

wa will prevent us from exercising any influence upon the Government there, other than is given us by our representation. The influences of the interests of a country like ours (almost an island) are necessarily confined within her lines, and when the legislation for our interests is placed in a parliament beyond our borders we should have an increase of numbers in representation to compensate for the entire want of local influences.

But the Provincial Secretary tells us that we have a large representation in the Legislative Council which fully compensates us for the want of representation in the Assembly. Mr. George Brown, arguing that question, said that the complaint had been made that they had given us too large a representation in the Upper House; but he says "*in the Lower House, Canada shall hold the purse strings.*" You will further remember that all the Lower Provinces combined have only 24 members in the Legislative Council, whilst united Canada has 48. But whatever differences of opinion may have hitherto existed between Upper and Lower Canada, there is no doubt you will find them as one when their interests come in collision with those of the Lower Provinces. When a man and a wife quarrel, and a third party steps in, they both unite against him. Upper and Lower Canada may have disputes at times too, but whenever the Lower Provinces come in, they will unite as one Province against us. The Provincial Secretary tells us that if our Representatives band together, they can exercise an influence which will make them sufficiently felt in the Canadian Parliament, and referred in illustration of his argument to the influence that the members of Cape Breton exercise here; but he did not tell us that these form a much larger proportion to the whole number in this House than would the Representatives from Nova Scotia exhibit in a Parliament of 194 at Ottawa. But suppose they did band together to make their influence felt in that Parliament. Now, I ask the hon. Prov. Sec'y. to consider the position in which he places this Province and her Representatives. I cannot conceive a more degraded, a more humiliating position than the Representatives of a spirited people compelled to forego their political opinions—their conscientious convictions on all public questions, in order to obtain for their people a consideration in the distribution of the funds. But even supposing our 19 Representatives could so far forget themselves as to turn political hucksters, and offer to sell themselves, body and soul, they will never obtain more than a few pickings from the public chest, which we shall do more than our share in filling. Under any circumstances, however humiliating, we shall be powerless to enforce a just consideration of interests. There is a beautiful work of art, representing two hounds chained together by the neck—one is large and powerful, looking down with contempt and indifference upon his lesser companion, who is as beautiful in the formation of limb, apparently as swift to follow the game, and as keen of scent as the other, yet crouches, overawed and helpless. Often as I have looked upon that work, I have felt an impulse rising

within me to strike the chain from the little fellow's neck, and let him free. And ever since this Confederation scheme has been published—every time I have looked upon a miniature copy of that work, I have thought of Confederation. I have seen in it Nova Scotia, bound and chained by the neck to Canada, and thinking of my country thus helpless, powerless, and prostrate at Ottawa, with a Representation of only nineteen in a Parliament of 194, the exclamation rises from my heart—"God help the little fellow." Around me sit the men to whom the constituencies of Nova Scotia entrusted her Constitutional rights—her interests and welfare—to whom she, for four years, bared her neck—is there—can there be one among us who will help to fasten upon that neck, this chain, prepared by the delegates? No, let us rather keep sacred that trust—let us rather go back to the people, and learn of them at the polls their wishes on this great question, lest in after years, they have just reason to execrate our memories—lest they pray Heaven to strike palsied every hand that touched to fasten a rivet of that chain.

I come now to the financial terms of this scheme of Union. The delegates have adopted at Quebec a scale, and arranged the debt of the Provinces pretty much as they did representation, upon a plan of population irrespective of the incomes which the Provinces possessed. It seems to me at the very outset, the hon. delegates laid down the wrong principle, instead of arranging the debt according to population; they should have looked at the incomes—at the revenues, and funds, what each had in the treasury. If any gentleman should propose to form a partnership with another on Granville street, what is the first question that is asked? The amount of his income—not how many persons are to enter the partnership. Taking it upon this ground, little Nova Scotia, as represented by these gentlemen, has not received justice. Canada is allowed to come into the Confederation with a debt of \$62,500,000, Nova Scotia with one of \$8,000,000. Now, in the year in which this arrangement was made, the income of Canada was \$5,884,594—whilst that of Nova Scotia was \$861,989—in both cases derived from Customs and Excise. According to that income of Canada, as compared with that of Nova Scotia, she should have only been entitled to come in with a debt of \$54,000,000. But the hon. gentlemen should not have taken the present income only into consideration. They should have considered that under Confederation we shall be placed on the same tariff, and therefore they should have looked to the effect of this increase of tariff. It has been ascertained by close calculation, that under the Canadian tariff, Nova Scotia's revenue would have been \$1,330,514. Taking it upon this basis, if we were allowed only 8 millions, Canada should have only \$85,452,507, or reversing it, if Canada is allowed \$62,500,000, Nova Scotia should have been allowed \$14,107,330. By adopting the principle of income, instead of population, it would have given us over six millions more than we are actually to receive under this agreement.