

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 29, 1868

The Speaker took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS

Hon. Mr. Holton moved that Mr. Blake be added to the Standing Committee on Railways; stating that the object was to have the benefit of Mr. Blake's legal knowledge in considering the clauses of the Railway Act. Carried.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING

Mr. Gibbs moved to add the name of T. R. Merritt to the Committee of Banking and Commerce. Carried.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. Morris moved that Messrs. Langlois, Merritt and Cartwright be added to the Committee on Private Bills. Carried.

QUESTIONS

After the business of routine had been disposed of, it was elicited from Ministers in reply to the understated questions, viz.:

PARLIAMENTARY GROUNDS

Mr. Morris—Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause the grounds in front of the Parliament Buildings to be planted with trees during the present season?

Hon. Mr. McDougall said it was the intention of the Government to have the grounds around the Parliament Buildings planted, but whether with trees or shrubs was not yet determined.

COMPOSITE SHIPS

Hon. Mr. Chauveau—Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a bounty, for a limited number of years, for the construction of composite ships?

Sir J. A. Macdonald said it was not the intention of the Government to grant any bounty for the construction of composite ships.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE STATUTES

Hon. Mr. Huntington—Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish the statutes of Canada to Justices of the Peace throughout the Dominion?

Sir J. A. Macdonald said the enactments of this session were of such importance that the Government intended to furnish each Magistrate throughout the Dominion duly qualified to act, with a copy of the Statutes of the present session. He did not mean, however, to indicate what course hereafter might be taken as to the distribution of the Statutes. They would call the attention of Parliament next session to the whole subject.

THE SILVER NUISANCE

Mr. Bechard—Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce during the present session, any measure calculated to remove the depreciated value now attached to the silver coin current in the Dominion.

Sir J. A. Macdonald said it was not the intention of the Government to ask any legislation this session on the value of silver coin. They hoped, however, by Administrative Acts, to relieve if not altogether to remove, what was known as the silver nuisance.

NOVA SCOTIA SENTIMENTS

Mr. E. M. McDonald moved the House into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:

1. That the system of Government existing for many years previous to the year 1867, was well adapted to secure the happiness of the people, and to strengthen and perpetuate their attachment to the British Crown, while under its operation the wealth and general prosperity of the Province rapidly increased.

2. That it appears from a petition to the British Parliament signed by nearly forty thousand inhabitants of Nova Scotia, praying that the Act of Confederation should not be passed, until the people might have an opportunity to express their opinion at the polls, and also from the reports of numerous public meetings transmitted to the Colonial Office,

that the majority of the people of that Province were opposed to the passing of that Act, by which their relations with the British Government were to be changed, the autonomy of the Province destroyed, and the privilege long enjoyed of regulating their own commercial affairs and collecting and disbursing their own revenues taken away.

3. That the passing of the British North America Act by the Parliament of Great Britain, without the consent of the people of Nova Scotia, was a departure from those principles by which the authority of the Mother Country over these Colonies has been regulated for the past twenty-five years, unwise in itself, an unsafe precedent, and not justified by any existing circumstances in the local affairs of that Province.

4. That it now appears from the result of the elections held on the 18th day of September, 1867, at which the approval or disapproval of the Confederation Act was a test question, signed by fifty-two of the fifty-seven elected representatives of that Province, and from an address to the Crown unanimously passed by the Local House of Assembly at Halifax, praying that the Province should be restored to the political status enjoyed before the Act referred to was passed, and also from the more recent action of the Local Government in sending delegates to England to urge the prayer of that petition upon the Government and Legislature of Great Britain, that Nova Scotia still avows her hostility to that Act, and her earnest desire to be freed from its operation.

5. That no form of Government can be successful that does not command the confidence and approval of the people subject to its control, and to compel Nova Scotia to remain in a political connection thrust upon her without her consent, against which she now protests, and from which the vast majority of her people have asserted their determination to be free, would aggravate the discontent and political distractions now notoriously existing in that Province, would be detrimental to the best interests of the whole country, and might even imperil the peace of the Dominion.

