

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 14, 1867

THE CABINET VACANCIES

Mr. Holton said in the absence of the honourable member for Hochelaga he would ask the Minister of Justice whether he was in position to make any statement in regard to the filling of vacancies in the cabinet caused by the resignation of Mr. Galt and Mr. Archibald. Reports had been seen in the public journals respecting offers of office to honourable gentlemen known in that House—one a member of that House and another a member of the other branch of the Legislature. The House should know at the earliest moment what appointments were made.

Sir John A. Macdonald replied that negotiations were in progress and had arrived at such a point that he hoped in a day or two to be able to announce the names of the gentlemen appointed to the vacant offices.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

Mr. Jones (Leeds and Grenville) resumed the debate on the address. He was not one of those members who thought Confederation was going to accomplish all the good predicted by its admirers but some change was found to be necessary. He believed in party governments, but parties must have principles to divide them. Questions would likely soon arise in Parliament which would divide the House into two parties. He would not apologize for the acts of the late Coalition, but it was not fair to saddle the whole blame of the increase of the debt to them. He protested against increasing representation, and hoped measures would be taken to reduce it. Before the Confederation Act we had a larger representation in Parliament in proportion to population than any other country in the world. He thought the Inter-colonial Railway would cost more than the estimated amount, \$15,000,000, and that a larger guarantee should have been obtained from the Imperial Parliament. The opening up of the Northwest Territory would not be considered to be so beneficial to Canada as was generally supposed, but he could not agree with the opinion of the member for

Hants that that country could not be defended. He concluded by hoping that the House would enter on the consideration of the matters coming before them, without any reference to old party feelings, and party cries.

Mr. Joly, in the absence of Mr. McGee, rose to defend that gentleman against some remarks of Mr. Mackenzie ridiculing his attempts to suppress Fenianism in Montreal. Referring to Confederation, he (Mr. Joly) said he could not speak of that scheme with the enthusiasm of some members. He saw many dark clouds ahead and thought it would have the effect of sweeping away French nationality in this country.

Mr. Mackenzie said that the honourable gentleman had misunderstood his remarks. He had not accused the member for Montreal West of encouraging Fenianism, but held that he had miserably failed to prove that it existed as an organization, as he promised he would.

Mr. McKeagnie complained of the influences used at the last election to carry the election—the antis were termed rebels and annexationists. In the name of the people he represented, he protested in strong terms against the mode in which Confederation was carried. Whether the Act was good or bad it mattered not; it was a radical charge and the people had the right to be consulted. If the Imperial Government had said that the measure was a necessity and they must accept it, he could understand it; but when they pretended to have acted in accordance with the wishes of the people of Nova Scotia it was an utter mockery. But the question now is, how shall we redress the grievance—shall we repeal it? Yes, he would say repeal it, but not immediately. In deference to the Imperial Parliament and a large number of people in Nova Scotia, he was willing to wait awhile and see what the fruits of Confederation would be. (Hear, hear.) But he was not for peace. He would only prolong the battle—if Confederation turned out to be an injury to his Province, he wanted the way left open for withdrawal from the Union.

Mr. Bodwell heartily sympathized with the congratulations addressed by his Excellency

