

ed by an act relating to the Baddeck church property some years ago. There was something in the face of the matter so insulting to the intelligence of the House that he felt it hardly right to ask members to listen to any arguments. The language used in reference to the Inspector of schools was strong but it was entirely justified by that officer's conduct. A fear had been previously expressed that the Inspectors instead of attending to their duties would be made the tools of the government and the conduct of this Inspector afforded a complete indication of the remark. The man who should of all others endeavour to reconcile angry feelings was stirring up strife, issuing warrants against the clergy and making himself the tool of the member for Victoria. While he, Mr. Archibald, and his friends were giving assistance to the government on the school bill, this officer whose acts were a stain upon the man who recommended him and the government who would continue him a day in office, was using every effort to destroy its good effect. The very petition written by him showed him to be destitute of acquaintance with the principles of an English education, it contained blunders in every part of it, and this was the man who had charge of the education of the County of Victoria. After being appointed a Justice of the Peace, this individual had issued a warrant against twenty-five persons for going into a church and listening to a minister, and had fined them from \$10 to \$20 each, although the prosecutor swore that no breach of the peace had been committed. In the Act relating to the Union, a clause had been inserted providing that no congregation deciding to remain separate, within three months after the passage of the law, should be embraced in the union. He would be satisfied that the House should decide the matter on the speech of the member for Victoria, who appeared as the representative of a body that disowned him.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL, said that the Legislature was in the habit of dealing fairly with the rights of every religious body. If the question was considered in the proper spirit, there need be no fear as to any injustice being done to any set of men. He regretted that the hon. member for Colchester had not provided in the bill of 1862 for the security of private rights. He could tell that hon. gentleman from his own personal knowledge, that at the first circuit in Cape Breton after the act had passed, he was met by deputations of religious bodies asking what could be done to protect their property. By the time they got the requisite advice, they were unable to give the 30 days notice required by the act. The act operated before the people knew what to do. It was not right for the Legislature to hand over the private property of one person to another.—Justice should be done where a man had put his hand into his pocket and contributed to the erection of a church, manse, or other property. If a majority of the congregation retired to another church, he should be remunerated and protected as far as the property was concerned. He regretted that the matter had been brought up, but now that it was there it should be given a fair and equitable hearing to the claims of the petitioners. He held that the true principle was this:—that if a number of persons went over and joined another church, they

should not take away the property but leave it to those that remained,—who belonged to the Free Church. He believed that it was only the intention of the promoters of the act of 1862 to receive power to manage their own internal affairs, but not to legislate away the rights of others. One congregation—that of Mr. Gunn—had been excepted at the time from the provisions of the act. Here the principle was established that it was unconstitutional and unjust to legislate away the rights of the parties who might object to the union. If it was right in one case, it was equally right in all others—to reserve the rights of clergymen in other parts of the country. Some little allowance ought to be made for a person like the hon. member for Victoria, who had the property which he had helped to create legislated away. No person could accept such a state of things without remonstrance. He did not think, however, that the present bill could meet the difficulty, and he would therefore suggest that it be referred to a special committee.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the Free Church had united with another religious body with which it agreed in doctrine. It was to all intents and purposes the same church it was before; it had the same right to the property it owned previously.

The discussion was adjourned.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced an act to authorize the appointment of an additional Health Officer for the port of Halifax.

Hon. PROV. SECRETARY laid on the table a return asked for by Mr. Bill, relative to the appointment of Commissioners in the County of Kings.

TUESDAY, APRIL 10.

#### UNION OF THE COLONIES.

SPEECH OF HON. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY.

House met at 3 o'clock.

Dr. TUPPER then rose and said:—The house will recollect that, a few days ago, the hon. member for Richmond put a question to the Government, in relation to a very important subject, and on that occasion I stated that the situation in which we stood in respect to the Union of the Colonies would preclude me from giving him an immediate reply, until I had an opportunity of placing myself in communication with my colleagues in the Government, and with the other gentlemen who had assisted in maturing the Quebec scheme. I stated, however, to the hon. member and to the house, that in view of the great importance of the subject,—of the events which were daily transpiring in connection with the question—I would take the earliest opportunity of giving, in my place, the policy which the Government and the friends of the Quebec scheme of Confederation in this Legislature are prepared to take in relation to the matter. In order to redeem the pledge and bring the attention of this Legislative Assembly to the consideration of the gravest and most important question that has ever been submitted to it—after due deliberation with my colleagues, and consultation with the gentlemen who were associated with us at the Quebec Conference—I rise for the purpose of giving to the house and country the fullest information as to the policy which we are prepared to assume in relation to the subject. I regret deeply that in approaching a