

they should be held sacred. I am not the man to violate them. It might be proper and correct in questions affecting the domestic policy of the Province, affecting our public works or any other great leading interest connected with our own local affairs, that even an honorable member of this House has conscientiously changed his opinion from those he was pledged to observe at the hustings, to vote in this House according to his changed opinions, and in opposition to his pledges, because a member of this House represents not only a local constituency but also the whole people, and because at the next election his successor, should he be not returned, could repeal the effect of his vote, and a succeeding House could undo what a previous House had done. Such cases have often happened in England and in the Colonies. We all know the course Sir Robert Peel took in reference to free trade, although pledged to his constituents to support a high protective policy. But in cases of that kind a man might be justified to act different from his pledges and take the consequences, but this is not a parallel case. This Confederation strikes at the whole Constitution of the country, strikes at the Constitution of this House, and, if carried, no subsequent House could alter or repeal what we might do. No subsequent House could retrace the steps which we had taken. Like the fall of a tree, a subsequent House would be lifeless. The act had been committed; therefore, Sir, no member could justify himself before his country, however much his opinions might have changed in reference to the desirability of a union, to vote for it in this House when he is pledged to his constituents to vote against it. I shall not do so, although I am convinced of the desirability of being confederated, and of uniting with our sister Colonies. But unless I get further authority from my constituents, I cannot go for it. I am prepared, should my constituents want my services, to go back to them at the next election in favor of Confederation, in favor of carrying out the supreme wishes of the mother country on this question. Leaving this subject for the present, I have other good reasons for voting against the Government.

The Government have been guilty of maladministration in the affairs of the Crown Land Department. They try to throw blame on the late Government. We are not here to-day to try the wrongs of the late Government or any previous Government. If the late Government should have issued an order of survey for every acre of the public land in this Province, to sell all the lands of the country to one man, would you justify this Government if they had carried it out, and sold all the lands of the country to one individual. If the late Government thought proper to issue an order for survey to lock up in the hands of one individual land to the extent of 15,000 acres, which is nearly as large as the whole Parish of Dorchester, the present Government were not bound to carry it out. I came not here to say whether the late Government did right or wrong. I am not here to advocate the late Government, for I frequently gave them opposition on questions in which I thought they were wrong. The late Government thought proper to issue an order for survey, and if the incoming Government thought a great wrong was going to be done to the people of this

country, by granting to one man 15,000 acres in fee simple for all time to come, they should have refunded the money paid for the survey to the man for whom the survey was made, for the policy of the Government should be to defend the interests of the people in preference to subserving the private interests of a private individual. In England we see cases where companies are subsidized to run a line of steamships. The company has to run the risk of the policy of the incoming Government in respect to the continuation of the subsidy, and it is no breach of faith to withhold it. So in this case, there would have been no breach of faith whatever, for the duty the Government owed to the people of this country was of far more importance than to comply with the wishes of a private individual, however enterprising he may be. Talk about the wrongs of Ireland, and I know she has wrongs, for if ever there was a corn-trodden country it is Ireland. This wrong has been brought about by the same system this Government is now pursuing, that is, locking up large blocks of land which should belong to the yeomanry of this country. The occupier of the land should own the land, and this principle of serfdom should not be introduced into this country. Notwithstanding the expression of opinion by my hon. friend from the County of Kent (Mr. Cair), the people of that County will say, the land of this country belongs to the people of this country, who have to roll the black logs and pile the black stumps, and cannot afford to pay rent to any man. We must avoid the errors of the mother country, and take lessons from the wrongs and errors done to Ireland, in order to pursue a different course. It may be very well to gratify the wishes of any private individual to sell him a large block of land, but we must reflect that in so doing we legislate for all time to come, and introduce into this country, in future time, a system ruinous to the future welfare of the country, and for which our posterity will blame us, for it is natural to suppose that if we lock up whole Townships, by adopting the same course that has been adopted in Ireland, the same effects will be produced. I condemn the Government most particularly on that point, for I do not think the late Government committed the incoming Government to any line of policy, and they would have been guilty of no breach of faith if they had withheld the grant, and reimbursed the individual for the costs of survey. During the last sitting of the Legislature, I expressed disappointment in the conduct of the Government, because they had no policy. I could not suppose that men would come together under our system, having a constitutional and departmental Government, without having some line of policy. In England they often form a Government over night, and a full policy is arranged, otherwise the Government could not be formed. If it be announced to the representatives of Her Majesty in this Province, that they have succeeded in forming a Government, the idea is conveyed that that Government has adopted some policy under which they intend to administer the affairs of the country. Confederation was settled at the polls, and the Government of the mother country have informed us that they will not legislate away our rights until we consent. The Government should have been formed upon some local policy, in a colony where a depart-

mental and responsible Government is established. Why then did the Government prescribe men, because they sympathized with the imperial policy, over which policy this local Government could have no control, any further than by expressing in a despatch to the mother country that our own people had decided against it? The wishes of the people having been expressed at the ballot box against the scheme, the local Government could only be formed on a local policy, and not antagonistic to the imperial policy, whatever that may be. Suppose there was going to be a war between England and any power in any part of Europe or the neighboring Republic, and we should get up an anti-war party, or party in favor of war, would it be right to form a Government in this province on either of those principles if it interfered with the policy of the Imperial Government? Not at all. The Government must be formed on local grounds to carry out the local wants and requirements of the country; from what has transpired during the debate, from the statements made by my hon. friend Mr. Wilmot, it would appear that His Excellency sent for him and my colleague to form the administration, and it would seem that notwithstanding Mr. Wilmot had had great political experience, had been the leading mind in a previous Government, had great knowledge of the commercial and agricultural wants of the country; that my colleague took upon himself the exclusive right of the formation of the Government, and brought men together in that Government without any policy, and upon no known principle. I find no fault at the personal of the Government, and particularly none to my colleague (Mr. Botsford) being taken in as Surveyor General. I expressed myself, at the time, satisfied at his appointment. I find fault that they started upon a do-nothing system.

The House of Assembly was called together on the 27th day of April last, and the Speech from the Throne was delivered, but there was no policy in it; the great interests which should occupy the attention of the administration of the country was completely ignored. The most important interest is the settlement of the country, by which we get an increase of labor, which increases the wealth of the country. This important interest was not mentioned in the Speech. We were left in doubt as to the Legislative enactments that stood in the way of the completion of our Railroads, and the educational institutions of the country were not alluded to. I then thought proper to rise in my place and ask for information but I was denounced by my hon. colleague the leader of the Government, who said he did not wish my support. At that time the Government had in their possession an important despatch from the Mother Country in reference to a Union of the Colonies, which if known to the House at that time, would have obviated the necessity of sending a delegation home to England. If I had known of it, I would have moved an address to have it laid before the House. I believed at that time that the Mother Country did not fully endorse a Union of the Colonies. I believed at that time that the Canadians concocted the Scheme to redress their own private wrongs, but I do not believe it now. I believed too at that time that they did not intend to build the Intercolonial Railway, but wished to go into a Union for the purpose of getting over