

which has been referred to in debate, I think when a man is in favor of a moral reform, he ought to continue so, and ought to advocate its advance when in power, if he did so in opposition. If I believed in the sentiments which the Attorney General has uttered on this subject, if I held the opinion which I have heard him avow, over and over again, no official position, no title, no salary, no temporary power, would induce me to abandon the Maine Liquor Bill till I had carried it out, and made it a law of the land. If he had taken his position on the old Temperance measure,—if he stood thus before the men of the country who were in favor of that measure, he would appear, morally and politically, incomparably higher than he now can ever expect to do in the estimation of those who believed in the efficacy or the practicability of that reform.

Respecting Railway affairs, I know that it is very difficult to discuss them satisfactorily here until the papers are down; I postpone consideration of them, therefore, until the documents are here.

In reference to Mr. McCully's dismissal, I may remark that he was dismissed on the very principle which gentlemen opposite declared to be most unsound when they were in opposition. What more did McCully do, than Barry Dickey did, when I was a member of the Government? Did he not follow me about, and oppose the policy of the Administration at every step, and do all he could to overturn the Government of which he was an officer? He had the right to do so. We fought the battle as gentlemen. But what more did Mr. McCully do? He went to the election of the County of Hants and made a speech there,—and his dismissal followed. Mr. McCully may have done something more than Mr. Hall, Judge Dodd, and others who opposed the Government of which I was a member, but if so, I am not aware of the fact.

I could not but smile, when the Attorney General compared himself and the learned leader of the Opposition to two flowers. The comparison may be appropriate, but when I look at their withered locks and venerable aspects, they look to me very like "the last roses of summer." (Laughter.)

Hon. Financial Secretary said.—We have been treated with one of the usual speeches of the member for Windsor, in which he has referred to everything but the subject under consideration, I am induced to occupy a few moments; I might let that speech pass, but for one remark. I allude to the attempt to pull down the royal prerogative, and the assailing of the Lieut. Governor's speech, by a side wind. I did not expect to hear any man holding a respectable position in the country, venture to affirm, after the explanations which have been given in the press, that the flag of England was degraded on a certain occasion last summer,—while he pretends at the same time that he has not a word to say against the Lieut. Governor. One word as to allowing Catholic priests to dictate to the Province; that was, in effect, the cry raised against my own church. Who fails to remember when, to the Bishop of the Church of England, who applied terms of contempt, and almost every Episcopal clergyman was treated similarly in the columns of a newspaper which now happens to be on the other side? I recollect when the name Episcopalian was almost enough to drive a man from the door of Government House,—when it almost incapacitated any one from holding an office under Government. The cry raised then and now is similar. I felt much then, and I will stand by any sect against which an attempt is to array the popular prejudice, in consequence of the exercise of religious freedom. I felt all that when my own Church was assailed, when the Windsor College was assailed. Some of the men who supported Conservative views on that subject, then, were Roman Catholics; Lawrence Doyle left the House again and again, because, as he said, he would not participate in such injustice. I recollect that the Catholic body stood by me in those difficulties, and I will stand by them in theirs; they did not desert my cause, and Heaven may desert me when I desert them. (Applause.)

Mr. Tobin.—I do not wish to occupy time at this hour, but a few remarks now may tend to lesson debate and save time at a later period of the session. When we recall the circumstances of 1856, in reference to which the Roman Catholics are blamed for overturning the Government,—the public mind will not fail to recollect that the member for Windsor was the immediate cause of that overturn. The hon. gentleman speaks to-day of dragging by a foreign ecclesiastic, because eight or nine gentlemen, when a difficulty took place between him and his friends, voted contrary to his views. The gentleman alluded to was not a foreign ecclesiastic. He was entitled to the protection of her Majesty, as any other subject was.

I remember the difficulties that the Liberal party had in 1856; measures were stated in the speech of that session, and the document was assailed by the member for Windsor openly, in every part of the city. He denounced it.

Hon. Mr. Howe.—You are quite wrong there. Mr. Tobin.—I am not. You will have opportunity of reply, and I wish not to be interrupted. The Educational measure was a topic of the speech; did not the hon. gentleman assail that? I believe he was the means of its not being carried. The member for Inverness stated that his embarrassment, his weakness, was caused by his connection with the Catholics.

