had thought it desirable to hold at a time when action was required. That was not a meeting

for discussion at all.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that, speaking as one of the people of Nova Scotia, he must express his strong disapproval of the manner in which one of his delegates had discharged his duty as explained to the House. The Legislature had not given the hon. member any authority to go across the water; in fact, his action had been condemned as a gross assumption, as entirely incompatible with the system of government which we enjoy. Selected by some irresponsible persons, in defiance of the principles of the British constitution, the hon. member undertook to present himself before the British Government and Parliament as one of the "people's delegates."-Having spent a great deal of time and money. the hon, gentleman now volunteered an explanation of the way in which he had discharged his trust to the members of the Legislature, as a portion of the people whom he undertook to re-The House was aware that the hon. present. member spent some seven months in England pretending to be a people's delegate. In common with two other gentlemen, he undertook to teach the people of England how to deal with an important question, and had given the people of this country an enormous amount of trouble, and had expended a great deal of money, in sending perambulators through the Province for the purpose of getting up petitions .-Now, after all he had done, the hon. member had condescended to give the House and country some explanations. These explanations reminded one of the story of the person who had been called upon to pay for a newspaper which had been sent to him; he put in a variety of pleas; he said he never subscribed to it, that he never took it, that it was never sent to him, and if it was sent to him, he never took it out of the post office, and that he had paid for it already. It now appeared that, notwithstanding all the time and money spent, the petitions were of a character that precluded their being presented to the British Parliament. From want of information on his own part, he had misled the people. Had not he (Dr. T.) as one of the people, then, a right to complain of the hon. member? The hon. member had acknowledged that the petitions had been treated with contempt—that no member of the British Parliament could be induced to present Having presented himself in England without any authority, having volunteered his services to the people of this country, he now contessed that the moment the battle was commenced in England he ran away. When he had spent seven months in England, the momentany thing was to be done he took his passage and returned home. Did the hon. member mean to say that the people of this country would consider such action on his part as a proper mode of discharging his duties? Any person who knew anything about public life, about the usages and practices of Parliament, ought to have known that the petitions the hon, member took with him —signed as they were in numerous cases by a more closely than ever, and obliged her to assist single person, scores of names having been put in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway.

on the petitions without the knowledge of the individuals-could never have been presented to the House of Commons. If the hon, member and his friends had ventured to bring their petitions from the dust bin into which they had obviously been consigned, he (Dr. T.) had been fully prepared to show their character. They found the moment they put themselves into communication with English gentlemen, that these petitions were as worthless as the paper on which they were written, and yet the hon. member complained that the petitions were treated with contempt.

The hon, member for East Halifax had also presumed to say that the feeling prevalent in England was to get rid of the Colonies, but he never made a more unjustifiable statement in his Take the discussion that took place in both the Lords and Commons and it would be found that the two great governing parties of the country, the Liberals and Conserva ives, alike regarded this Union as s rengthening the connection with the Crown. From the very inception of this Union, from the first despatch written on the subject, the same opinion was entertained by the statesmen of England. In fact, the argument which recommended itself particularly to the British Parliament, was that it increased and strengthened the tie that now binds these Colonies to the Empire. Such was the idea that exhibited itself on every page of the despatches of Mr. Cardwell, and an abler statesman was never entrusted with the Colonies. From the commencement of this question down to the time he attempted to prevent one of his political friends taking up a position, which he considered injurious to British subjects on this side of the Atlantic, he had not hesitated to express his deep conviction that the interests of the Empire required that these Colonies should be bound and cemented to it more closely than ever before, and that he regarded this union favourably on the ground that it would increase our power to cooperate with the parent state in sustaining our present connection.

The late Colonial Secretary, the Earl of Carnarvon, united with his predecessor, and declared that the Union would assure and perpetuate the connection between the Crown and the Colo-When the question was discussed in Parliament, although an insignificant opposition was raised by the friends of the self-constituted delegates of the people, every man who had a single word to say in favour of the Union did it on the ground,-and this was a fact that could not too deeply sink into the minds of the people of the country,-that it was the duty of England to stand by the Colonies, to regard any encroachment upon these Colonies as one upon the mother country. What did you find on the other side? Why, the friends of the "peoples' delegates,"—the feeble echo they were able to get in the British Parliament,-declared that the Colonies were a burthen upon the Empire, and that they were hostile to the measure of the Union, because it bound the Colonial dependencies to England