

When he was appointed and found that a man-of-war was ready to take him to Newfoundland, and that he could not go to Prince Edward Island, he expressed his deep regret that he could not join us. Believing and expecting that something would grow out of that meeting, he wrote to the Government expressing regret that he could not join the delegation, but that when he returned in October he would be happy to aid them in any scheme that might be arranged. It is not necessary for me to go over the evidence that he was always in favor of a union of the Provinces. Whilst conducting a leading public journal he advocated it for years; within these walls he repeatedly referred to the subject in a manner that was calculated to bring conviction to the people of this country. Who does not remember the story he told so often that when he arrived in Liverpool a consul from the United States, the bearer of important despatches, was allowed to go ashore, whilst he had to remain in the ship. Should a Colonist, he said, be considered so little entitled to consideration? Should not the Colonies assume a position that would entitle them to more respect among the nations of the world?

I am not going to recapitulate what occurred at Charlottetown, or enter into any elaborate exposition of the necessity and advantages of union; it has been thoroughly discussed in the press and on the platform, and on the floors of this House. I have yet to hear, in this debate, anything on the subject that has not been often said before. It is complained that there are eleven lawyers in this House in favor of the scheme; but are not the best minds in the country also supporting it? I need not tell gentlemen who are opposing this great measure of intercolonial progress, and who the "head centre" is. He is well known in this House and country; he has been receiving pay from the Imperial Government for the past two years, but, opposed to the views of that Government, has been secretly using every means to thwart them, and at the same time tried to deceive the people by a letter that he was not opposing the measure in any shape. Now that his pay has ceased, the mask is thrown off, and we find him openly in antagonism to the measure which he pretended he had not endeavored to thwart. He, a servant of the British Government, has been for months past insidiously laboring to destroy a scheme that he knew had secured the approval of that Government, of the British Parliament and people, and the best minds in British North America. This is a free country, and every man is at liberty to write what he wishes; but there are responsibilities thrown upon some persons in reference to many public measures that should induce them to act with great discretion. That discretion has not been observed by Mr. Howe. He has forgotten the responsibility that he owes to the people of this country. He was not called upon as a public man, for he occupied no position in this country that required his action, but he has gone out of his way to oppose this measure, and to slander and vilify members of this House, on both sides. We are told that this is the patriot of Nova Scotia, and that therefore he is entitled to consideration. Let us see the position that the hon. gentleman occupies before the people of Nova Scotia, and scrutinize his claims to the confidence of the

country. He went to England on a railway mission, three or four years ago, and entered into an arrangement by which the people of this province would have to pay three and a half twelfths of the entire cost of the intercolonial Railway, and then came back and, by the power of a small majority, whilst an employee of the British Government, passed an act to carry it out. Now, when the road is to be built on most advantageous terms, he is found opposing a scheme of union without which its construction must be delayed for years. He went to the county of Lunenburg at the general election in 1863, and the people rejected him by an overwhelming majority. He has since then been in the pay of the British Government, but during that time what evidence did he give of his patriotism? Did he serve the interests of the people on any single occasion? No; his patriotism was subdued by his salary.

This gentleman, whose ability is undoubted, whose speeches I have listened to on the floor of this House with the greatest interest, assumes to be the guide of the people. Let us see what claims he has to that position. We all know that the Reciprocity Treaty was entered into in 1854. It came to be ratified in this House, and where do we find that hon. member? We found him endeavoring to defeat that measure, and dividing the House on the question. If the hon. member had been successful, we would never have had any Reciprocity Treaty, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, and the advantages of that measure and the favorable position it now so strongly enable us to take in dealing with that question, would have been wholly lost. Again, the question of the settlement of the Mines and Minerals came up for consideration in 1858. It was arranged by a gentleman taken from each side of the House—by the present Judge in Equity and the hon. leader of the Opposition. Mr. Howe led up an opposition to the measure, and did all in his power to frustrate the arrangements that the delegates had made in London. These were two important questions which have proved most advantageous to the people, and yet Mr. Howe, the patriot, was found throwing obstacles in their way. Again, the hon. gentleman became a railway commissioner, and I need not remind the House that, in 1856, he was constantly found button-holing members, and endeavoring to upset the Government of his own party, whose subordinate officer he was. If that Government, which he represented as resting over a volcano, was not immediately broken up, it was not his fault. Things went on this way until 1857, when the Goulay shanty riots occurred. We all remember the religious animosities that were excited. Who was the origin? This same gentleman. He destroyed his own political friends by forcing measures upon them which they could not with safety adopt, and which divided, as he knew it would, his own party. He raised religious strife in this country for his own personal objects, and excited neighbor against neighbor who had lived for years in peace and quietude. He managed by this means to get into power in 1859, but do you think he endeavored to preserve consistency of action? Nothing of the kind. After his success, by a small majority, which was subsequently melting away, and feeling the power unrighteously obtained fast slipping