Mr. E. M. McDonald said there had already been two or three Nova Scotia debates during the present session, and he did not know that anything very new could be stated as to the facts of the case. Of the resolutions, four were little more than a recall of facts that could not be denied, resting on evidence before the House or easily accessible to

members, while another stated a principle which he thought so self evident, that it could not be controverted and was hardly debatable. He did not therefore anticipate any very lengthened debate. The people of Nova Scotia protested against this Union. Her representatives were here in this Parliament of the Confederation, but they were here simply in obedience to the law, and it was surely no disgrace to them that they obeyed the laws. It had been said in another place that there was no record on the journals of this Parliament that the representatives of Nova Scotia protested against the Union. It was his desire to place such a record on the journals in order that there might be no doubt as to the circumstances under which that Province was brought into the Union. It was her desire to be restored to her former position. The exercise of power which was complained of by Nova Scotia was most arbitrary. It struck a blow at a principle which was of the utmost importance to the maintenance of free Government and which should be dear to every man here, what is Nova Scotia's case to-day may be Canada's to-morrow. The same power that legislated away the institutions of Nova Scotia without the consent of the people in 1867, might legislate Canada in the same way, in 1869. The principle, therefore, to which he asked the assent of this House was one not only of critical importance, but of the utmost practical consequence. The Union had been brought about mainly to do away with the sectional difficulties which had existed between Upper and Lower Canada. Yet now we found the same sectionalism continued and extended in the Cabinet. One seat in the Cabinet was now vacant, because a Nova Scotian possessing the confidence of the people could not be found to fill it. There was another aspect of this sectionalism. There was at this time a direct antagonism between the Dominion and the Local Government in Nova Scotia. And what was the case of Nova Scotia in this respect now, might be the case next year of Ontario, Quebec, or New Brunswick. Jealous and sectional differences might arise, which might at any moment produce this result. From considerations of this kind, he thought it was evident that the sole reason on which this Act of Confederation was sought to be justified, that it would consolidate and unite the interest of all the Provinces of British America, had not been realized in the results. The history of the Confederation so far was not calculated to give confidence as to its stability and success. It started on the 1st of July last with a debt for its population

of three and a half millions, equal to the whole debt of the United States at the end of the first six months of the late war for a population of thirty-five millions; and yet, as if that debt was not large enough, measures had already been adopted, and were in process of being adopted, which would add to this debt almost unlimited liabilities. The burden might not be very severely felt at present, but let these liabilities be incurred when pinching hard times come, and the people of Canada found that they had not realized the prosperity which was promised, they would begin to consider that it would have been well for themselves had they listened in time to the remonstrances of Nova Scotia. It had been said that if Nova Scotia were out of the Union, she would be worse off than she now is. The last three years the debt of Nova Scotia had been more than doubled. It would seem that from the time the delegates assembled in Quebec until it was finally consummated in England, the men governing that Province set themselves deliberately to ruin the Province of Nova Scotia, by bringing it into such a position of debt and embarrassment through a variety of mad schemes that it would have no alternative but to submit to Confederation. This was a gloomy picture, but if Nova Scotia were separate from the Dominion, she would at least have the liberty to manage her own debt in her own way; and her recuperative power and rapidly increasing prosperity would soon enable her to overcome any temporary difficulty. The Minister of Finance had stated that on the 30th of June next Nova Scotia would have received from the Dominion \$600,000 more than she had contributed to the Dominion Treasury. He would not inquire now if that statement was correct or not, but if it were true he would ask what advantage was Canada to gain by compelling Nova Scotia to remain in the Union? The people of Nova Scotia disliked the Union, not merely because of itself or its financial consequences, but because of the mode in which it was thrust upon them. The question was not now one of comparative advantages, but it was a question of human liberty, of political freedom, of right and wrong, on which he asked the House to express an opinion. He asked the House to consider what might be the consequence if the appeal of Nova Scotia was refused? If the delegation to England returned with an unfavourable answer, the people in some parts of the Province becoming exasperated might determine to resist the