to this House and country on the consummation of the Confederation scheme; which he had strenuously supported because it promised, to his mind, the consolidation of British power on this continent, and many substantial benefits to the people of British America, as well as a remedy for many sectional evils and difficulties under which we had laboured for a number of years past. He could not, however, say that he regarded our new constitution as faultless. He regretted that it brought us back to a nominated Upper House. He regretted, also, that it had not been submitted to the people before its adoption. He congratulated the House on the great ability in debate shown by the gentlemen who had not formerly had seats in the Legislature, and who now came as representatives. At the same time he regretted the attitude the Nova Scotia members had assumed with reference to this measure of Confederation. In narrating the wrongs, which, from their point of view had been done to Nova Scotia, he thought that they had rather overdrawn the picture. The people of Ontario had rather been disposed to think that the scheme on the contrary gave undue advantages to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. They had accepted it however in spite of this on account of its manifold advantages to the whole Confederation. It was still undoubtedly an experiment, and he hoped that honourable gentlemen from all sections of the Dominion would have sufficient patriotism to give it a fair and impartial trial. Mr. Bodwell proceeded to contend that Nova Scotia, as a member of the Confederation, would not in any way lose its individuality and local self-government, while at the same time it could not fail to reap many benefits from its connection with the rich and fertile provinces in its rear. He admitted, however, that if the Nova Scotians were determined to fight it out to the bitter end in order to get out of the Union—if they were resolved so long as they were in it, to make the Union a source of weakness instead of strength, he for one would say, let them go in peace. He then proceeded to refer to some of the topics embraced in his Excellency's speech. He said that by assimilating the postal laws Government would reduce the rate of postage on letters, and abolish all postage on newspapers throughout the Dominion. Western territorial extension was a subject deserving of the most earnest attention. It was of great importance that the fertile lands in the West should be rescued from the hands of the grasping monopoly which had long endeavoured to

[Mr. Bodwell (Oxford South)]

conceal their value, and to throw it open to settlement and colonisation. But under present circumstances, and while our future was in some measure unsettled on account of the attitude of Nova Scotia, it was a question in his mind whether Government would be justified in making any great present outlay for opening up that country. As regarded the defences of the country the opposition would heartily join in the adoption of any well considered scheme. He indignantly repudiated the implication which for electioneering purposes had been raised by gentlemen opposite on the loyalty of the opposition by the declaration that Fenians and Annexationists were found in their ranks. He claimed for Her Majesty's opposition in this House that they were just as loyal as the gentlemen who sat on the Treasury Benches, and he claimed for the people of Canada generally of all shades of political opinion that as regarded loyalty they were unsurpassed in feeling by any portion of the British Empire. But while admitting that means should be taken to put the country in a position to defend herself against aggression, he hoped the ministry did not contemplate a measure which would exhaust all the resources of the country in order to maintain a standing army. He hoped Ministers would not forget that we were not yet a great nation—that we were a people of only four millions, and that we had not the resources possessed by great countries for establishing a complete system of defence. He had no fears of American aggression and hoped it would ever be our policy to cultivate friendly relations with the American people. He regretted that so far as appeared from the speech no measures had been taken by Ministers with the view of securing reciprocity of trade with the United States. The abrogation of reciprocity had not produced the injury some had anticipated, but no one could doubt that great advantage would accrue to this country from correct trade relations with the United States. He believed that overtures made to the American Government by the late Minister of Finance never would have received the sanction of the people of Canada or this House. Such a thing as legislative reciprocity was not what we required. What was required was such arrangements as would give stability in the interests of commerce. He then proceeded to advert to some observations which fell from the member for West Toronto last night. When that gentleman said that his party—the party which he declared had swept Ontario—were prepared to give the administration a fair and impar-

tial trial, he presumed that trial meant a servile following of the learned Knight at the head of the Government, so long as he continued to distribute the patronage in a judicious manner among the members of that honourable gentleman's party. As regarded the present Government, while a party man and opposed to Coalition, he (Mr. Bodwell) was not prepared to say he would not accept good measures at the hands of the present Administration. He reminded the Minister of Public Works of his declaration in Lanark, during the elections, that on the assembling of the House, if the Reform members desired he should leave the Administration, he would do so, and return to the Reform ranks. He (Mr. Bodwell) believed it would be for the interests of the country if the honourable gentleman now fulfilled the pledge, for he believed any Coalition Government for the ordinary administration of affairs must necessarily be a corrupt and extravagant government.

Mr. Carmichael (Pictou) explained the manner in which the election in his county had been carried. He objected to Nova Scotia occupying a position of inferiority and existing by sufferance.

