars, and to two officers collecting a large amount of revenue at two of the most important ports of the Province, shrank from sustaining the government and has been found in the ranks of the opposition ever since. He could not consistently support gentlemen who went to the country with the cry of retrenchment on their lips, and who, when they found themselves installed in power, not only did not retrench but largely increased the expenditure in every department.

I challenge these gentlemen, one and all, to shew me a department in which the expenditure has not been largely increased; even the Attorney General's office has a new charge of \$212 for telegrams. I will not refer again to the hon. gentleman's defence as regards the proposed reduction in the civil list; he had intelligence enough to know that certain charges on that list could not be touched, and he must have known likewise that it was impossible to effect the large saving which he proposed in 1862. We have been told about delegations, and I am reminded that Mr. Howe received \$400 for that service. It is said that these delegations were fruitless, and resulted in no good to the country. I ask the Provincial Secretary why it was that they had no immediate result? It was from no want of zeal or ability on the part of Mr. Howe that the great measure on which he visited the mother country and Canada was not accomplished, but it was because the Canadians, with whom the Provincial Secretary is allied, broke faith with him; and in proof of the fact, I refer the hon. gentleman to Mr. Tilley, of whom I am always disposed to speak with respect, for the proof that the Canadian delegates, on that occasion, behaved in a manner discreditable to themselves and to the Province they professed to represent. I was glad to hear the Provincial Secretary say that the cost of the recent delegation to England—\$2,500 apiece to the six gentlemen who went, one of whom, it was said, only stopped long enough to see what o'clock it was—will be transferred to the government of the Dominion. I am glad of anything which will enlarge the sum hereafter to be at the disposal of the Province, because I feel that with the paltry pittance we are to receive, even the few thousand pounds, which those gentlemen put into their pockets, will be esteemed a boon by the people towards bridging their rivers, improving their roads, and increasing the grant to education. But giving them credit for that sum as returned to the treasury, it will be found that the large sum of \$15,067 has been expended by the present administration in delegations—nearly four times the amount spent by the late government. I invite the attention of the country to the fact that in three years these gentlemen have spent \$15,000 against our \$4,000.

HON. PROV. SECY.—That \$4000 was for Mr. Howe alone, and does not include the expenses of the other delegates. The Queen's Printer went on a delegation which cost \$160.

MR. ANNAND continued.—I believe \$160 was spent by the Queen's Printer in a delegation, and that sum added to the \$4080 will make \$4240 as the entire cost of delegations during our four years of Government. I wish to guard the Provincial Secretary against those reckless

assertions which he makes from time to time: he said that there were other delegates not charged for in the amount which I have given, and that while Mr. Howe had charged \$600 for a mission to Canada, he had been satisfied with \$400. Now, I will put him right. Mr. Howe charged that \$600 for three delegates, and I was one of them.

HON. PROV. SECY.—I spoke from the entry in the Journals.

MR. ANNAND continued.—If the hon. gentleman had examined the accounts with the care which he should have exercised before making such a statement, he would have found that Mr. Howe, Mr. McCully, and myself were content to take \$200 a piece for our expenses to Canada, while these retrenching gentlemen, who were carried free of charge, and entertained with exhaustive festivities, had the modesty to charge and put into their pockets just double the amount. That is my illustration of the difference between a Government that did not pretend to retrenchment and the Government that came in under that very cry. An attempt was made to justify the large expenditure on the delegation to the West Indies, but we know that almost any merchant in Halifax, with a little enquiry, could have given us all the information which we possess at this hour. I have no hesitation in pronouncing that expenditure a great job. Instead of that attempt to find new markets being regarded as an inducement to the American Government to renew reciprocity, is it not a fact that the effort was regarded as a menace, and has made that Government more determined than ever to refuse negotiation. Where are we to find a market like that offered to us by the thirty-four millions of people beside us? The true policy of these Provinces undoubtedly is to cultivate good feeling with the United States, to conciliate its people, and not to menace and threaten what we are powerless to effect. Look at our mining enterprises alone,—where does the capital come from but the United States? Obviously, it is our interest to cultivate the trade between that country and ours. No other land, all the Colonies and countries of the tropics put together, can offer us a market for the product of our industry to be compared with that of our natural customers in the neighboring Republic.

The hon. gentleman was pleased to refer to a speech which I made on a former day, in which I referred to the fact of his carrying on a professional practice while a member of the Government. I should never have referred to him in that connection if he had not made a violent, virulent and unjustifiable attack upon me in regard to a gold mining company which was in operation in this country, but which has ceased to exist. He admits that he received a large amount of money for his professional services. I am glad that in that particular I did not misrepresent him; and it will be remembered that the ground I took was this: that the time of a public servant belongs to the people—that he is paid for his time, and being amply paid, should be devoted exclusively to the public service. He told us that he made a large sacrifice in accepting the office of Provincial Secretary, and in going to England for seven months, but he did not tell us of the large pro-

pective advantages which he expects in the higher sphere which he hopes soon to attain;—and we must remember that not only his pay as a delegate, but his official salary, were going on while he was pursuing the object of his ambition. With his personal ambition I do not find fault; but we know that he and his colleagues have been devoting themselves to effect a change which will not merely add 2 1-2 p. cent. to our taxation for a single year, but will increase our burdens at least 50 per cent. for all time to come. These gentlemen boast about the reductions they have made at the eleventh hour, but I ask them why they did not apply the pruning knife when their own salaries were involved? They propose to make these reductions simultaneously with the transfer of our revenues to another country, and when as the member for North Colchester proved the other day, the duties will be so raised that on four articles alone we will pay an additional \$300,000 a year.

The Provincial Secretary also told us that when Mr. Howe went to England on the mission connected with the Intercolonial Railroad, he did nothing but secure for himself the office of Fishery Commissioner. I throw back that slanderous insinuation. Mr. Howe was guilty of no such meanness; the office was not vacant when he was in England, but was conferred on him when he was in this country, and if ever there was a man who deserved the consideration of the Imperial Government it was Mr. Howe. So far from his being guilty of selfishness in connection with his visits to England I know that by his efforts on the subject of Confederation he has sacrificed his prospects of preferment, not only with the present Government of England but also with the party in opposition. When the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed, he might, if so disposed, have kept the Fishery Commission open for a couple of years, receiving his salary, and the Home authorities would not have complained. Instead of which he hurried up his work and closed the commission that he might be in an independent position to urge upon the Home Government his views with regard to Confederation. I know also that Lord Stanley, now Foreign Minister, sent to my friend a kind note thanking him not only for the mode in which he had discharged the duties of his commission, but for his promptness in closing it up.

It does not become one in the Provincial Secretary's position to assail a public man who, if he is now poor, has had temptations enough to be rich. If the Prov. Sec. has suddenly become wealthy, I ask the people to draw the contrast, and ask themselves whether Mr. Howe might not, if he had chosen to be, now be even more independent in his circumstances. The hon. gentleman also attempted to explain his conduct in accepting the position of City Medical officer, but it is notorious that not only when out of office but long after he had been appointed Provincial Secretary, he canvassed to obtain and hold that paltry office. "But," says he, "I remained there that I might benefit the poor."

Was it necessary that the premier of Nova Scotia, as he delights to call himself, should seek a subordinate position under the City Fathers? That reason may satisfy the hon. member's friends, but it will not carry much weight in the country, unless I misunderstand the intelligence of the people.

We have been told that in assuming our debt Canada is to take into consideration our assets as an offset. I looked into the act and all I can find is that any excess of our debt over eight millions must be a first charge on the future local government of this country. It is true that certain assets, with the assent of Canada, represented by the increased amount will be our property. The new Provincial Building, for instance, may be assigned to the Local Government, but if it is, all we can do is charge the General Government rent for the Post office and such other general departments as may occupy it, and to that extent alone will we receive anything from Canada on account of the debt incurred in connection with its erection. As I said on a previous occasion, my belief is taking the information under my hand, and to some extent groping in the dark for want of fuller information, that the debt of Nova Scotia, when the account is closed on the 30th of June, will be \$8,500,000. The report of the committee on Public Accounts shows that the debt on 30th of September, including a subsequent issue of Treasury notes, was within a trifle of \$8,400,000—so that, assuming that there is only \$100,000 more to be added, and we know that heavy liabilities have been incurred in connection with the new building and other services—it will be seen that we will enter Confederation with at least \$500,000 more indebtedness than will be assumed by Canada. This would not be a very large sum if we had control of all our revenues, but \$25,000 a year to be deducted from the small pittance of 80 cents per head, will be a heavy charge on the local government. Even this year we had the road grant cut down by \$64,000, by way of preparing us for Confederation, and I do not hesitate to say that unless we reduce the grants to education and navigation securities and other indispensable public securities—if we allow a reasonable sum for the expenses of the Legislature and civil government—by entering confederation with a debt of \$250,000, we will not have a dollar to spend on our road and bridges.

As regards retrenchment, I have shown that the expenditure in every public department has been increased, and that additions were made to the number of public officers. I conclude by repeating that this government that came in with the cry of retrenchment on their lips have violated every pledge given to the people at the hustings. Retrenchment, and not Confederation, as was asserted by a member of the House of Commons, was preached at every hustings in the country, and that retrenchment scheme has been the foundation of Confederation. If it had not been for that cry, leading the people to believe that large sums of money were to be saved, these gentlemen would never have been in a position to

force Confederation on the country. The Prov. Sec. accused us of claiming credit for all the good measures which were introduced when we were in office, but if ever there was a set of men who adopted the measure of their predecessors, with the exception of retrenchment, it is the present government. The policy of the late administration was railway extension, and that is the only policy in connection with which these gentlemen can truly boast of success. We bequeathed to them the tariff under which they have collected the revenue, and the railway policy which they have been so successful in carrying out.