laws of this Dominion, might determine no longer to pay its Custom duties. He said this not by way of threat but by way of warning. The non-payment of Dominion Customs was a matter which had been fully discussed through the Province. Suppose in the excited state of feeling which would be produced by want of success of the mission of the delegates this should be carried out, and suppose that in the enforcement of the laws some persons were arrested. Suppose the populace effected a rescue! Suppose the troops were called out and blood shed, what would be the state of things that would follow? Small in number as the population of Nova Scotia might be, still they numbered 350,000, the descendants of Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, who have been trained to believe and know that they had a right to control their own destinies. He said this in no spirit of disloyalty, but the House would be wonderfully blind if it refused to look at such probabilities. It should be remembered, too, that from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia there had gone forth to the United States many thousands and tens of thousands of young men who were now watching anxiously the tendency of events in their native Provinces. When these men saw their own people restrained by force of arms, driven into political connections which they despised and abhorred, and that blood had been shed in restraining them, what would be the result? not the raid of a rabble horde as in the Fenian affair, but the invasion and uprising of many thousands of the best blood of the Province. Such an expedition would only end in ruin and disaster, but it was a result which should be avoided by every means in the power of those who wished well to British interests on this continent. He had every confidence in appealing to the House to give the resolution, he had now the honour to submit, a calm and careful consideration.

Hon. Mr. Johnson wished to know if the honourable gentleman from Lunenburg understood what he had been talking about? Did he not know that it required the same power to undo as was required to do? and that if he wanted to repeal the Union it could be done not by this Legislature, but by the Imperial Parliament? He went on to contend that the argument of the member for Lunenburg, that because a large portion of the people of Nova Scotia opposed the Union, it should be repealed, was fallacious. It was a fact of more importance that nine-tenths of

the population of the Dominion were in favour of maintaining the Union as a means of maintaining British interests on this continent.

Mr. Morris said in view of the fact, that there was now a delegation from Nova Scotia, representing before the Colonial Office the views of those who were opposed to the Union, he thought it would have been a more judicious course to have refrained from placing these resolutions before the House, but as they had come before the House, it behoved the House to deal with them from a national and imperial point of view, from the standpoint of the interests of British subjects on this continent. Mr. Morris proceeded to state that from all sides of the House, every disposition had always been shown to meet the views of Nova Scotia so far as that was practicable. He then appealed to Nova Scotia to rise above petty and narrow prejudices and interests, and to look rather to what were our larger interests as a portion of the British Empire, and concluded by moving the following amendment:—“That the House do not now go into Committee on said resolution, and that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the interest of the British Empire as well as of the Dominion and of the several Provinces of which it is composed, will be promoted by the maintenance and consolidation of the existing Union, and that this House confidently trusts that a due attention to the interests of the people of the whole Dominion and a wise and judicious course of legislation will result in a general acceptance of the Union by the inhabitants of the Dominion, and will conduce to the well being and advancement of the whole community.”

Hon. Mr. Dorion said this amendment would have come better had it been moved after the House went into Committee of the Whole. If the House adopted it as a bar to going into Committee, it would be considered that the House had refused to entertain any consideration of what were felt to be grievances by the whole people of Nova Scotia. He hoped the member for Lanark would withdraw his motion and allow the House to go into Committee on the resolutions.

Sir John A. Macdonald hoped the member for Lanark would not agree to this proposition. To refuse to go into Committee on the resolution did not in the slightest degree interfere with their fullest discussion; on the other hand, to go into Committee on the resolution was to affirm that there was some-

thing correct in their principle. If any member thought there was a spark of principle in these resolutions which ought to be affirmed by this House, then he might vote for going into Committee on them; but if any honourable gentleman thought that the whole tendency of the resolutions was contrary to what he believed to be correct, then he would falsify his own position and his own judgment by consenting to go into Committee. The principle affirmed in these resolutions he (Sir John A.) was prepared from beginning to end to deny, and he could not stultify himself by agreeing that they should go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Jones (Halifax), spoke in support of the original resolutions. He stated that the feeling of Nova Scotia against the Union was more intense and unanimous than it had ever previously been. He ventured to say, without fear of contradiction, that three-fourths, even of those who had voted as Unionists at the last election, would to-day rejoice if repeal could be carried. Any one travelling through Nova Scotia could not mistake the feeling of the people—could not avoid seeing that they had come to the settled conclusion that they could not remain in their present state of political existence.