Mr. Oliver heartily concurred in the congratulations offered to His Excellency on the consummation of the Confederation scheme. He felt grieved that the gentlemen from Nova Scotia had not come with the resolve to join the other members of this House in making our new constitution a great success. He could not help sympathizing with them in consequence of the mode and manner in which the scheme had been carried in opposition to the will of the people. He hoped, however, that they would allow the constitution to be judged by its fruits, and if those fruits were unpalatable to them, he, for one, would not oppose dissolution of the Union, so far as they were concerned. Mr. Oliver then proceeded to show, at some length, that in the arrangement of the details as to the debts of the several Provinces, and the subsidies to be paid them, Nova Scotia received justice—and more than that, as compared with the other Provinces. He pointed out that they received the benefit of the Government buildings and other important works which had been paid for, without being required to contribute an equivalent. There was one thing, however, which Nova Scotians dreaded in joining this Union—which he was free to confess he dreaded also. This was the raising of the tariff. He thought it would be for the

interest of the Dominion that the tariff, instead of being raised should be reduced so as to approximate to that heretofore prevailing in the Maritime Provinces. He thought that the true principle to regulate our commercial transactions with all other countries would be perfect freedom. He dissented from the opinion of the member for Hants, that we were not in a position to defend ourselves. He believed that backed by the whole strength of the Mother Country, we need not fear an aggressive movement from any quarter whatever. In illustration of that point he read an extract from a speech of the Hon. Mr. Brown, and remarked that the member for West Toronto in his speech last night had availed himself of these figures without acknowledging the source whence he derived them. Mr. Oliver adverted to a statement made by the Minister of Finance that Ministers had carried the elections in the Province of Ontario because the people of that Province sanctioned the policy of the late Ministry, and especially their banking policy. Such was not the fact. The people were asked, during the elections, to forget the past history of these men, and to give the Ministry a fair chance in working out Confederation. As regarded the currency scheme, he had himself voted for it, but did so because the assurance was held out to the House that if sufficient money could be raised by the sale of Provincial debentures, the currency scheme would not be put in operation. He asserted that faith had not been kept with the country in this matter—that if 7 per cent. debentures had been put on the market in a proper manner, they would have been readily taken, but that the scheme of selling debentures was so managed as to secure its failure. The late Finance Minister said that the Commercial Bank did not fall in consequence of the contraction of the currency. In opposition to that statement, he (Mr. Oliver) contended that the effect of the scheme was to produce generally the impression that when the Bank of Montreal had received such superior advantages, no currency was safe, and the want of confidence thus produced gave rise to the run upon the Commercial Bank, and its suspension. As regarded the alleged approval by the people of the banking policy of the Government, he ventured to say if the election had taken place after the failure of the Commercial Bank, not one in five of the gentlemen opposite from Ontario, supporting the Administration, would have found a seat in the House. Mr. Oliver proceeded to advert to the real cause which he conceived had given

the Administration a victory in Ontario. One of those was the disposition on the part of the people that those who had taken part in maturing the Confederation scheme should have an opportunity of carrying it into practical operation. Another reason was to be found in the unscrupulous tactics of members of the Dominion Local Governments in their visits to various constituencies. Another, was the influence of the Grand Trunk, and in this connection he warned the members of the Maritime Provinces of the pernicious results which would be experienced if the Grand Trunk were allowed to get hold of the Intercolonial Railway as they had of the Buffalo and Lake Huron. A fourth reason was the free use of money. He could not concur in the invitation given by the member for South Oxford (Mr. Bodwell) to the Minister of Public Works to take his seat on the opposition side of the House. He thought that from the action of that gentleman during the last election he was not entitled to act on that side. When they found him travelling from one end of Canada to the other to defeat reformers, and going all the way from the seat of Government to Toronto to vote for a Conservative against a Liberal candidate he did not think he was entitled to be recognized as a Reformer. Mr. Oliver then adverted to the constitution of the Senate, regretting the adoption of the nominating principle. Its first results were very unfortunate in filling the chair of the Senate with a gentleman from this House who was distasteful to the members of that body, and in the fact that the people of Nova Scotia had not now in the Upper House a single representative of their views as expressed during the recent election. He trusted that part of the constitution would be amended. Having expressed his desire that the gentlemen from Nova Scotia would join in working out the constitution so as to make it productive of blessings to the people in all parts of the Dominion, Mr. Oliver resumed his seat amid cheers.