Hon. PROV. SECY.—I will not detain the House by an address of any length, but I wish to express my regret that by a memorandum prepared from the Journals in the Financial Secretary's office, I was led into an error as to the amount taken by Mr. Howe for the delegation to Canada. The sum charged against him, I understand, includes the expenses of two of his colleagues. The effect of this is to reduce the \$4,000, which I stated as drawn by him during his term of office, to \$3,600, as against \$2,500 drawn by me, leaving him still \$1,100 over the sum which I received. I am glad that the hon. member has referred to the civil list, because he has thus enabled me to state what I had before overlooked; the very important fact that the moment the government accomplished the object of getting power to deal with the civil list, they introduced a retrenchment bill which reduces the amounts to be paid to the Legislature and the different public officers by \$30,000 a year; and the hon. member true to his principle of resisting everything like retrenchment, resisted that measure as far as he was able, and that amount will be saved to the country, because we were enabled to carry the bill in spite of all the opposition which he and his friends could give to it. I will not go into the question whether Mr. Howe could or could not have retained his office for a longer time; but the statement of the hon. member tallies strangely with the despatch to Mr. Howe, which is on record, recommending him to close the business of his commission as soon as possible. A more imperative command to a public officer to stop drawing the public money never was put on record, and yet we are to accept the assurance that Mr. Howe would have been allowed to hold on. I did not bring any such charge against Mr. Howe as that he had sought his own interests only on the delegation, but I said that the only result of that delegation, for which the hon. member for East Halifax, as Financial Secretary, paid Mr. Howe \$1,500, was to obtain a good office for himself, and that it therefore ill became his friend to talk about delegations. The hon. member tells us that Mr. Howe did everything in his power to accomplish the Intercolonial Railway, but does it lie in his mouth to say that he was engaged in promoting the interests of this country when he was forwarding a measure by which the province was to pay £50,000 per annum for a railway which was so worthless that it would not pay for grease for the wheels? I want to know what excuse he had to make for drawing \$1,500 from the pockets of the people, and for endeavoring to fasten on the country a liability of £50,000 per annum in connection with a

work which was so worthless as that. We were told that the government had adopted the policy of their predecessors. Surely that should not be made a charge against us; but there is a great deal of truth in it; and the fact is, that on every occasion on which we have come forward and carried to maturity the measures on which the hon. member and his friends had staked their public reputation, we were met by the most determined hostility from him and his colleagues.

On every question affecting the progress of this Province, the hon. gentleman has assumed the position of an obstructive. All the measures which my colleagues and myself have been able to promote have been passed in the face of the obstruction of the hon. member. What did he do in reference to the Picton Railway? He got over the hon. member for Yarmouth, and every one he could from this side of the house, in order to defeat and obstruct the Government in their progressive policy. So in respect to the great question of Union, to which he and his friends were so solemnly pledged, he stood forth the uncompromising opponent of the Government and the gentlemen who united with them to accomplish that measure of progress. The same course has been pursued by him with respect to the Intercolonial Railway. No sooner did the present Government take it up and deal with it with the same success that has characterized their whole action in respect to all measures of progress, then he came forward and did all that man could do to prevent the people of this Province obtaining that great work. It was only necessary for the Government, in fact, to propound their policy on any question, and the hon. member ever came out to oppose them. I am quite willing that the hon. member should charge us with having adopted principles which he and his friends had propounded. It is the first duty of a public man to adopt that policy, and to promote those measures which they believe are essential to the prosperity and development of the country. But we have always stood true to the principles we have adopted, and carried them successfully through, while the hon. member has deserted them. We have not spent the public moneys on fruitless delegations, but can point to the accomplishment of great measures as the evidence of our energy and zeal in the public service. I feel, however, that it is altogether unnecessary for me, to labour this question, for I feel that the house as well as the country fully appreciate the position of the hon. member. He stands before the people the opponent of measures of progress.

The hon. member has said that we were unable to give such a large grant to the road and bridge service this year in consequence of Confederation. He knows that the press under his control told the people some months ago that the country was in a bankrupt condition. Yet this Session he has told us that we were able to build a railway to Annapolis, the Intercolonial road, and one to Canoe as well. But the hon. member must know that it would be impossible to continue the extraordinary grants hitherto given to the road and bridge service the moment we had to bear the annual interest on the Picton railway. He knows, too, that if it had not been for Confederation we could not have been able to give the large ex-

tra grant for the road and bridge service. Our financial position, when the expenses of our great public works are assumed by the General Government, would be far better than it would be if we remained without uniting ourselves with the other Provinces. Then we have made a large saving in the public expenditure by the measures we have passed this Session in reference to the local constitution. The hon. member says we have increased the public debt by \$200,000; suppose we had, although I deny the accuracy of his statements, have we got nothing to show for it? How long will it take us to make up that amount? If he looks at the Provincial Building being constructed opposite, at the extension of the Hospital for the Insane, the St. Peter's Canal, and other works of Provincial importance, he will soon find where \$200,000 has gone to. But before I conclude, let me allude to another matter which was a disputed point between us. He questioned the accuracy of my memory as to the amount expended in connection with laying the corner stone of the Asylum. I gave the amount at £300, but he stated it was only £320. Now I must admit that I was wrong, and I cheerfully make the correction required. But how was I mistaken? Why, I understated the amount. I find on referring to a speech of Mr. Howe, that that gentleman gives it at £313 7s. 10. I hope, therefore, the hon. member will acknowledge that my version is at least as reliable as his own.

Mr ANNAND—I feel it due to acknowledge an inaccuracy in stating the amount expended by the late Government in the entertainment to which the Provincial Secretary has referred. I spoke, not from memory, but from information given by a friend who sat beside me. But I cannot allow the Provincial Secretary to sit down without replying to the remark in which he accused me of being an obstructionist. I tell him that in all the valuable services which the Government have rendered I was with him. I never voted against the grant for education, nor for roads and bridges, nor navigation securities; I never opposed the extension of the railway to Pictou. It is true that I differed from the Government on some points of policy, and I have felt it my duty to bring them to book and to ask them why they have not redeemed the pledges which they gave to the country. The Provincial Secretary has referred again and again to the action of the People's delegates on the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. My remark that the road would not pay grease for the wheels was the remark of an eminent engineer who had given the subject his attention,—and I must say that my faith in that road, as a means of through traffic, was very much shaken by the report of Mr. Fleming. After a very thorough examination, that gentleman demonstrated that the railway would not be a paying concern, and he led us to believe that the terminus would be at St. John. But, as Mr. McLellan proved the other day, our revenues would have enabled us to build the road ourselves, and would also have enabled us to go on extending our roads East and West to the extreme boundaries of our Province. When I am told that that work is to be a great boon, I ask what are we to pay for it? On four articles alone we are to pay \$300,000 a year; that, with the in-

crease of the ad valorem duties, would give half a million of dollars, and the entire cost of the road, £3,000,000 at 4 per cent., would only be \$600,000. And, let me ask, what is to become of our railway extension hereafter? Who supposes that we will get it from Canada, with their grand projected fortifications and their expensive canal extension? But even if the railroad were a great boon, it would be no compensation for the loss of our government and our revenues. We were told the other day by the Attorney General that the People's delegates continued to oppose the guarantee for the railway even after the Confederation bill had passed. I tell him he is entirely wrong, and I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Howe stating that the moment he and his friends found Confederation was sure to pass, they withdrew their opposition to the railway. I make that explanation in justice to Mr. Howe; and as for myself, I could not offer opposition when I was on this side of the water.

The Attorney General also taunted us with not having presented the petitions from the people. Let me tell him that that taunt does not become him or his colleagues, for I have good reason to believe that they did their best to prevent our being recognized at the Colonial Office, but in that step they did not succeed—we were heard; and they then used every exertion to prevent the voice of the people from being heard. But the Attorney General should have known better than to charge us with not presenting those petitions, for the records of the Imperial Parliament show that those petitions were presented by Admiral Erskine, on the 5th of March, while the bill was in committee. It is stated to have been the largest petition presented to the Commons of England.

I have been told that the press under my control represented the country as in a bankrupt condition before Confederation; at that time I was not here, and I do not know that I ever read the articles referred to, but is it not a fact that money could not be procured to meet the checks drawn on the treasury of this Province.

Hon. FIN. SEC.—It is not true, and never was.

Mr ANNAND continued:—I am not able to state the facts from my own knowledge, but the general impression in the community to this day is that the assertions were true, and that being the case, it was the duty of the press to represent the facts. The Provincial Secretary has said that we cannot expect to get so large a sum hereafter for our roads and bridges, but let me ask why not? We have seen the revenue increase in one year by \$185,000, being \$35,000 more than the interest on the Pictou railway, and if our customs revenue had not been taken away, and handed over to another country, we could have covered the country from end to end with roads. I would like to see the face of the Province covered with railways; and as to the Annapolis road, I may say that I think that line should have been carried on by paying a company a subsidy for twenty years, and then we would be done with the liability, and could have gone on with our extensions. The subsidy would then have been returned to the treasury, to be re-employed in the construction of other railways and public works. Thus the country would have gone on and prospered, and blossomed as the rose. But

under the arrangement which has been effected we are out short in our career of progress, and the splendid prospect before us is marred. We are to remain, in future, a dependency, not of the mother country, because direct communication with the Crown is cut off, but of Canada, and we are to be subjected to her taxation, and to be drawn into her broils and her isolation. That word isolation has been used in reference to Nova Scotia, but Nova Scotia can never be isolated as long as she remains beside the sea, forming a part of the magnificent Empire to which I am proud to belong, and commanding the ports to which every Englishman sailing from the Mersey or the Thames resorts. We are to become a dependency of Canada—to submit to new trade regulations imposed by a country cut off from the rest of the world, whose policy is protection, and to share in her isolation; and our people, peaceful, prosperous and happy, are to be identified with the factions, and I might almost say, the bankruptcy of Canada.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL—We have heard a good deal about expenditures for wines, but I can assure the hon. member for East Halifax that it was not all used by the supporters of the government. As regards the expenditure in the Board of Works, it is no good defence to say that the late government did wrong, because every one knows that they were turned out of office for their misdeeds.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL—Several matters connected with the closing of the business of the legislature have called my attention away from the debate up to this time, but I understand it was produced by an attack made on the Government by the hon. member for North Colchester, which was followed up by a series of attacks on the part of the hon. member for East Halifax. There are persons connected with dramatic performances who, after being lost sight of for a time, make their appearance in so different a costume that they can hardly be recognized. If the hon. member would only look in the glass occasionally, and try himself by the different phrases of character which he has assumed for the last twenty-five years, he would hardly know whether he was a representative of East Halifax in this legislature or a native of the South Sea Islands. From the various positions he has assumed, there is no man in the country who can undertake to say whether he is in favor of government construction of railways or construction by companies, or whether he is in favor of a capitalization or an annual subsidy for the companies. There is an old adage which tells us that certain persons of doubtful character should have good memories, but unfortunately the hon. member has not a good memory, and he reminds me of those birds who cover their heads, and think that their whole body is concealed,—having a bad memory himself he is led away by the delusion that every one else has a bad memory also.