Hon. Mr. Holton said he doubted very much the propriety of the course which the member for Lanark had taken with reference to these resolutions. The honourable member would not allow the House to consider the resolutions in detail, but asked the House to affirm something else. He did not say he would support these resolutions; although he (Mr. Holton) had thought it unwise to consummate the Union without the free consent of all the Provinces, he was not disposed now at this stage to vote that it should be repealed; but he desired the House should have an opportunity to pronounce on the fact that it was exceedingly to be regretted that this Union had been forced on the people of Nova Scotia without their consent and against their will. He desired to make the Union acceptable to the people of Nova Scotia, and he thought it would be the part of wisdom and statesmanship for this House when the question was thus forced upon them, to deal with the facts of the case fairly and dispassionately and in a spirit of condition towards Nova Scotia; to admit they had grievances to complain of, and to endeavour by every legitimate means to satisfy them that they had to look for good Government rather through the

[Mr. Johnson (Northumberland).]

operation of this constitution than through its repeal. But let not the House tell them that the measures adopted to revolutionize them against their will were all right. He begged to move an amendment to the amendment, the following:—

That considering the discontent which is alleged to prevail in Nova Scotia in consequence of the passage of the British North American Act of 1867, it is desirable that this House should form itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the grievances of which the people of that Province complain.

Sir G. E. Cartier said the resolutions of the member for Lunenburg were objectionable in several particulars. The House was asked to go into Committee to consider certain facts and matters, a great part of which they might have heard of as matters of notoriety, but of which they had not that authentic knowledge which a Parliament ought to have before arriving at any conclusion.

Mr. E. M. McDonald said the Government and the House were in possession of the address which had been passed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia.

Sir G. E. Cartier said the House was no doubt aware that the Local Parliament of Nova Scotia had passed an Address; but as to other facts set forth in these resolutions they had no knowledge—for instance, that a petition against Confederation had been signed by 40,000 inhabitants of Nova Scotia. He denied, moreover, that the Union Act was passed without the consent of the people of Nova Scotia. It was passed with their consent, as expressed by their representatives and by the Ministry of the day. He denied that submitting such a matter to a popular vote would have been in accordance with the principles of the British Constitution. If the people were not satisfied with the conduct of their representatives they should have acted in such manner as to upset the Government of the day, and to bring about a change of its policy. When the people of Nova Scotia complained of not having been properly treated, he asked them to look back twenty-eight years, and see how the Union of the two Canadas was brought about, without Lower Canada having been consulted either through vote of its people, or the voice of any Legislative body.

After the recess,

CANADIAN LAKE UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. Morrison introduced a Bill to incorporate the Canadian Lake Underwriters' Association—ordered to be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

MERCHANTS' BANK OF CANADA

Mr. Abbott moved the second reading of the Bill for the amalgamation of the Commercial and Merchants' Bank—ordered for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole to-morrow.

BILLS FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker announced Bills from the Senate constituting the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the Bill providing for the wife and children of the late Mr. McGee without amendment.

NOVA SCOTIA SENTIMENT

Sir Geo. E. Cartier resumed his argument against the motion of Mr. E. M. McDonald, repeating that this House could not be expected to agree to the proposition, that the people of Nova Scotia had given no consent to the Union, which had been based upon the action of their own legitimate mouthpiece, the Legislature of the Province, which it was contrary to the principles of the British constitution to ignore in favour of appeals, which no Ministerial crisis had rendered necessary, to the judgment of the constituencies. To lay down the rule that Parliament should thus abrogate its functions upon each occasion of unusual moment would be to assume as governing principles theories peculiar to pure democracy. The proposition of the honourable member for Chateauguay seemed to assert that the Imperial Government had dealt differently with the several Maritime Provinces, and evinced a consideration for Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island which had been denied to Nova Scotia. Such had not been the case. Each Province had been dealt with, and this principle was specially laid down in the Union Act, in accordance with the expressed desires of their several Legislatures. This question, however, was not one coming fitly under discussion here. If it could be contended that this House had inflicted injurious legislation upon Nova Scotia, they might properly be called upon to.

consider the consequent complaints, but they could not be held responsible for the action of the Imperial Government, into which they could bring no enquiry capable of carrying redress.