Hon. Mr. Young.—I said, by the pressure. Mr. Tobin.—Yes—the pressure! What did the hon. gentleman say in 1857? That there was no such pressure. (Mr. Young.—No.) Look at your speech made at that time. Looking back to the history of those transactions, we

may see that all the difficulties that arose, grew out of the agitation alluded to. If pressure complained of existed, how could all the useful measures of which we hear, have been carried? Would not the Conservatives have prevailed if the other party were embarrassed by pressure? It was from the disaffection of the Catholic body that the one side became weak, and the other strong. If the gentlemen with whom the Catholics are now politically associated, feel any undue pressure brought to bear on them by the Catholics, if any dismissals from office have occurred on account of connection with the Protestant Alliance, I invite them, as men of honor, to proclaim it to the country, and I will be prepared to take the consequences. Let them say at any time that undue pressure interferes with the conducting of Government, and then we will invite gentlemen of both sides to combine for the public service. I now say, that if Mr. Foreman was not connected with the Protestant Alliance, he would have been dismissed long before he was. If influences were used on that question, it was to go on, if possible, to finish the road at the time desired, by no means to dismiss Mr. Foreman, for it was known that his dismissal would be ascribed to his connection with the Protestant Alliance. I have no objections to gentlemen making any combination they please. The country is free, and I do not see what any religious body has to lose or gain, by the question of who leads the Government here. The question which now really occupies attention, is that of the few offices which are held by members of Government. Let a change of patronage take place, and the political question would be settled, and the religious question also.

SATURDAY, Feb. 5th.

Hon. Provincial Secretary.—Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow the precept which I am glad has been given in this debate, to avoid any expression which would be calculated to arouse angry feelings.

The Attorney General, sir, seemed to think that the leader of the opposition was premature in inviting discussion at this stage of the public business, and proposing a vote of want of confidence, before the papers were on the table touching the charges brought against the government. I rather differ from the leader of the government in that opinion, and think that the leader of the opposition exercised a wise discretion; because, if he had waited for the public documents explanatory of the acts complained of, he would be in no position to make such a motion. If he had not anticipated such explanations, and the means of judging fairly, the refutations would have been found so complete, that the house would scarcely listen to discussion on the subject.

The hon. member has charged us with weakness, averring that we have no policy;—and infers that, from the fact that no great measures are proposed in the opening speech of the session. It ought to be in his remembrance that when he came down at a former period, sustained, as he claimed, by a majority of 16 or 17 members, he did not invite the house to the consideration of any great measure, except one on Education. Several weeks of the session elapsed before that was laid on the table; it only remained there for a short time; it was withdrawn by the hon. gentleman, and since then the ambition of his own party seems to have been, to disavow any participation in that measure.

Two elections, which returned members to the opposition benches, have taken place recently, and it is inferred from that, that the government is weak. In the two counties alluded to, the opposition had strong claims; and if the government could carry those, the misfortune might be expected to result, of the disappearance of a constitutional opposition. Since the formation of the present government, eight elections have taken place, and six out of eight have been carried by the government. The returns spoken of effect no change of parties in the house; where then does the hon. gentleman find the weakness which he asserts.

The opposition are able to go into the counties of Hants and Colchester, and say that the policy urged and forced on the country, by them had drawn from all the people £60,000 per annum, to be expended for the benefit of those counties. I ask can the opposition who carried that policy, which I believe to be a gross injustice to the whole population of the Province, which embarrasses our resources and deprives remote constituencies of their share of the public money, can they, under these circumstances, plume themselves so highly on retaining those two seats?

The organs of the opposition strenuously opposed the equalization of the representation based on population, although it originated with themselves, and has been advocated by their leading men, and proposed here by the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*?

The leader of the opposition, less cautious than the member for Windsor, has rather committed himself as the advocate of the late Chief Engineer. One of the most unpleasant duties ever forced on the government was the removal of that engineer. Who are more deeply interested in the success of the railroad than those who conduct the public affairs of the country? Does not the hon. gentleman know that no weight presses so like a mill-stone on a government as embarrassment in financial matters—and that if they cannot grapple successfully with that, they must be prepared to go to the wall? In that spirit we took up the railway policy, endeavouring, under many difficulties, to carry it forward.

One of the chief charges made against the government is that £1500 a year is paid to the present engineer. What does Mr. Foreman say? That he came to the Province with the expectation

that he was to obtain from £1,500 to £2,000 a year sterling; and that he would have scorned to accept £937 10, if he had known that was all he was to receive. With that testimony, it is obvious that the difference between £500 and £1,500 is not worthy to be named. It is indispensable that a properly qualified engineer should be had, of course at the lowest rate such skill can be obtained.