He accuses us of telling the House that the people's petitions were not presented, but he told us so himself the other day, and gave us the reasons, telling us that he and his colleagues behaved so badly that they could not find a man to present them. I felt that if the 40,000 signers of the petition were satisfied with that excuse we had no great reason to complain, but he went further and gave us another reason

—the assertion that there was not time for them to be presented. I thought that the intelligent public outside would hardly accept these statements as correct, and when in the face of those assertions he now tells us that his excuses were all a sham, that we did not prevent the petitions from being presented, and that they were really presented, I ask whether the members who have heard him, or the people who read the debates, can place any reliance on what he says. If the petitions were not presented, his statement of to-day is untrue,—if they were presented, his charge against the delegates of preventing their presentation is groundless. He made another statement to-day with just as much confidence as if he spoke from his own knowledge—that the authorized delegates did all in their power to prevent him and his colleagues from being heard and recognized. I deny the truth of that assertion and I demand the proof;—from my knowledge of the feelings of every one of my colleagues, I deny that, by act, word or deed, we did anything to prevent those gentlemen from being heard. If the hon. member does not produce the proof of his assertion, he must stand condemned as a man who will hazard an assertion which he makes out of whole cloth without having the slightest corroboration to support it.

But the honorable member went further and not only told us what took place while he was in England, but undertook to contradict my statement of what took place after he left. He says it is not true that the people's delegates tried to prevent the passage of the guarantee bill when they found that the Confederation bill was likely to pass, but I ask him did he sign a document bearing his name which was presented to the House of Commons, and which made use of every argument to induce the Parliament and the public of England to come to the conclusion that if the railroad were built it would not pay grease for the wheels? But I take the statement which he has just made, and which he gives not only on his own behalf but on that of his colleagues, that the opposition to the guarantee bill was withdrawn, and I make to the House a statement not from hearsay, but from actual knowledge: the gentleman who led the hon. member from East Halifax and others into opposition to union, in my presence and in the presence of members of the Imperial Parliament after the union bill had passed a second reading, and it was known that it was merely awaiting the guaranty, used language calculated to raise distrust in the colonies, and as far as words could go, induced those who heard him to believe that the guaranty would have to be redeemed out of the pockets of the people of England.

That is my answer to the hon. gentleman's assertion, and I give it thus specifically because he has challenged it. The reply I made at the time was to this effect: "Is that the language that is now used to the people of England? I can recollect when a gentleman came from Nova Scotia whom the people expected to return with seven millions of dollars, and they were vying with each other to reward him for this very work." Then the hon. member tells us that the petition was the largest ever presented in England, but he must have a very imperfect knowledge of the number of names usually appended to petitions in England, or

he would have known that hundreds of thousands of names are sometimes presented. He asked us also why we should not hereafter have as large a sum as hitherto for our roads and bridges. Does he expect an answer to that question when himself and others who are obstructing us, have so lately declared that there would be no means by which the annual liability for the construction of the Annapolis Railway could be met? I can answer him in his own words, but one who heard his declaration to-day, that even with Confederation, by holding on to the subvention, the whole debt connected with that extension would be paid in twenty years, and the picture presented by the future before us would be a most beautiful one to contemplate. If he makes the calculation he will find that, by putting away \$5000 a year, he will effect that object even yet. We were to give \$16,500 a year, under the former arrangement to the Company, and now we are to give \$11,000, so that by investing the balance we will have the debt paid in twenty years. The hon. member ridiculed the idea of Nova Scotia being isolated while the flag of England remained to protect us. Let me ask him if that is the language he always holds, and if he and his colleagues did not say to the people of England that a sufficient number of troops could be raised in the State of New York in a month to take these Colonies from the grasp of England? If that assertion was true, and the Colonies united would be in so bad a position, I ask him where would little Nova Scotia be with her population of 300,000 inhabitants? Her position on the sea renders her more open to attack, unless she has something more reliable than her own resources for defence.

As I said at the outset I have not been able to give much attention to the debate, but I will now refer to the action of the member for North Colchester who, a case in which a complaint was urged against a certain expenditure by the Government. He was a member of the Committee on Public Accounts, and, in connection with his duty, had laid before him certain accounts of the Board of Works concerning which he makes a variety of complaints. Now, I ask, has he done his duty to the other members of the Committee, or not? Did he do his duty to the country, if, having complaints to make, he did not bring them to the notice of the gentlemen operating with him in the Committee? Did he send for the Chairman or any member of the Board of Works to explain the alleged irregularities? As far as I can learn he took no such action, and I regret that the hon. member is not in his place to answer those questions. Why he has thus run away before his conduct was enquired into, is for him to settle with the House, but I can only say that if he desired that justice should be done and a fair investigation had, why did he say nothing in the committee or to the Government about the matters in connection with which he experienced difficulty? It is evident that the correction of the accounts and the saving of the public money were not his objects, for he waited till the committee reported, and then brought here charges against individuals without taking the trouble to ascertain whether they were correct or not. His de-

sire, without doubt, was to get something on which he could attack the Government, making his constituency believe that there was something wrong in the public departments without giving us the slightest opportunity for defence. That is not a position which will recommend itself to the House or to the country, as one that an honorable and prudent man would occupy. The hon. member avoids this by saying that on another subject he applied to the Fin. Secretary's office for information and could not obtain it; but let us see whether he was not going beyond his commission.

It is a safe rule I think that a man who sticks to his business is most likely to be successful in its accomplishment, and let us see what the hon. member's duties were. He is appointed to take up and examine the Public Accounts to 30th Sep., and he went and applied for a statement of balances due by the Collectors to 30th March. This is the information which he complained of not getting, but I hold it was not within the scope of his duty to ask for it; he was arrogating to himself duties which did not belong to him. I do not wish to say anything offensive to the hon. member, but I desire that the public should know that when he was refused that information he had departed from the duty assigned him.

Mr. LONGLEY:—I was not in the House to-day when the hon. member for East Halifax made an attack on the government, and I may not therefore be fully aware of the tenor of his remarks, but I am informed that he made an allusion to the wood contract recently entered into on the Railway Department. Being a party to the contract I am willing to bear my share of responsibility and I think I can show that the contract was not a disadvantageous one. I will state the prices which the department has paid for wood during the three or four years preceding the commencement of Mr. Hyde's contract, and also the prices paid outside of that contract because the agreement does not include the Windsor branch. In 1863 we paid for wood \$2.31 per cord, in 1864, \$2.38, in 1866, \$2.52, in 1866, \$2.91.

Now it must be borne in mind that though the contract is dated 1st April, 1865, yet up to the year terminating 30th Sept., we had used only 2000 cords from Mr. Hyde, and yet the average price of wood for that year including Mr. Hyde's wood was, as I have said, \$2.91. It is believed that the wood furnished by Mr. Hyde will be worth ten per cent more than that furnished heretofore, because he is not only obliged to keep a large supply on hand, but he is to furnish seasoned wood for shed—assuming, however, the quality to be the same as heretofore, it will be \$2.72 per cord or 19 cents less than the regular price, and if it is to be worth ten per cent more, then its cost would only amount to \$2.00.

But there are other facts to show that the contract will be advantageous. We paid at Shubenacadie and Stillwater, right in the woods, in 1866, \$2.89 per cord. In 1863 the consumption of wood by the department was 4,150 cords; the consumption in the nine months of 1864 was 3,400 cords; and that of 1866 was nearly 7,000 cords.

Not only has the price, therefore, been rapidly increasing, but the consumption has been increasing in the same ratio, and I am not quite sure but we would have had to pay by tender and contract, in 1867, fully \$3 00 even for the wood in an imperfect state. There is the best evidence that before the end of the five years we would have had to pay \$3.25 or \$3.50 per cord; and I therefore think that the hon. member is likely to make about as much advantage out of this transaction as out of the others which he so bungled. He evidently feels that he cannot do worse than he has done, and he continues floundering about in the hope that something will occur to better his position. In connection with this subject, I am in a position to furnish the opinion of one whose experience of twenty-five or thirty years should entitle his views to some consideration. Before entering into the contract, having some doubts as to the propriety of making an agreement running so far ahead, I made enquiries of the locomotive superintendent, and he stated that his experience led him to believe that wood obtained at \$3 per cord is cheaper to burn than coal. It is supposed by many that as the railway will run to Pictou harbor, opposite the coal fields, where an inexhaustible supply is to be obtained, it would be cheaper to burn coal; but experience shows that the contract with Mr. Hyde was dictated by economy, and is likely to prove advantageous to the department.