Mr. McDonald (Antigonish) replied at considerable length, contending that this House was the proper tribunal where complaint should be made and redress obtained. The honourable member for Guysborough had once held very strong opinions of the invalidity of any Imperial statute from which the people had withheld their consent and to which they had denied their sympathies. It would not be seen how far he maintained the principles of his former speeches. It had been argued that Nova Scotia had received greater amounts than had been paid since Confederation. If so, it had only been in the matter of salaries and the creation of offices thrust upon her unwillingly. If this motion was voted down, the injustice would yet appear.

Mr. Stewart Campbell thought the issue should be left to the Imperial decision. This House had no power to redress the grievances of Nova Scotia. It was not a local question; its settlement would affect for weal or woe the other Provinces. The repealers of Nova Scotia were a mere party of grumblers. He said the members of Halifax had pledged themselves during the election campaign that if elected to the Commons of Canada, they would do everything in their power towards the maintenance of British interests. He wished to ask his co-representatives from Nova Scotia, if they were to give servile obedience to the wishes of their constituents, how it happened that they were here in violation of solemn resolutions requiring them not to proceed to Ottawa? The member for Antigonish had referred to the tariff. He supposed the honourable member would have been glad if no amendment had been made to the tariff. He ought to admit, however, that in making that amendment, the Government and this Legislature had given a substantial proof of their good will to Nova Scotia. The remission of tonnage dues he was sure would be received in Nova Scotia as a boon to be very gratefully accepted. He regretted very much one portion of the speech of the member for Lunenburg that the refusal of repeal would endanger the peace and destroy the loyalty of Nova Scotia. He protested against that statement as a libel on the Province of Nova Scotia. Were it not for a portion of the press of that country, he was satisfied we

[Mr. Cartier (Montreal East).]

would not have heard a tithe of the murmuring which had proceeded from that Province. If the press and the sixteen representatives here from Nova Scotia had taken a more moderate stand, and had urged the people to accept the Union, he believed there would have been little of that murmuring and excited feeling of which so much had been said. What would be the effect of repeal? There were 72 gentlemen who had been appointed Senators, and it would become necessary for the Queen to go almost on bended knees to these gentlemen, and tell them she had committed a mistake in appointing them. The Senate must be broken up, and they must go home. He denied that he had ever asserted that it was unconstitutional for the Nova Scotia House of Assembly to ask for the Union Act or for the Imperial Parliament to pass it. He did not concur in the resolution passed by the Nova Scotia House, but as to their right to pass it he never had a doubt. He then alluded to the handsome manner in which the people of this portion of the Dominion had responded to the call on behalf of the suffering fishermen of Nova Scotia. He blushed for the references which had been made to this in the press of Nova Scotia, and he must hold the gentlemen who were now pushing these resolutions responsible for the tone of these references. He referred to the last speech delivered by Mr. McGee, and regretted that the sentiments he then expressed as his last sacred legacy to his country had not found a better lodgment in the minds of the gentlemen from Nova Scotia. He proceeded then to comment on the resolutions. As to the 1st he remarked that the system of Government which had existed in Nova Scotia previous to 1867 was Responsible Government, the same as she now enjoyed. Having touched briefly on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th, he said with regard to the 5th resolution, that the leading assertion it contained, that a Government to be successful must rest on the confidence of the people, subject to it was a truism, but it must be remembered that the people subject to this Government were the people of the Dominion generally and not of Nova Scotia exclusively. In reference to another part of the resolution, he repeated that the consent of the people of Nova Scotia to the Union had been constitutionally given. He held moreover that at this moment nine-tenths of the intelligence of Nova Scotia was in favour of the Union. He believed this was the last we would hear of the repeal movement in this Legislature. It had been brought

up on this occasion by the honourable gentlemen merely to satisfy the exigencies of their position. The position taken by the repealers reminded him of a sentence illustrative of bad grammar which he had learned at school—"I will be drowned and nobody shall help me." He then referred to the two amendments—he could see no advantage to be derived from going into Committee to consider the grievances of Nova Scotia. What was the good of laying bare and exposing those grievances if no practical result was to follow? The amendment of the member for Lanark entirely met his approval. The honourable gentleman then made some remarks on the importance of maintaining the Union with a view to preserving the dignity of the empire and securing the good will and protection of the mother country which would ever prove true to those who proved loyal and true to our common sovereign and to the interests of the empire. He regretted the introduction of these resolutions as calculated to keep up an agitation which was fast dwindling in its dimensions. In proof of this he read a letter, which he stated was from a prominent gentleman in his own county, and in which the repeal agitation was declared to be a farce almost played out. He had no interest in this matter but what he believed to be the interests of his country; and after a long experience of public life he was satisfied that the public man who dealt honestly and faithfully with his people, and pursued what he was convinced was the right course, whatever might be the prevailing sentiment of the hour, was the man who would stand best with them in the long run.