AFTER RECESS

The Speaker took the chair at eight o'clock.

Mr. McGee—Mr. Speaker: Although we all must feel the inconvenience of a prolonged discussion on the Address, I trust the House will grant me its kind indulgence in rising to offer such remarks as have suggested themselves to my mind during the course of this interesting and important discussion. (Hear.) In doing so, sir, I make my obeisance to the eminent position you occupy, and to its pres-

[Mr. Oliver (Oxford North)]

ent possessor; a most grateful duty to any one who has had the privilege of the previous acquaintance of Mr. Speaker, and a duty which will be grateful hereafter to every member of this House who himself had formerly that privilege. This Parliament, Sir, over which you have been chosen with unanimity to preside, meets here in what was called the other night "the backwoods of Canada," under singular, but in the main, what I cannot but think, fortunate auspices. Contrary to foolish rumours which had been let loose by their foolish authors, no member for the new Dominion is absent from his seat; we meet with full benches, and with an Executive strong enough in experience and in following, to give a salutary certainty to the financial and other measures that may propose to this House. (Hear.) We meet in the Capital of the Sovereign's choice in obedience to the Sovereign's summons; and I trust, and believe, we are all here to make the best of that Constitution, which our own work has received that Sovereign's cordial approbation. (Cheers). This Capital, it is true, is very near the backwoods; it is rather the ground-plan of a great city, than what one usually conceives a great capital city, ought to be; but if the foreshowings of the speech from the Throne, should come to pass, and our new nationality be extended, "from the Atlantic to the Pacific,"—and from the Atlantic to Lake Superior is a long stride in that direction, —(Hear, hear), Ottawa will be found central enough and convenient enough for the transaction of the public business of the entire Dominion. Mr. Speaker, so soon as we were assembled under this roof we had the speech from the Throne, now under consideration; but there was another occasion, on which another speech from the Throne, might have been addressed if not to us to those who sent us here; a speech which might have been made when Her Majesty gave her assent to this Act; which history will not fail to make as addressed by England to us in this passing year of 1867, and in terms such as I will venture to find expression for, as best I can. Her Majesty might have said on the occasion to which I refer,

Gentlemen of the four United Provinces, I transfer to your charge and keeping, all those parts of North America which remained faithful to the King, my grand-father, after the secession of our other American possessions. I transfer to your charge and keeping, a vast territory which the Kings my predecessors have clung to with a determined resolution for three centuries; for the possession of which we seven times went to war with powerful rivals; which cost us to retain and defend, many thousands of lives and many millions of treasure: This territory so eagerly explored, so

ardently coveted, so bravely contested with gallant competitors; I now, in the name of my people and by the advice of my Imperial Parliament, transfer to you and yours, to have and to hold, to make or mar—to build up or to break down.

(Loud cheers.) Her Majesty might have so spoken on the passage of the Union Act,—and if deeds were as vocal as words, (which they often are to those who understand their dialect,) such a speech has actually been delivered to us, by the head of the Empire, and it is to take that speech, as well as this into consideration we are assembled here. (cheers.) Sir, this is not the continuation of any former legislature; nor are we here, least of all, as one Province men; we are here, if in good faith, as members of one Dominion, Puissance, of “new nationality” so constituted by a deliberate and well considered Act of the Sovereign, to begin a new set of journals, which we all trust may become the precious records of a great, free people. (Cheers.) I regretted much to hear my honourable friend from Hants, for so (notwithstanding certain hard sayings during his late hustings’s campaign, I presume to call him); I regretted much to hear him so repeatedly use the terms, whenever he spoke, “your country” and “my country.” This Act by virtue of which we were summoned here, in the Queen’s name, constitutes us, so far as a Constitutional Act can, one country; we are all here, every man of us, if in bona fides, which I do not doubt, to legislate for the four Provinces (and all British America, ultimately) as one country; and the hour that we passed that bar, to take the oath of Membership in the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, we assumed the character of fellow-countrymen even more bindingly, than we had it before. The honourable member and those who may agree with him, have already made their election in coming here; they have already acknowledged the Union, and sealed their acceptance of it with a most solemn oath; they cannot, therefore, be in the Union and out of it, at one and the same time; and my respectful suggestion to the gentlemen of that opinion is, that they should give it the adhesion which they have given, cheerfully, and gracefully as the honourable members from Westmoreland and Guysborough did when they spoke, and so let us proceed, to hold common council for a common country. (Cheers.) This Act says: “Canada shall be divided into four Provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.” I sincerely trust the honourable members have no insurmountable prejudice against accepting the common name of