Mr ANNAND—As the hon gentleman has chosen to make an attack upon me, I would only tell him that if I were disposed to give him a certificate of character, I would quote the language of Mr Archibald, who described a certain building across the harbor as the appropriate place for the Railway Commissioner. It is unfortunate that the hon gentleman did not hear my remarks, for they did not relate to the prices, as I knew nothing of them; but I contended that it was a piece of administrative mismanagement, with the railway running into the heart of a coal region, to enter into a contract for the supply of wood for five years. I am content to leave it to the judgment of any engineer to say whether that was a provident bargain or not, and I know it is contrary to the reports made by the engineers of previous governments. The hon member is one of those gentlemen who came in on the cry of retrenchment, and his idea was that the late commissioner should receive £250 instead of £600 per annum, but he himself has found no difficulty in taking £600 a year while he has been in office. The hon member's consistency, however, shews itself in everything. A few years ago he proclaimed that "rum and railways were the ruin of the country." I am not prepared to say whether he has changed his views as to rum, but we know that he has not hesitated to accept the post of Chief Commissioner of Railways. As to his capacity for that position, we will ascertain whether the General Government, requiring the services of first-rate men, will continue his engagement.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—As to the statement that the hon. member for East Halifax and his colleagues on the delegation withdrew their hostility to the Intercolonial Railway immediate-

ly on the passage of the Union Bill, I would ask whether he has any information of Mr. Howe going to the gentlemen whom he had urged to oppose the guaranty—whose opposition he had boasted of—to one of the most talented members of the Commons, Mr. Lowe and confessed to them that he had deceived and misled them. If he did so, and if he asked permission to withdraw the statement that our credit was not worth a dollar, and that a man trusting British America a pound would lose it, because we would repudiate the debt, then he is in a position to say that their opposition to the railway was withdrawn, but he must not tell me that the opposition was withdrawn. After the Union Bill was endorsed by an overwhelming majority, that hon. member in the house and in the press did his best to defeat the project and to prevent the Province having the benefit of three millions of pounds sterling expended among them. I could take up the paper edited by the hon. gentleman and could shew the house that day by day he denounced the railway as a worthless expenditure of the public money. If he and the party with which he co-operates could succeed in deluding the people of the County of Halifax and of the country, into believing his statements and supporting their candidates they would prevent the construction of a mile of railway in the Province. The portion of the line which is ready to be taken up at once is the portion between Truro and Moncton, but if these gentlemen could succeed in procuring the return of nineteen members to the House of Commons, pledged to demand a repeal of the Union they would cut off this Province from the rest of British America, and what government could be found in Canada willing to expend a dollar on a line of railway until the lapse of half a dozen years when the safety of the experiment was tried?

If the hon. member can convince the people of Canada and New Brunswick, who will be united, because New Brunswick will send a united phalanx of union men to strengthen the hands of the first government to be formed to secure the construction of the road, that he has withdrawn his opposition in the face of his declaration that the business of the remaining portion of his life would be to cut off Nova Scotia from the rest of British America, making St John the terminus as a matter of necessity, then he will have to take back these declarations which he has made in the press and on the platform. But while the paper under his control and the party with whom he acts are putting repeal on their banners, and showing a determination to obstruct the union, if I were a Canadian or a New Brunswicker with a seat in Parliament, I would say, "Hold your hand; if Nova Scotia is determined not to assist in carrying out the great objects of union, and to break up the Confederation, it would be an act of insanity to spend a dollar in Nova Scotia until the question is fully tried out, and until ten years hence it is seen whether repeal is to be the motto, or whether Nova Scotia is prepared to show the benefits flowing from the Act of Union." The position of the hon. member and of every anti-unionist at this hour is the position of total antagonism to the Intercolonial Railway, and if the people of Halifax and the rest of the Province expect such men

as their representatives, I do not hesitate to say that we could not expect such an act of insanity as the expenditure of a pound on the portion of the railway which should run through Nova Scotia. If there are men among us so reckless of their own position in the eye of the public as to take up the attitude of obstruction, and to place themselves in a position to be over-riden by the public sentiment of the country, I have no fear of the action of the intelligent citizens of Halifax, knowing how deeply they are interested in giving such co-operations as will secure to this city all the benefits to result from the construction of the great highway of nations, and the action which I think will take place in this constituency will be endorsed by every intelligent constituency in the Province. The hon. member for East Halifax has gone too far in his declarations respecting the position of this Province and the Intercolonial Railway, to obtain the confidence of any number of the electors. Whoever will be elected, the selection will be made from among those who have a regard for the position and prosperity of the Province, for the people know that to elect the men who have been traducing every public man who has given his aid to the union, and have been trampling on and treating with contempt the credit of Canada, would be only explicable on the ground that they are utterly blinded to their interests and to the prosperity of the country. Now that the policy of union is settled, many of its strongest opponents will be found like the Custos of this country, who, in taking his seat as chairman of the meeting the other evening, and that he had taken a very active part in politics, but he felt that, regardless of the past, now that union has become the law of the land, as loyal citizens we are bound to come out, and giving the law our support, place the representation in the hands of the friends of union. Suppose that to-morrow the member for East Halifax were elected to serve in the House of Commons, with what face could he rise in that Parliament and ask the aid of a single man on one side or the other in any question in which the interests of Nova Scotia were concerned? After the assertion that Canada was in a bankrupt condition, made notwithstanding that her debentures and ours are the highest of any of the Provinces, from the fact that, although she had made enormous expenditures in connection with defence and in the extension of her canals, her surplus was so large as to warrant her credit being placed as high as ours, flourishing as is the financial condition of Nova Scotia. I ask even if a constituency in Nova Scotia were found to elect him to-morrow, where would he hide his head? To ask for any consideration for his country would require an amount of audacity even exceeding that which he displayed in attacking the financial policy of the government. The ground on which I confidently expect that the interests of Nova Scotia will be considered paramount to those of any section of British America is that we have men of standing and ability who will go to the united Parliament and lay before it claims which no Parliament could ignore. We will find men in the ranks of both the Liberal and Conservative parties, who, without reference to the political differences heretofore existing among us, will go there and claim that consideration

which is due to those who have carried forward the great measure of union on which our common prosperity depends.

The union bill was carried in the British Parliament notwithstanding all that the hon. member for East Halifax and his colleagues could do to damage the credit of the Province, to represent the railway as a useless undertaking, and to make it appear that the object of Nova Scotia was to break up and destroy the Confederation. We have had it represented to-day, and have heard through the anti-union press, that Nova Scotia is in so helpless a condition that all the government of the United States has to do is to refuse to establish commercial relations with us in order to embarrass our trade, and that they can come down whenever they please and seize on the colonies. I ask if that is the way to advance the interests of the country—to proclaim that we must fall a helpless prey to the first aggressor? He says that to attempt to open up a trade with any other country than the States is useless, and he follows it up by denouncing the men who have striven to place us in a most prosperous condition commercially, and to bring to our aid the whole force of the Empire in the event of an attack. I do not wonder that this gentleman, instead of being like the delegates sent by this legislature, ready to go back and place their future fate and fortunes in the hands of the electors; conscious of what he deserves, shrinks from the defeat to which he must expose himself in going before any constituency. He sends to the county of Queens to see if that constituency will afford him an escape from the averted faces of the electors of East Halifax, and back comes the modifying reply that, though money to any amount had been offered by the capitalists who are ready to back him, an anti-unionist could be returned for Queens. That is the position in which he has placed himself by endeavoring to place the country in such a condition as would make us a bye-word and laughing-stock for all time to come. Having committed himself to that course it is too late for him to say that it was a little piece of deception used for another object; he cannot thus wipe out the record that will stand against him to the end of time. I do not wonder in the face of that record that on his return from England, as he told us the other day, on making a hasty visit to his constituents, he told his friends in Halifax that he had made up his mind to bid good-bye to public life. I can only say as regards myself that I should like to do the same, I have accomplished as much for my country as most public men could have done, and would be glad now to escape from the turmoil and responsibility of the public service, but I feel that having undertaken a great responsibility in dealing with the question of union, it would ill become me, having no such record against me as that which stands against the hon. member for East Halifax, to shrink from devoting my services still further to my country, more especially as my exertions in connection with this great question will give me an advantage over most of my countrymen in claiming consideration for the claims of the Province.

Mr. ANNAND - It must be evident that the hon. gentleman is in a most desperate condition when he is willing to place the whole fate of his party

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 ever 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 the 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 hurled 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

brand of disgrace that could rest on a people, and was only to be compared to a corrupt verdict given by a brow-beaten jury?

The House then adjourned.

House met at 11 o'clock.

Mr WHITMAN presented a report from the Committee on Crown Lands, and introduced in accordance therewith a bill to make void a grant of Crown Lands.

BILLS.

The House then went into Committee on Bills, and passed the bill to provide for the road services in the County of Digby; the bill to provide for the building of a bridge across the Salmon River, in the County of Guysboro'; the bill relative to the Station for the Windsor and Annapolis Railway; the bill to repeal Chap 19 of the Act of 1859, and to substitute other provisions in lieu thereof; the bill to amend Chap 70, R S, "Of Railroads," being in reference to the apportionment of railway damages in Hants County; the bill to legalize the list of electors, and the bill to enable the Trustees of Preston School Section to obtain certain lands.

The bill introduced by the Crown Land Committee, to make void the grant to Mary McDonald and others, was then taken up.

Hon FIN SEC said that this bill would have the effect of setting aside a judgment delivered by one of his colleagues and himself. A person named Ronald McDonald, some years ago, had lodged money for a grant, and before the grant was issued Mr P Smyth obtained a judgment against him. On the death of McDonald the grant was claimed by the wife and heirs on the one side, and Mr Smyth on the other. The decision had been in favor of the former.

Hon ATTY GEN explained that Mr Smyth was not only a judgment creditor, but had taken out letters of administration, under which this property had been sold to pay the debts of McDonald, and the grant, therefore, interfered with the rights of the other creditors.

Mr ARCHIBALD expressed himself adverse to the policy of making the grant, but said that if the principle of the bill were adopted it would make the rights of property dependant on a vote of the Legislature.

Mr S McDONNELL said that if McDonald were living his heirs would not receive the grant, and their rights should not prevail over Mr Smyth's, who stood in the place of their father as regards his title.

Mr MILLER agreed that nothing but an extreme case would justify the legislation proposed, but this was an extreme case. A serious wrong had been done and some remedy should be given.

Hon Mr SHANNON, as one of the members of the Executive who gave the decision, said that the conclusion they had arrived at so far commended itself to his judgment, that he would take the same course if the matter were open again.

Hon FIN SECRETARY thought that the Judge in Equity should have the power possessed by the Chancellor in England of making void any grant by which a palpable wrong was done. He,

however, sustained the grant which had been made to the widow and heirs.

Mr ARCHIBALD suggested that the matter be compromised by Mr Smith being compensated for whatever injury he had sustained.

Mr C J CAMPBELL said that the Crown Land Committee were forced on a consideration of the whole case to the conclusion at which they arrived. The revocation of the grant would leave the parties in their original position, and they could then take their legal remedy. He was opposed to compensation being made from the treasury.

Hon ATTY GENERAL agreed with Mr Archibald that the proposed legislation would be unconstitutional. He supported the proposal for compensation.