Mr. McLellan said the member who had just spoken had read the election card which the members for Halifax had issued during the last election, to show that their anti-Union feeling was not very strong. That might possibly be the case, for even the public men who had been in the habit of mingling most with the people, were not aware how strong was the feeling of the people until they learned it during the election. The honourable gentleman had referred to the contributions from Ontario and Quebec for the distressed fishermen. He (Mr. McLellan) had expressed his thanks as warmly for that as was possible to do. The member for Lanark regretted that this question had been brought here, his regret could not be greater than that of the Nova Scotia members that there had been occasion to bring it here. He proceeded to refer to the allegations of the fact embraced in the reso-

lutions, and to the evidence of their correctness, which was in possession of the House. The fact, for example, that a petition had been presented to the British Parliament, signed by nearly 40,000 inhabitants of Nova Scotia, that the Act of Confederation should not be passed, might be verified by a reference to the journals of the Imperial Parliament, to be found in the Library. The honourable gentleman went on at some length to state the strength of the feeling of the people of Nova Scotia against the Union, and their determination, if possible to have it repealed.

Mr. Mackenzie said as the position taken by the Nova Scotia representatives depended very much on the soundness of their constitutional argument, he desired to address a few words to the House on that point. He had opposed in the old Canadian Parliament a direct reference to the people, first, because he believed that such a reference was not necessary under the British constitutional system, and second, because he did not believe a vote of the people could have been obtained on such a reference free from other issues. At the same time he would consider himself recreant to the duty he owed to the people, if he had attempted by his vote in Parliament to impose upon them a constitutional change that would be distasteful to them. He had no difficulty, however, on that score, for he had been fully satisfied that the people of his Province were favourable to a measure which would consolidate British interests on this continent. But the question had been submitted to the Nova Scotia Legislature in a different way from that in which it had been submitted to the Canadian Legislature. Had the resolution submitted to the Nova Scotia Legislature been submitted to the Canadian Legislature, he would have voted against it, for it gave full power to the delegates to treat with the Imperial Government in whatever way they pleased. A more loosely drawn, a more extravagant resolution it would have been scarcely possible to propose to a Legislature. The resolution, however, was adopted and the delegates from Canada and New Brunswick had no reason to suppose it had been otherwise than properly obtained. It had been alleged that it had been carried by improper means, but with that we had nothing to do. The resolutions passed in the Legislature of New Brunswick were very similar. He did not think that the argument from Nova Scotia founded on the way in which the Union had been consummated was of force now to break it up. But it was alleged as another reason for repeal that

great discontent now prevailed. So far as this discontent rested on substantial grievances he was ready to do all in his power to assist in remedying them. He was quite willing that the House should go into Committee on the resolutions. Where a certain number of people looked upon something as a grievance, they were entitled to be heard; and if the Nova Scotians could convince him in Committee that they had grievances, and that he could do anything to remedy them, he would be willing to do so. He did not wish that the gentlemen from Nova Scotia should go home and tell their people that they could find no one here to sympathize with or even to listen to their complaints. Presuming that they asked for the Committee with the intention to abide loyally by the decision of that Committee, he had no objection to allow the resolutions to go into Committee.

Hon. Mr. Dunkin thought the point before the House was, whether there really was any such question before them as they could properly and with advantage go into committee upon. Although at first opposed to the measure of Confederation, as it had been carried, he now would support it. Under the circumstances, he could see no use in the world of going into Committee on the question.

Mr. D. A. McDonald said there was one thing very evident, that the great bulk of taxation for the Dominion would be paid by the people of Ontario. So the grumbling of Nova Scotia was entirely unnecessary. The Intercolonial Railway would certainly benefit Nova Scotia more than Ontario. He believed the constitution should be made for the people and not the people for the constitution. There was no comparison between the position of Nova Scotia and Canada. It was not fair that Nova Scotia should come in with these large claims. He must oppose the resolutions.

