

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