Mr TOWNSEND was of opinion that the government had done perfectly right in making the grant. He thought it would be outrageous to give Mr Smyth the amount of the judgment;—how could it be ascertained what portion of it was paid?

Mr MILLER replied that Mr Smyth's affidavit that the debt was still outstanding, was attached to the paper.

Mr C J CAMPBELL said that this case showed the necessity for placing at the heads of departments men who were fitted for the work. The general opinion seemed to be that the lawyers were fitted for everything.

Mr MILLER said that the disputes would be greatly multiplied if it were not for the legal training of the men of whose unfitness the hon member complained.

Hon ATTY GEN moved that the bill be referred to a select Committee to report the amount which would compensate Mr Smyth for the injury done him.

Mr TOWNSEND moved that the proposal for compensation be not agreed to.

Mr HATFIELD seconded. The original resolution passed 18 to 12.

The Committee adjourned.

HALIFAX ROAD SCALE.

Hon Mr SHANNON laid on the table the road scale for Halifax Co.

Mr ANNAND regretted that a difficulty had arisen this session for the first time between his colleagues from West Halifax and himself on the subject of the road monies. He contended that the special grant for the County should be subdivided before the prorogation of the legislature.

Hon Mr SHANNON did not see what the road scale had to do with the special grant, which was always left in the hands of the Government.

Mr ANNAND said that the hon gentleman was himself a member of the Government, and, under the arrangement proposed, would himself control the special grant entirely.

Mr PRYOR said that the course pursued was the one always adopted.

The House adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The house resumed at 3 o'clock.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table correspondence relative to the Naval Brigade.

Mr. HEFFERNAN moved the second reading of the bill relative to the sittings of the Supreme Court in the Co. of Guysboro'.

SUTHERLAND AND MITCHELL'S CONTRACT

Mr. ARCHIBALD asked the Government if they were disposed to lay on the table the papers connected with the petition and contract of Messrs. Sutherland and Mitchell. He understood that this firm entered into a contract for the construction of a section of the Pictou Railway, under which they continued to work until the 19th of January. They then signed a document agreeing to come in under the contract of Mr. Fleming, but they stated that with the effect of this document they were not acquainted at the time, and this seemed reasonable, because it was not known until the meeting of the Legislature that Mr. Fleming had assumed the work. They claimed from the Government \$12,000, and an additional sum from Mr. Fleming, and asked that the papers be laid before the house.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that no committee could examine into the matter at that period of the Session, and he did not think it would be wise to recognize the claims even if there were time.

The Government were satisfied that these contractors had no claim whatever against the treasury, and their claim against the contractor they could contest in a court of law at any time. He had gone personally over the Pictou line in company with the Chief Commissioner, the Attorney General, and Mr. Fleming, and on coming to the section of the petitioners it was found that they proposed to substitute tunnels for certain bridges and masonry, but the price they named was beyond what was reasonable; but as the engineer stated that they had taken the contract low, especially the masonry, on which they must lose heavily, the Government allowed them their own price. The house would understand his surprise, on seeing by the account that, after getting the change made on their own terms, they charged \$5000 for the substitution. The Government were, however, quite willing to allow them to establish any claim they had in a court of law.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that he had the authority of the contractors for stating that the entire work had been done at the rates prescribed. He was not prepared to enter into the discussion, but had hoped that the claim would be adjusted by the house without the delay of litigation.

CONSUMERS' GAS COMPANY BILL

The Legislative Council having sent down this bill, with an amendment compelling the new company to give compensation to the Halifax Gas Light Company for the use of their trenches, and compel them to lay their pipes four feet from the present pipes,—

Hon. FIN. SEC. moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. PROV. SEC. moved in amendment that that portion of the clause proposed by the Council which compelled compensation be agreed to, and that the remainder be struck out. He said that if the new company availed themselves of the expenditure of their predecessors, it was only right that they should pay for the privilege; but he did not see why a useless expenditure of £20,000 or £30,000 should be insisted on.

Mr. ANNAND said he was glad that the proposal for compensation commended itself to the house; the measure would otherwise be a very arbitrary one.

Mr. BLACKWOOD said that the committee on private bills had recommended the four feet clause. He would, however, support the compensation clause.

Mr. PRYOR thought that some guard for the water pipes should be inserted. They would be exposed to the frost in case of the trenches being opened by the Gas Company during the winter.

The motion of the Provincial Secretary then passed.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

The House then went into committee on bills, and took up the bill to incorporate the British and American Telegraph Company.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that the Nova Scotia Company, by petition, opposed the clause giving the right to the new company to establish lines of telegraph through the Province, because they were compelled to maintain a number of lines which paid nothing, and the new company would have the right to take from them the profit of the paying lines.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said he was fully disposed to guard the interests of the Nova Scotia Company, but the bill proposed nothing more than it was necessary for the new company to have. By the arrangement recently made, matters were in this state: that for the next five years the Nova Scotia Company would only get five per cent. for the use of the lines from the Western Union Company, who had the lease. The original shares were \$20 each, but they had been far below that, and had only risen to \$16 when the cable was laid, and they had lately sold at \$10.25. The new company proposed to land a cable at Halifax, and would require such land accommodation as would enable them to transmit their messages.

The present cable did not give one-sixth of the accommodation that was required, and the new company proposed to transmit at one-fifth of the present rate, and it would therefore be the interest of the old Company to impede the operation of the new, and therefore such powers as were necessary to the enterprise should be given in the bill. It was true that the Western Union Company had the right, if the income on the Nova Scotia lines diminished, to give up the lease, but he was convinced that the business would be increased by eight times after the laying of the cable and the reduction of the price. It was expected that Halifax would be the great railway terminus, and if the cable were laid to this city the present danger of news being intercepted would be obviated, but the company would not lay the cable to Halifax unless they could be ensured of the requisite accommodation. He believed that the interests of the Nova Scotia Company would not be prejudiced, and said that the petition against the bill was only agreed on by the casting vote of one of the directors. They offered no acceptable compromise, and were amply protected, because the British and American Company would not have the right to construct a land line unless they could not obtain proper transmission. It was suggested

that the decision as to the exercise of this right be left in the hands of the Governor and Council, but it would not be fair to ask a company to invest £600,000 under such terms, in view of the influences which had been brought to bear in some such enterprises previously.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that when the cable was laid the Nova Scotia company gave notice of the termination of the lease, and the lease was actually terminated, but finding that a large amount of property would thus be thrown on their hands, an arrangement was made for the payment of five per cent. The cable had taken away all the business that resulted from the transmission of news by the steamers. He could not understand how the Nova Scotia Company would be benefited by the operations authorized in the bill. At present the news was sent to New York and then sent back to Halifax, because it would not be paid for here, and it would not be paid for even at the reduced rate. There had been no complaint made so far as to want of accommodation, and it should be remembered that the Nova Scotia company were operating under heavy burdens. The Montreal company having control of the Canadian lines had authorized our company to put an additional wire upon their posts at their expense for the transmission of our messages. He was willing to give any necessary safe guard, but he was not willing that the government should step in and appoint the operators who would be paid by the company, and compel the building of a new line for the cable accommodation, when the cable might not be in operation more than a few months.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that when fault had been found with the management of the lines every alteration suggested was carried out, and the Nova Scotia Company was doing the work at a cheaper rate than existed in any part of the world. If there was a reasonable prospect of the cable being a successful experiment, he would be in favor of giving the new company the strongest security, and if the Nova Scotia Company failed in transmitting the messages, he would give the right to decide whether the new line should be built to the Governor and Council; but the bill assumed that they would not give the accommodation.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that this proposal appeared reasonable, but it was not such as a company could be expected to expend £600,000 under. The Directors would say that if the Nova Scotia Company had such influence in the Legislature as to prevent the passage of the bill without that modification, the same influences would be brought to bear upon the Governor and Council.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that all the new company had a right to demand was a security for the transmission of their messages,—the vested rights of the Nova Scotia Company should not be interfered with.

Hon. FIN. SEC. said he would be strongly disposed to protect the rights of the Nova Scotia Company, but the Attorney General only asked for the new company such power as was necessary under the circumstances. The old company would not be interfered with as long as they did what they stated they were prepared to do, and the new company only asked security for a safe and rapid transmission. Nothing so contributed to the development of

trade and civilization as the cheap and rapid conveyance of intelligence. The British and American Company would not have the right to put up a post or a mile of wire until that took place which the Nova Scotia Company admitted would warrant interference. He did not agree that the bill created the inference that the Nova Scotia Company would fail in their obligation.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that the interests of the present company should be protected, but it would be very unwise to give such a refusal to legislation as would compel the selection of some other port for the landing of the cable.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said he could not see the force of the objections to the bill. He remarked that the present company were bound by law to give to the house a return of their profits, and asked if that had been done.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that a return would show that their profits for a few years past were nil.

The bill passed, as slightly amended.

BILLS.

The bill relative to marsh land passed; also the bill relative to Coronors, and the bill relative to statute labor in the County of Richmond.

The Legislative Council announced, by message, that they did not agree to the amendment proposed to the Consumers' Gas Company bill.

The bill relative to mines and minerals was then taken up, when a discussion arose on the clause making possession of gold bearing quartz in a gold district *prima facie* evidence that the same had been stolen.

Hon. PROV. SEC. opposed the clause as entirely too stringent.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that more than usually severe legislation was necessary, for the representatives of some of the companies said that their works must cease unless the pilfering were stopped.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE said that representatives from twelve companies appeared before the committee and stated that one-tenth of the gold taken out was pilfered.

Mr. ARCHIBALD thought that it would be a piece of extraordinary legislation to make the possession of a piece of quartz *prima facie* evidence of theft. A person visiting a mine and obtaining specimens might under these circumstances, be criminally charged without the slightest reason.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the difference between this and other cases of stolen property arose from the impossibility of identification.

Hon. FIN. SEC. suggested that the clause be made applicable only to the workmen at the mines.

Mr. TOBIN said that all persons engaged at the mines should be placed on an equal footing. Very often suspicion fell on the humbler class of workmen when they were not at all to blame.

The clause was amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Financial Secretary, and the bill passed.

The Committee adjourned.

The house then adjourned until Saturday morning.

SATURDAY, MAY 4.

The House met at 11 o'clock.
 Hon J MCKINNON introduced a bill to improve roads and bridges in Antigonish.