Mr. Forbes supported the resolutions. He spoke against the stamp duties as being exceedingly unpopular to Nova Scotia. The people looked upon them with disgust. If he thought Confederation would benefit Nova Scotia he would gladly support it. As it was, he deemed it to be his duty to ask for repeal. He referred to the sale of the island of St. Thomas, and asked if the rights of that people were not guaranteed by the United States. For his part he did not care about purchasing the Hudson's Bay Territory; but would it answer to allow the people to be destroyed by

[Mr. Mackenzie (Lambton).]

the Indians! It might be, however, that Indians would be better treated than Nova Scotians. He went on to discuss to whom should be attributed the paternity of the Confederation, and said Sir John A. Macdonald had the credit of that with the assistance of Dr. Taché, Dr. Tupper and Mr. Tilley, who, if not a Dr., was next door to it having been trained in a medical atmosphere.

Hon. Mr. Dorion said he had opposed Confederation, but after a majority of the people of the Province from which he hailed had decided in its favour, he had come here with the determination to place no impediment in the way of harmonious action between the different sections of the Dominion; but when the representatives of Nova Scotia declared that the Union had been forced on them against their will and complained that they laboured under a variety of grievances, he thought it only right that the House should go into Committee to consider what these grievances were and to see if means could not be devised for removing them and making the Union work more harmoniously. He thought there was good ground for complaint as to the mode in which the Union had been consummated with reference to Nova Scotia. Whatever truth there might be in the doctrine that, under ordinary circumstances, a Parliament was to be held as speaking the voice of the people, still, when a petition, signed by over 30,000 of the people of Nova Scotia was sent in protest against Confederation, that afforded good reason why the Imperial Parliament should have paused before forcing Nova Scotia into Union. That was now a matter of the past, but it was a duty now devolving on this Parliament earnestly to consider whether anything could be done to remove the causes of discontent still existing in Nova Scotia. It was their duty to see whether they could not in some way induce the Nova Scotians freely to accept the existing state of things and join the other Provinces in working for the prosperity of the Dominion. Because the people of Nova Scotia were a minority of the Dominion, that was no reason why their representations should not be listened to. There should be sufficient justice in this House to induce them fairly to consider the complaints and alleged grievances of a minority.

Sir John A. Macdonald said he had been unable to understand the drift of the argument of the honourable member for Hochelaga. The honourable gentleman had urged very warmly that the House should

listen to the grievances of Nova Scotia. Had not the House done so? Had not three whole weeks in the early part of the session been occupied in discussing these grievances? Had not the fullest opportunity been given to-night to every member from Nova Scotia to state their grievances, with much more advantage—the Speaker being in the Chair—than it would possibly be done in Committee? The honourable gentleman's proposition was that they should go into Committee and listen to any and every suggestion of a grievance, and perhaps they might find a remedy, and if not, what then? The honourable gentleman did not attempt to state what then. There was but one grievance alleged in these resolutions, and that was the continued connection of Nova Scotia with the rest of the Dominion. The amendment of the member for Lanark met the proposition of the promoters of these resolutions in the most respectful way, but met it fairly and squarely by saying that we could not go into Committee even to consider the question of a Repeal of the Union, but were at the same time prepared to meet the Nova Scotians in the most considerate and conciliatory way possible in order to secure the harmonious working of the Union. The member for Chateauguay then came in with his amendment indicating by a side-wind his sympathy which he did not venture to declare by his vote. It would do no good to go into Committee to consider the alleged grievances. These alleged grievances the Nova Scotians considered as so many advantages, for they were weapons with which they could fight against the Union. The member for Halifax in a previous debate had frankly declared that there were features in the tariff of the first part of the session which would be agreeable though obnoxious to Nova Scotia, for they would increase the feeling against Confederation. They wanted to be sufferers and what was the use then of examining their alleged grievances with a view to conciliation? Sir John then examined the argument against the right of a Parliament to effect an important constitutional change without an appeal to the people, and as an instance of the right of Parliament to do so, pointed to the action of the existing Imperial Parliament in carrying a measure of reform which its opponents and even John Bright himself had declared to be revolutionary, although the Parliament had not been elected with any reference to that question. He regretted that the Nova Scotian members had

brought up this matter again. Their right to do so, however, was undoubted. He went on to express the hope that the leading men of Nova Scotia, even at some risk of their popularity, would endeavour to induce their people to accept the situation to submit to the inevitable and to assist in building a future for this country of which we might all be proud. He believed there would soon be a reaction in Nova Scotia, and that the people would adopt this course.