The leader of the opposition intimates that he is afraid to travel on the railroad. He tries here to damage that work by infusing dread concerning it. I may remark, that in this country, where changes of temperature present such difficulties to railway operations, I look on it as almost miraculous that so many thousands have travelled on the road without loss of life to any passenger. The hon. gentleman may not be very courageous, but with such evidence of safety, I would have supposed that even he would venture. At one of the short curves of the road, the principal travelling engineer lost his life, during the management of the late government; yet no man in this house brought such casualty forward, as a means of infusing dread into the public mind, and preventing the use of the road.

The hon. member for Inverness intimates that the removal of Mr. McCully was the first case in which a Judge of Probate was dismissed on political grounds. I may refresh his memory a little. He will find that, because a Judge of Probate simply gave his vote for my friend from Shelburne, he was dismissed, although there may have been some other trumpery charge, to use his own expression. The Judge of Probate for Halifax was not dismissed for political reasons, not for going to an election, and so far forgetting his position both as a Judge and the station he occupies at the other end of the building, as to appear on the hustings to oppose the government in a county where he did not belong, but it was for conveying the impression, when called upon as a man and a lawyer to vindicate the Judges of the land from aspersions concerning the revivification of a criminal, that he had not been executed because he was a Catholic.

Mr. McCully well knew that the commutation of sentence was effected by the Judges, and he thus assailed the very fountains of justice, and attempted to degrade the Bench of our country in the estimation of the people.

When the minute of council under which that gentleman was dismissed, and which he has not seen fit to publish, is laid on the table, this will appear.

In defiance of the Conservative party in this house, they passed a law taking the appointment of the Sheriffs from the Judges, to whom it properly belonged, as the Sheriff is especially their officer. The law requires that the Chief Justice and a Judge named by him shall agree with a committee of two members of the Council upon three persons, of whom the Governor shall appoint one. When Mr. Howe was defeated in Cumberland he declared publicly before he left the hustings that Sheriff Chandler should be turned out of his office, and he kept his word. No charge was brought against that officer—no hearing was given him; but contrary to the wishes of the two judges who had his name placed at the head of the list, he was superseded by the government, and Mr. McLean appointed in his stead.

When in England I received a memorial from nearly two hundred of my constituents, requiring the displacement of Mr. McLean. That memorial was never even acknowledged by me nor did I write a line on the subject to the government, as I would have sacrificed a dozen seats rather than yield to anything in the nature of a threat. I returned here expecting to find that Mr. McLean had been re-appointed. Such was not the case. The government and the Chief Justice had been memorialized to supersede Mr. McLean. When the committee of council met the Judges, they stated frankly their convictions, and the Chief Justice thought it right that Mr. Morse, the Prothonotary, should be called upon to verify his statement by affidavit.

This was done; and the committee of council, consisting of the hon. Attorney General and myself, agreed before meeting the Judges that if they did not consider the charge against Mr. McLean sufficiently sustained, and insisted upon his re-appointment, we would yield our own views to their wishes, and place his name at the head of the list, as it carried out the views we had ever advocated.

After the Chief Justice read the affidavit of the Prothonotary he declared that he could never consent to recommend Mr. McLean, and that he would not sign a list with that name upon it. I would now ask the hon. leader of the opposition if he calls these trumpery charges? I would ask the hon. member for Windsor if he calls this dismissing a man without a hearing; and I would ask the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle* if he calls that coercing the Judges, or if he can look without shame upon the untrue statement with which he has forestalled the testimony upon this subject, by sending misrepresentations so gross to the country.

I now come to the taunt of the hon. leader of the opposition on the question of the Prohibitory Liquor Bill.

Sir, if there is one subject upon which it especially behoves the hon. member for Inverness to be silent, it is that,—if there is one subject which the leading members of the opposition, and the press supporting them, should blush to mention, it is that. All the leading men in the opposition have ever treated this measure with deadly hostility and ridicule.