POST OFFICE REPORT.

Mr. BOUBINOT moved that the report of the Post Office Committee be adopted.

Mr. KAULBACK called attention to the fact that several petitions had been presented to the committee for a daily mail to Lunenburg. A numerous signed petition had also come before them in respect to the unsatisfactory way in which the mails were now carried. A daily mail was necessary for the growing requirements of Mahone Bay, Chester and Bridgewater, as well as Lunenburg. The House should know that the service could be performed without additional expense to the Province; for the Messrs. King offered to take the contract for a daily mail at the same sum that was now given for a tri-weekly mail. Under these circumstances he moved the following amendment:

"Whereas the Messrs. King have offered to convey a daily mail between Halifax and Liverpool, and a tri-weekly between Liverpool and Shelburne, for the same sum now paid for three mails; Therefore Resolved, that the Post Office report be amended so as to give a daily mail as far as Liverpool upon the terms proposed, the offer to be first made to the present contractor, and if declined, then to be handed to the Messrs. King or submitted to tender."

Mr. BOUBINOT, chairman of the Committee, said that if Lunenburg had been given a daily mail, the same privilege must have been extended to very many other places. Besides, a great many applications for additional routes came before the committee, especially from Lunenburg, and it would have been impossible to consider these favorably if the daily mail accommodation asked for was granted. Under all the circumstances the committee decided that it was not advisable to extend the daily mail service. No county received a greater amount of consideration than Lunenburg, at the hands of the committee. The application of the Messrs. King had been carefully considered, but the committee felt it could not be granted without interfering with the rights of another party. If there were grounds of complaint against the present contractor, the matter ought to be brought before the Postmaster General. It must also be known that when the Messrs. King lost the contract some years ago, they still kept on the line, and did their utmost to drive the present contractor off. The petition presented against the mode in which the mails were now carried was not sufficient to induce the committee to interfere with the contractor.

Mr. ANNAND said it appeared that a large sum of money had been given to the contractor, in addition to his contract, during the past year. He considered it most improper that a thousand dollars should be given to any one, without the service having been offered again to tender. Nor could he see why there should be any hesitation in giving the additional mail accommodation asked for, when it could be granted without entailing

any greater expense upon the Province. As he understood it, the Messrs King were willing to take the property of the present carriers at a fair valuation, as determined by arbitrators.

Mr. COFFIN alluded to the loss the present contractors had sustained in consequence of King's line having been kept up. He could say that, on the whole, the present contractor was well up to time so far as the westward portion of the route was concerned. In fact the service was as well performed as it had ever been before under any previous contractor. The only delay that occurred was during two or three months of the year when travelling everywhere was impeded. The present contractor had made great improvements in the line, and was ready to allow it to be inspected, and if the result of the inspection was not satisfactory he would abide the result. He believed it would be very disastrous to the public interests to allow private individuals to come and take away a contract from another in the summary mode proposed by the Messrs King. He understood that the additional grant referred to had been given in consequence of a steamer having been put on the western route, and thereby most materially interfering with the contractor. He had felt that it would not have been right to extend daily mails all over the Province, at a time when we are about entering upon a new state of political relations.

Hon PROV. SECY explained that the grant of \$1000 had been given on the recommendation of the Postmaster General, and in view of the fact that the contractor had lost largely by the placing of a steamer on the western shore since his contract had been entered into. Of course, if the steamer stopped running, the grant would not be continued. As respects that portion of the report which referred to the Postmaster General, he said that both sides of the House would agree that no public officer had ever discharged his onerous duties more faithfully or more efficiently than Mr Woodgate.

Mr ANNAND also alluded in terms of encomium to the Postmaster General.

Hon ATTY GEN also coincided in the remarks made by previous gentlemen in respect to Mr Woodgate, with whom, as a chairman of the Post Office Committee, and as a member of the Government, he had, for very many years, been constantly brought into contact. He also alluded to Mr Passow—a faithful public servant for very many years; and expressed the opinion that the House would cheerfully acquiesce in the increase of salary granted to that gentleman as some recognition of his public services. He then went on to explain that the additional grant had been given to the contractor on the western shore line on the recommendation of the Postmaster General, and otherwise showed that the report was the best that could be made, under all the circumstances.

Mr JOST was in favor of a daily mail, but in view of the large consideration that had been extended to Lunenburg, and the other reasons given by the committee for refusing the application in question, he felt it his duty to support the report.

Mr LONGLEY urged that a portion of the report be amended so as to require the steamer between Digby and St John to go up to Annapolis, whenever it was practicable.

Mr KAULBACK strongly urged the adoption of his amendment upon the House. He considered it due to the interests he represented to ask the House to consider favorably the application for a daily mail, particularly as it would be performed without entailing any additional expense upon the Province. No doubt could exist that the present line was not kept up as efficiently as it ought to be. There was not a covered conveyance on the road, and the mails were never up to time. When the House considered that daily mails were now running to the eastward and other parts of the Province, it must be seen that it was only an act of justice to grant similar facilities to Lunenburg.

Dr HAMILTON said that having signed the report he felt bound to sustain it, although he was in favor of granting additional accommodation to the western counties. He also stated that he had happened last winter to go to the westward, and must admit that the mail accommodation was not then what it ought to have been.

After some further remarks on the subject Mr. Kaulback's amendment was put and lost by the following division :

Yeas—Donald McKay, Kaulback, Bill, C J Campbell Longley, Allison, Ray, King, Anand, Balcam, Brown—12.

Nays—Shannon, Moore, Townsend, Tobin, Donkin, Hamilton, Jost, Bourinot, Miller, Robertson, Provincial Secretary, J Campbell, Ross, Coffin, Cowie, Caldwell, MacFarlane, Financial Secretary—18.

Mr ANNAND then moved that the report be amended so as to authorize the Postmaster General to advertise for tenders for a tri-weekly mail to Shelburne.

This resolution was lost on the following division :

Yeas—Allison, Bill, Kaulback, Anand, C J Campbell, Ray, Balcam, Brown—8.

Nays—Shannon, Mora, McKay, D. Fraser, Townsend, Whitman, Bourinot, Financial Secretary, Provincial Secretary, Robertson, Miller, J Campbell, Tobin, Hamilton, Cowie, Jost, Caldwell, Coffin, MacFarlane, Attorney General—20.

Mr Longley's resolution in respect to the running of the steamer to Annapolis, was assented to.

Mr. KAULBACK was about moving another resolution, but he did not do so after an explanation from the Provincial Secretary that the additional grant to the present contractor was only contingent upon the running a steamer on the Western coast.

Mr. ANNAND then moved that the recommendation of the report, that \$4000 be given to Mr. Hyde as compensation, be struck out. When the Annapolis railway was built, similar claims might be made.

Hon FIN. SEC. explained that Mr. Hyde would suffer large losses in consequence of the depreciation in value of very large buildings he had erected in connection with the mail service. Few

contractors had ever performed their duties more efficiently than Mr. Hyde.

The motion was lost, and the report was adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. introduced a bill to postpone the July and extend the December term of the Supreme Court at Halifax.

The House then went into committee, and passed the foregoing bill; also, the bill for the more effectual preservation of useful birds and animals.

The FIN. SEC. moved a resolution providing for supplementary grants, which was passed.

The House adjourned.

MONDAY, May 6.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

A number of bills were finally passed.

Mr. PRYOR, chairman of committee on Militia, reported from that committee.

The report was adopted.

Mr. MCKINNON reported from the Committee on Indian affairs.

The report was adopted.

Mr. ROSS alluded to the necessity for making an additional grant to the breakwater at Neal's Harbor, Victoria.

Hon. FIN. SEC. had no objection to add three or four hundred dollars for the work in question.

RAILWAY TO DIGBY.

The house then went into committee on the general state of the Province, and took up the resolution relative to the extension of the railway to Digby.

His Honor the SPEAKER said that he felt it was altogether out of the question that he should delay the house, at that late period of the session, with any lengthy remarks on the subject before them. Indeed, it was unnecessary to show the advantages that would proceed from the extension of the railway to Digby. Those who were at all acquainted with the Western part of the Province must see that it was impossible for the line to remain at Annapolis. The harbor of Digby was in every way more suitable for the terminus. By bringing the road to that town, the counties of Shelburne and Yarmouth would be placed in position to receive immediate advantages from it that could not be expected if the terminus remained at Annapolis. No doubt, in the course of time, the line would be extended still further, and reach its natural terminus at the West, namely, Yarmouth. It was well known that the Harbor of Annapolis was not accessible, very often for some weeks, during the winter. Digby, however, did not lie under a similar disadvantage, but was accessible at all seasons. Before closing, he must add that the Western part of the Province would ever feel grateful to the present Government and to the Legislature for having promoted the building of the road to Annapolis. He trusted that, having gone so far, the Legislature would not refuse to grant the extension required—the extension that would be of great benefit to the Province generally.

Mr. S. McDONNELL alluded to the energy and zeal with which the Speaker had advocated the resolution in the interests of his constituents, but he was afraid it was too late in

the session for the house to express any opinion on the subject.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that the hon. gentleman could hardly have examined the resolution, or he would not have arrived at the conclusion he had. It simply authorized the Government of the day, whoever they might be, on the completion of the road to Annapolis, to make a survey for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability of a further extension to Digby. No one could doubt the advisability of such a step.

Mr. ANNAND understood the resolution to call for a survey immediately, and to pledge the house to the construction of the railway after that survey had been made and the road built to Annapolis. He was desirous of seeing the road built, but he was unwilling to hold forth vain hopes, or to bind the future Legislature.

Mr. TOWNSEND advocated the survey being made as far as Yarmouth.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that it was not in contemplation to call upon the local Government for the purpose of making railway extensions. Under the act of Union the railways became the property of the general Government, and would be regulated by it. Under these circumstances it would be quite justifiable for the Legislature to authorize a survey, which, when made, might induce the general Government to extend the line so that it might be made more productive.

Mr. COFFIN urged that the survey be made as far as Yarmouth.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said a survey between Digby and Yarmouth was unnecessary, for the country was a dead level, and without any difficulties in the way of a railway.