Hon. Mr. Huntington replied to the attacks made by the Premier on the members for Hochelaga and Chateauguay for the course they had pursued in this debate. He said that the honourable gentleman seemed unfairly to assume that whoever opposed his views was an enemy of Confederation. This was like his old tactics when he raised the cry of disloyalty against every opponent. The honourable gentleman predicted a reaction in Nova Scotia, but was the honourable gentleman doing anything to bring about this result? What was he doing to conciliate the feelings of Nova Scotia? Everything he had done in that direction was done too late. He had urged their leading men to head a reactionary movement. If they did so, they would be broken like glass. There had been a combination of their leading men of both parties to bring about Confederation, and what had been the result? They had been rejected by the people. Mr. Huntington at some length animadverted on other points in the Premier's speech, and said that if it was really desired to soothe the excited feeling of the people of Nova Scotia, the House should agree to go into Committee to consider their grievances. If they refused, the effect in Nova Scotia, he believed would be to increase the bitterness and double the excitement now prevailing.

Hon. Mr. Anglin characterized the amendment of the member for Lanark as a specimen of very unfair Parliamentary tactics, and said no one except the Minister of Militia had ventured to controvert any of the statements of facts embraced in the resolutions. It was only to the fifth resolution which laid down the deduction to be drawn from these facts that any real objection had been taken. He (Mr. Anglin) was prepared to vote for the whole of these resolutions, believing them to be correct and true. Having himself accepted the situation, and being willing to give Confederation a fair trial, he felt it awkward

to vote against the amendment of the member for Lanark, but he felt it equally awkward to vote for it. He would have no hesitation, however, in voting for the amendment of the member for Chateauguay.

Hon. Mr. Gray spoke against the Nova Scotia position.

The House then divided on Mr. Holton's amendment, which was lost. Yeas, 39; Nays, 91.

Yeas—Anglin, Bodwell, Bowman, Cameron, Cheval, Coffin, Connell, Coupal, Croke, Dorion, Forbes, Fortier, Godin, Holton, Huntington, Jones (Halifax), Kierzkowski, McDonald (Glengarry), McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), Mackenzie, McKeagney, McLellan, McMonies, Mills, Oliver, Paquet, Parker, Power, Ray, Redford, Ross (Victoria, N.S.), Rymal, Savary, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Wallace, Wells and Young—39.

Nays—Archambault, Ault, Beaty, Bellerose, Bourassa, Bertrand, Blanchet, Benoit, Brown, Burton, Caldwell, Cameron (Peel), Campbell, Caron, Cartier, Cartwright, Cayley, Chamberlin, Chauveau, Cimon, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust,

DeNiverville, Desaulnier, Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Fisher, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Gray, Grover, Hagar, Huot, Jackson, Keeler, Kempt, Kirkpatrick, Langlois, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, Little, Macdonald (Sir John), McDonald (Middlesex), McGill, Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McConkey, McDougall, McMillan (Vaudreuil), Metcalfe, Morris, Morison (Victoria), Morrison (Niagara), Munro, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Poser, Rankin, Renaud, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ryan, Scatcherd, Shanley, Simard, Simpson, Snider, Sproat, Stephenson, Sylvain, Tilley, Walsh, Webb, White, Whitehead, Wilson, Workman and Wright—91.

The House then divided on Mr. Morris' amendment, which was carried. Yeas, 110; Nays, 16.

The **Nays** were—Messrs. McKeagney, McLellan, Jones (Halifax), McDonald (Lunenburg), Dorion, McDonald (Antigonish), Forbes, Croke, Savary, Fortier, Ray, Coffin, Ross (Victoria), Cheval, Power, and Cameron (Inverness).

The House adjourned at 2 o'clock.