When first returned to this house, I came pledged to advocate a Maine law. I redeemed that pledge—but after what I had seen in my own county—the most violent advocates of temperance sustaining Mr. Howe, who had ridiculed temperance—after what I had seen here on the part of men who came pledged to vote for such a

bill—after what I had seen in New Brunswick, where it was tried, I came to the conclusion that it was useless to attempt to pass such a law—that instead of doing any good if passed, it would inflict deep injury by remaining a dead letter on the statute book, and that it was far better for the friends of temperance to turn their attention to such practical measures as it might fairly be presumed would accomplish some substantial good.

These views were frankly stated by both the hon. Attorney General and myself to two of the leading temperance men in this city who concurred with us in the propriety of accomplishing all we could for the suppression of intemperance.

Sir, I hesitate not to say that more was accomplished in this house during the last session for the promotion of temperance than at any time during the past ten years.

The useless license law which encumbered the revised statutes was repealed, and an effective, stringent, and useful measure passed.

I must now congratulate the hon. leader of the opposition, upon having after a good deal of hesitation, come up to the mark and taken his ground in favor of the proscriptive principles held by the opposition.

He has told us that his government was destroyed by the "eternal undue irritating pressure of the Catholics, who grossly abused their power."

The Protestantism of the hon. member for Inverness, as well as that of other leading members of the opposition, was made to depend entirely upon what the Catholics should do.

Now, sir, I hold my Protestant opinions as tenaciously as any man in this country—I am as unwilling as any man can be, that any undue power should be exerted by Catholics or any body else. I am the representative of one of the most Protestant counties in Nova Scotia, and yet I am quite willing to go to the country on this issue, and let an intelligent people decide whether we shall, in this country, maintain the broad platform of civil and religious liberty, or whether the stronger shall combine to oppress and proscribe the weaker.

It may be the Catholics to day who are to be the victims, but once uproot the foundation upon which we all alike depend for protection, and tomorrow it may be the Churchmen, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, or the Baptists, who will have the misfortune to "unmake a ministry" and suffer proscription.

Is it not fresh in the recollection of the hon. member for Windsor, that the body to which I belong, although they recognize no "foreign potentate," nor have even an ecclesiastical head at all, unmade him when he attempted to combine the country against them in 1843, as he attempted with a like result the proscription of the Catholics in 1857?

Sir, no body of Christians in this house can be successfully proscribed, and those who attempt to excite a war of creeds and emblazon the hated name of proscription upon their banners, will miserably fail. The first principle of Protestantism is toleration in its most enlarged sense. The newly found Protestantism of the Hon. Mr. Young and Mr. Howe savors more of the Protestantism of Sweden than of Britain.

We have been taunted, sir, with a want of loyalty and true British feeling, because we refuse to lend ourselves to the sudden and selfish impulses of men who, deprived of office, are willing to desecrate the name of religion by making it an electioneering cry.

Let me ask these people to inform themselves, not only of the opinions of the leading Protestants of Britain, whom I have quoted, but to expand their views and adopt the noble sentiments of our beloved Queen, as expounded on this subject in her gracious Majesty's recent proclamation to her subjects in India.

In the proclamation they will find these sentiments.

"And it is our further will, that, so far as may be, our subjects of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to office in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge."

It has been asserted by the hon. member for Inverness that he was pressed and coerced by the Catholics, and I think that confession alone should prevent power being entrusted to such feeble hands.

I feel it due, sir, to the Catholic body to declare emphatically that the present government have never been subjected to any such pressure.

Nor does this rest, sir, upon mere assertion.—It is proved by actions that speak louder than words. When the Government was first formed, we were assailed by the declaration that all the offices of the country—all the positions of honor or emolument were to be handed over to the Catholics. Well, sir, one Presbyterian was placed at the head of the Railway, another was appointed Queen's Printer. After the *Morning Chronicle* had not only bemoaned the sad fate of the country, because, as they said, a Catholic was to be Crown Land Commissioner. Mr. S.P. Fairbanks the very gentleman of their choice was duly installed there.

Well, what did they do—give credit to the government for having done right for once by accident? Nothing of the kind. They said that the government were giving the lion's share to the Protestants, and throwing the jackall's to the Catholics, and endeavored to excite the very pressure from that body which they pretend to deplore.

I find, on perusing one of Mr. Howe's eloquent speeches to his former constituents at Preston in 1847, that he then held somewhat different views.

"But then, you were told that I have turned Catholic and want to establish a Catholic ascendancy. That I am opening new roads through the Country to let the French Catholics in at one end of the Province, and the Irish at the other, to raise the Yankee flag, and sell you all for slaves. (Yes—Massa Howe—they told us all