The resolution finally passed as follows:—

Whereas, The extension of a railway from Annapolis to Digby is absolutely necessary for securing the benefit of a safe and commodious harbor available at all seasons, and is of vital importance to the material prosperity and ultimate success of this great and desirable undertaking;

And Whereas, The Shore Counties, together with the enterprising and largely increasing County of Yarmouth, must at a very early day, successfully urge the extension of the railway to Yarmouth, which makes it of the highest importance that the extension from Annapolis to the harbor of Digby should be proceeded with at the earliest day possible consistent with the financial condition of the Province.

Therefore Resolved, That the Government be authorized to survey a line of railway from the terminus at Annapolis to the harbor of Digby.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH PROPERTY.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL gave some explanations in reference to a remark made by the Provincial Secretary on a previous day, that he (Mr. C.) had prevented the settlement of the dispute relative to church property at Middle River. Now he had obtained the papers on that subject from the office of the hon. gentleman, which he would read to the house to prove that he had not acted in the manner attributed to him. Mr. Campbell then read several letters which had passed between himself and between others on the subject. It

would be therefore seen, he went on to say, that he had not interfered to prevent a settlement of the difficulty. The majority of the people at Middle River were his own personal and political friends, and it was his interest to have the dispute settled amicably.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that he thought the papers would fully justify the statement he had made, or at all events that its general scope was accurate. He supposed that the offensive action of the hon. member towards himself was a retaliation for the course he had pursued on the same question on a previous day.

Mr. ROSS said that there could be no doubt if the hon. member had wished to settle the matter he could have done so.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that he had respected the Provincial Secretary so much that he had followed him for many years, but he felt that he could not allow any one, whoever he might be, to misinterpret his acts, or to question his veracity.

Mr. BLANCHARD regretted to see this matter again brought up, but he was particularly surprised to see the Church of Scotland mixed up with the matter. What had the Rev. Mr. Grant to do with the real question at dispute?

Hon. PROV. SEC. deprecated the bringing of any clergyman's name in the discussion.

Mr. BLANCHARD would not pursue the discussion any further, for he felt that the house understood it perfectly at that time.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. explained the matter as he remembered it. He thought that there was nothing in the documents in question to show that the hon. member for Victoria had prevented a settlement of the dispute at Middle River. Neither did he think the hon. member had fully understood the nature of the Hon. Prov. Secretary's remarks on a previous day.

The matter then dropped.

Mr. ANNAND presented a report from the Committee on Trade and Manufactures. The report was received and adopted.

Mr. KAULBACK stated for the information of the government that he had received letters stating that the mails to Lunenburg had been very irregular.

HALIFAX ROAD SCALE.

Hon. FIN. SEC. moved a resolution for the appropriation of undrawn road moneys.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that having with drawn the road scale for the county of Halifax the other day, and having been unable since to make any arrangement with his colleagues for East Halifax, he would now again lay it on the table.

Mr. ANNAND said that he had made several propositions to his colleagues—one of them saw that they should divide the special grant as they pleased so long as the subdivision was made at once; another was to take the special grant and apply it to the great roads of the county, another was that the subdivision be made by a committee drawn from the other side of the house. Unless the subdivision were made, he would be greatly embarrassed in the apportionment of the grant.

Mr. TOBIN said that the matter was in the hands of the government and it was impossible for himself and colleagues to divide the special grant. No doubt it would be divided according to the requirements of the county.

Mr. ANNAND was surprised to see the reluctance exhibited to divide the grant at that time. The only reason he could think of, as influencing the government, was that they had some electioneering purpose in view.

BOARD OF WORKS

Hon PROV SEC said that a member of a government would doubtless visit all parts of the county before long, and be able to see how the special grant could be most beneficially divided. He then went on to say that he rose for the purpose of laying on the table, by command of His Excellency, the papers and correspondence relative to the charges made against the Board of Works. These charges, it would be remembered embodied a number of points. It had first been brought to the notice of the House that a member of the Board, an unpaid member, had not only furnished supplies for that department by tender and contract, but had also supplied some articles that were outside of his own line of business. Another point was that, for the first time in the history of the department, wines and liquors had been furnished and charged under the head of "small stores." Another charge was that some of the articles was furnished at a higher price than they could be obtained in the market, though only a cent a lb, it was true. He had stated, on a previous occasion, that no person had been more taken by surprise than he had been when the charges were made against the department. He had immediately called upon the head of the department for the fullest information on the subject, as would be seen by the following letter:—

HALIFAX, May 6th, 1867.

SIR,—

I have it in command from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor to call your attention to the enclosed copy of a speech made by A. W. McLelan, Esq., and to call upon you for explanation thereto. His Excellency desires to be informed whether it has been the practice of the Board of Works under former Governments to furnish wines or liquors in the service of the Government, and under what circumstances you have made any such supplies, and to what extent? His Excellency also desires to know whether it has been the practice of the Board under the late Government to receive supplies for the public service from the members of the Board, and to know under what circumstances Mr. Pugh was entitled to supply articles in which he was not in the habit of dealing.

I am, &c.,

CHARLES TUPPER.

F. BROWN, Esq.,

Chairman of the Board of Works.

To that letter the Government received a reply, which he would read to the House. He did not intend, he might say, to offer any defence for the course that had been pursued. He must state frankly, if the department was put on the point of passing from the control of the Local Government, it might be very advisable to regulate by enactment that no parties connected with the Board of Works should furnish any supplies to that department. The only change, however, that had been

made in the practice of the department in the present case, it would be seen by the papers before the House was, that it had refused to give false invoices. Under the late Government it was the practice to furnish wines and liquors for the Revenue Cutter, which was used in conveying the judges and members of the Legislature, and performing other public services. Under the late Government these wines and liquors were charged as beef, pork, tea, &c., whereas now they were entered as "small stores." He would now read the letter he had received in reply to that sent to the head of the department:—

HALIFAX, 6th May, 1866.

SIR.—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, directing my attention to a speech made in the House of Assembly by A. W. McLelan, Esq., and calling upon me for explanations in relation thereto.

In reply, I beg to state that it has been the practice of the Board of Works, under former Governments, to furnish wines and liquors to the Government vessels, in proof of which I append a statement from Mr J B McNab, Chief Clerk in this office, shewing also that members of the Board, under former Governments, furnished supplies in large quantities, both by contract and otherwise.

Mr McLelan states that in July and August last the charges for small stores amounted to \$1600: this statement is incorrect. All the small stores charged for the whole year only amounted to \$830,—of this amount \$674 was paid for wines and liquors, the balance—\$156—being for other small stores, as will appear by the account's enclosed, shewing in detail the charges for small stores.

With regard to Mr Pugh's supplying articles, in which he was not in the habit of dealing, I have to state that under the circumstances it was considered important that the quarantine buildings should be erected immediately, and therefore there was not time to obtain lumber, &c, by tender and contract in the usual way.

Relative to the charges made in reference to the price of zinc, and alleged overcharge in weight of chest of tea, I beg to say that on referring to the original entries in Mr Pugh's books, I found that three zinc caps and one conductor had been omitted in the acct, although their value had been included in the price of the two sheets of zinc charged in the account. I found also that two entries of tea had been included in the charge of 122 pounds, one on the 14th July of 25 pounds, the other on the 24th of 97 pounds.

I append Messrs H H Fuller & Co and Messrs E Albro & Co's certificates, shewing that Mr Pugh paid those firms 16 cents per pound for manilla cordage, notwithstanding Mr McLelan's assertion that 15 cents was the price of that article.

Although it would appear at first sight that the account's for supplies for the "Druid" and "Daring" seem large, it must be borne in mind that those vessels were employed during the last season, without intermission, in saving valuable cargoes of cotton, &c, on Sable Island, and that in consequence a very large staff of extra men were employed on several occasions from 30 to

40 hours without intermission, at the risk of their lives, and were the means of saving about \$100,000 worth of property. It is unnecessary to add that such extra exertions and risk required every care and stimulant to excite endeavors

I have, &c,

FRED BROWN,

Chairman

The following are the certificates and letters referred to in the foregoing letter of Mr Brown:—

*Office of Board of Works, }
Halifax, May 6, 1867. }*

A supply of liquors for cabin stores was always put on board the government vessels by the Board of Works under the late government. These liquors were not charged in the accounts of the department as liquors, but appeared under the names of other articles, such as tea, beef, pork, &c Under the present administration, liquors have been included in the charge for cabin stores.

(Signed) J B McNAB,
Clerk B W.

I beg to state that members of the Board of Works under former governments furnished supplies to the government by contract and otherwise in large quantities, as will appear by the accounts.

(Signed) J B McNAB.

We beg to certify that Mr John Pugh purchased manilla rope from us in the months of May, June, August, and October, 1866, at 15, 15½ and 16 cents per lb.

(Signed) E ALBRO & Co.
May 6th, 1867.

We beg to certify that Mr John Pugh purchased manilla rope of us in the months of May, October, and November, for which we charged him 16 cents per lb.

(Signed) H H FULLER & Co.
May 6th, 1867.

The Hon Provincial Secretary went on to say that he had been surprised to learn that the hon member for South Kings (Dr. Brown) had sat in the House and heard the charges made against his brother, although he was in a position to explain what had taken place. That hon gentleman, it appeared, was a passenger in the *Druid* when she went to Sable Island last summer, and was fully acquainted with the whole circumstances under which a great deal of property had been saved. The hon member was quite aware that men had only been induced to make unwonted exertions to save property by the means of the stimulants provided them. It would be in the knowledge of the House that the Government had been able to make the *Druid* exceedingly useful in the way of saving a very large amount of valuable property at Sable Island which would otherwise have been lost.

As respects the other charges made against the department, it would be seen that it had only allowed the usual practice in allowing the unpaid members to supply articles required for the public

service. Under the late Government, Mr. Gibson, a highly respectable merchant, had furnished supplies when a member of the Board. It would be seen that the articles furnished by Mr. Pugh, outside of his own business, were as cheap as they could be procured elsewhere. It would be also seen that the hon member for North Colchester (Mr McLelan) had been inaccurate in saying that the charge for "small stores" in July and August was \$1600, for the fact was that it did not exceed \$830 for the whole year.

Mr ANNAND was glad that the papers had been brought down, but he regretted that the hon member for North Colchester was not present to examine them. That hon member had given much attention to the public accounts, and was therefore in a position to deal with the question thoroughly. If it had been the custom for an officer of the late Government to supply liquors and charge them as articles of food, it was the first time he had ever heard of it. It did not say much for the vigilance of the gentlemen opposite that they had not, when in opposition, discovered the matter. The country expected more vigilance and economy from the present Government than they had hitherto shown, and no doubt they would pay the penalty for their neglect and wasteful extravagance of the people's money.

Mr TOBIN said that being acquainted with the two gentlemen whose names had been mentioned, Mr Pugh and Mr Gibson, he was in a position to say that in their business transactions these gentlemen were entitled to the utmost confidence. He believed that the prices charged in Mr Pugh's account were such as would have been charged to any private purchaser. He was not prepared to say that it was wise for officers of the government thus to deal with their departments, and he could challenge the government to show one transaction of a business kind with himself. Believing that the trifling profits did not compensate for the little feeling which was displayed on the examination of the accounts, he thought that the complaints made about the stores put on board the government steamers were exceedingly trivial.

Mr MILLER said that when he heard it stated that \$1600 had been spent in small stores during two months, he thought there was something demanding investigation, but the charge had dwindled down to insignificance when it was found that the amount was only \$600 for the whole season. He was in a position to state that the expenditure was essential. He had visited Sable Island during the summer and Mr Pugh, who happened to be on board, was almost incessant in his exertions to save property, and had succeeded in saving property to a large amount, although he had not the inducement of the slightest remuneration. The captain of the *Druid* had also astonished him by the energy which he displayed. A large number of men had been kept at work on the Island night and day, and being continually wet and hard worked, it could easily be understood that stimulants were essential for them.

Dr BROWN said that he had also visited Sable Island last summer, and had seen a large amount of hard service done there. The supply of wine

on board the steamer was quite moderate, and the supply of liquors for the men was necessary. He did not see why he should be made the scape-goat for the Board of Works; he had not received any intimation that an attack was to be made on the Government in connection with that department.

Mr COFFIN thought that great credit was due to Mr McLellan for having brought the subject to the House. If liquors had been supplied to Government vessels under the names of beef, and pork, he could only say that it was a disgraceful action, whoever the parties were that had been concerned in it. The commander of an ordinary ship who would connive at such an act should be dismissed; and he thought that if the matter had been left to the commander of the *Druid* this would not have occurred. He would not say that the expenditure of \$600 was too large, but it should not appear in the shape in which it was put down in the accounts. If liquor were required for the men on the Island, there were no necessity for hiding it from the public; but he did not see why it was necessary to offer such inducements to the men on the Island,—they should do their work under the direction of their officers, without a glass of grog being held out to them as an incentive to exertion.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said he had on a previous occasion denied the correctness of the course taken by the member for North Colchester,—if that gentleman in the investigation of the accounts required any explanation he should have called before him the parties who could give the information, but he had left his duty undone, and had come to the house to make political capital out of the accounts. He, Mr. McL., had sat for weeks on the committee and had never given to his colleagues the slightest intimation that any explanation was required in the accounts entrusted to him, but went about the city asking the prices of the articles charged. Was that the course of a dignified member of the house or was it the conduct of a political pedlar? The government could not be expected to be present at every transaction in all the departments, and could not therefore be expected to furnish an explanation on the instant. The object evidently was to send the charges to the country unaccompanied by reply, and thus to obtain a trivial success at the expense of the government subordinates. The hon. member had led the country to believe that the expenditure occurred in the ordinary service of the government vessels and had kept out of sight the fact that the money earned by them at Sable Island was \$90,000. It might be wrong for members of the Board to deal with the department, but this system had been followed for a number of years by gentlemen who were above suspicion. If the hon. member for North Colchester had examined into the expenditure, he would have found it impossible to make the complaint which he had made.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. HILL moved the second reading of the bill sent down from the Council for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

Mr. MILLER said that this bill had been introduced in the house previously, and was re-

ported against as injudicious by the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. S. McDONNELL thought that the bill was unnecessary, and would be of too arbitrary a nature.

Mr. TOWNSEND approved of the bill, and thought that a necessity existed for its enactment.

Mr. BOURINOT concurred in this view.

Mr. ROSS thought that the bill would be the means of doing a great deal of good in the country.

Mr. HILL thought that the bill was necessary, especially in the city of Halifax.

Hon. PROV. SECY could not see any strong objections to the bill. It might include matters which did not require legislation, but it would be creditable to the legislature to pass such an Act.

Mr. MILLER said that the existing provisions were ample. The bill by placing larger powers in the hands of magistrates would tend to foster petty disputes, and would only differ from the existing law in the vexation it would cause.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. thought the clause giving to two magistrates the right to try for any injury inflicted on cattle, etc., was a good one.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON believed that the bill would be very beneficial. The present law was somewhat ambiguous.

Mr. MILLER said that the bill would not remove the ambiguity. It was not required by the practical circumstances of the country.

Hon. FIN. SEC said that a good deal of cruelty to horses existed in the country towns. As to the bill not being generally required, it would do no injury to those who did not come within its operation.

Mr. TOBIN thought that the bill should receive very careful consideration. The provision respecting overloading of horses was very vague.

Mr. ALLISON thought that a good deal of uncertainty would be created by the bill.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the prosecutor in each case would be obliged to prove the overloading or other cruelty.

Mr. MILLER said that in the city he had observed injury done to horses by their loads coming into contact with the street railway; some one might in such a case say that the horse had been overloaded, and thus a good deal of annoyance would arise.

The bill was read a second time.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SEC read a telegram from New Lurg, conveying to the members of the Legislature an invitation from Mr. Fleming to be present at the opening of the railway to Pictou on the 31st.

Mr. McDONNELL laid on the table the road scale for the county of Inverness.

The report of the Crown Lands Committee was adopted.

The House then adjourned until the next day at 11 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 7.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

The Crown Land Report was adopted.

The bill in reference to cruelty to animals was taken up, and Mr. S. McDonnell opposed the bill, and, after some further discussion, it was deferred by a vote of 25 to 7.

Mr. ANNAND laid on the table instructions relative to the division of road moneys for the County of Halifax, for the information of the Government.

EXPLANATION.

Mr. ANNAND—The hon. Provincial Secretary, on a former day, made a special allusion to myself in respect to an attempt I was making to find a seat in the New Dominion. I may say to the hon. gentleman that so far as I am concerned I have not authorized any one to make such an offer, as it has been stated, has been made. I may say further that overtures have been made to me from several counties, but to all I have given invariably a denial,—only under very peculiar circumstances would I offer for a seat in either parliament. I am very much like the soldier at Inkerman, I am going into a soldier's battle, and I am willing to assist anybody but myself. I therefore may say explicitly that the statement in respect to the County of Queens was altogether unauthorized.

Hon. PROV. SECY.—Perhaps I should not have made the remark I did. I had, however, letters shewn me by the members who represent Queens stating the fact that I mentioned, that overtures had been made to certain electors in the interest of the hon. gentleman. I must say that I envy somewhat the position which the hon. member proposes to occupy. Those who engage in political life do so at a great personal sacrifice. So far as politicians are concerned, we who are laymen have not the goal ahead of them that members of the Bar have. When they enter into these political struggles, they have before them a prospect of a time when they can leave public life and serve their country in an influential position. There is, however, no position more honorable or more important than that of a public servant. The public business must be done by some one ready to give up a considerable portion of his time for the sake of his country. In doing so, however, he must expect to sacrifice his personal comfort and private interest to no inconsiderable degree. There are many gentlemen in this Legislature who could have acquired any reasonable amount of wealth—who could have enjoyed the greatest personal luxury and comfort, but they have forgone all that in order to give their services to their country. As this is the last occasion on which I shall be able to make any remarks on the floor of this Legislature, I must say I feel a great deal is due not only to the kindness and courtesy of gentlemen on this side who have sustained me throughout my public career, but also to the courtesy and kindness of those who discharge the important duties of an Opposition in the House since I have had the honor of a seat on the Government benches. I can say further that there is nothing that I regret more at the close of my career in this Legislature, than at any time, in the heat of debate on public matters, I should have forgotten what was due to the personal feelings of gentlemen to whom I was opposed, and should have used expressions which, in my calm and reflecting moments it would have pained me excessively to have uttered. I trust that the good feeling which has characterized this Legislature—and I have never seen a Session in which there was such

a large amount of personal good feeling and less political asperity exhibited—will continue to animate gentlemen when we separate, and that all will leave animated by the most kindly sentiments for the prosperity of each other

MISCELLANEOUS.

On motion of the Hon. Financial Secretary, seconded by Mr. Annand, each of the Clerks was voted an additional hundred dollars for their services during the Session, the number of bills passed having been unusually large.

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE reported from a special committee to whom was referred the petition of Mr. J. Campbell, claiming to be the first discoverer of gold, that it had been found impossible to examine into the subject at the present session.

It was suggested that the Commissioner of Mines should inquire into the subject during the recess, so as to be able to give the next House the necessary information.

At three o'clock His Excellency came down and prorogued the House with the following Speech:—

Mr. President, and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

It affords me much pleasure to release you from further attendance during the present Session, which will doubtless be the last of the existing Parliament.

The numerous and valuable measures which you have passed will, I doubt not, largely contribute to the prosperity of the Province.

Under the operation of the laws effecting Constitutional changes in the Local Government and Parliament of Nova Scotia, the business of the country will, I believe, be efficiently conducted at a large saving of public expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

I thank you for the supplies voted for the public service.

Mr. President, and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

I cannot close this Session without expressing the deep gratification with which I have witnessed the action of both Branches of the Legislature on the question of Union of the two Canadas, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, under one Government and Parliament, as I firmly believe that your adoption of that measure will not only greatly increase the general prosperity of British America, and elevate all these Provinces in the scale of Nations, but that the Union was imperatively demanded, in order to give stability to the Institutions you enjoy, and permanent security to this portion of Her Majesty's dominions as an integral portion of the Empire.

In the sincere hope that Almighty God will bless and prosper you all, and that the loyal people of this my native Province may be happy and prosperous, I now close this Session of the Legislature.