Canada and Canadian. (Hear, hear.). If British America could have been condensed into one word; if it were equally indigenous, euphonious, and applicable, to all sections of our population, many would have preferred it; if the title of Nova Scotia could have been with propriety extended westward, I for my part, should have cheerfully accepted it, for I have a strong historical and personal feeling of attachment, for old Scotia and new Scotia. But of the names from which we were free to choose, there was none so indigenous, so euphonious, and so applicable, and without disrespect to the other Provinces, there was none so illustrious as Canada. (Cheers.) For three centuries—whether under French or English domination—the valley of the St. Lawrence has been the stage of great men, and the theatre of great actions; Canada is a name familiar to all educated people in England, France, and America, (cheers); and if as Lord Bacon said, in recommending the adoption of the name of Britain, in the reign of James I, a name has “much impression and enchantment in it,” I believe we have chosen the best one which was left to us, and one which we may hope, all our descendants, if not ourselves, will be proud to bear, to defend, and to illustrate. (Cheers.) Mr. Speaker, the Union is established, and we are here, or ought to be, all of us, as Unionists; and I quite agree with the honourable member for Cumberland (Dr. Tupper), that it would be much to be deplored, both here and at home, and beyond our limits, if the impression was allowed to go abroad, from this House especially, that our Act of Union was carried by means of intrigue, corruption and coercion. No such stain must be allowed to rest upon the fair repute of this great transaction; no such false version of the facts must be allowed to go uncontradicted into general and permanent circulation; and I stand here prepared to maintain the allegations in the Address, that not only as to its substance, but as to the mode of its preparation and passage into law this British America Act, is a glorious and most timely charter, for which we have all cause to be thankful. (Cheers.) As one of the least of its promoters, cognizant, I believe, of every step of its progress, from the first rude sketch scarce half designed at Charlottetown, in September, '64, to the finished piece of legislation, completed at Westminster, in '67, as we now have it here; I stand up to maintain, that all its provisions were honestly meant and fairly meant towards every Province; I stand here to maintain that three years discussion in this busy age was not an insuffi-

cient time for the consideration even of so important a measure (Cheers); and I deny that in any degree, our Union owes its establishment, to intrigue or corruption, or coercion. (Cheers.) This, sir, seems now, necessary to be done before this debate closes because not confining himself to personal vindication, the honourable member opposite (Mr. Howe) has endeavoured even here to discredit and dishonour the men and the means by which this Union was carried, and his efforts in that direction are put very adroitly on the American market. Here Mr. McGee read an extract from the *New York Herald* of Saturday as to Mr. Howe's speech. I purposely refrain from all criticism on the honourable member's personal vindication. If he says now he did not mean what he said at Halifax in '64, after the Charlottetown Conference was called, or at Port Robinson in '62 when I stood by his side, what we all thought he then meant, what was corrected for the press by a hand which he only could control, and what he received without explanation, our congratulations on having said, I can only observe that I regret it; I deeply regret it. (Hear, hear.)

Who would not grieve if such a one there be
Who would not blush if Atticus, were he?

But when the honourable gentleman goes farther than personal vindication—when he attempts to lay rude hands on this work of so many able and patriotic men, steadily prosecuted through several years, when he ventures to asperse the motives of our colleagues in this work and discredit the work itself—it is necessary that some Unionist, who knows all the facts, should rise before the close of this debate, to vindicate both the work and the workmen. (Cheers.) It will be remembered by all who hear me that the growth of this design in Canada was gradual and continuous. In '53 Sir Edmund Head, had promised in his speech, at the close of the Session to move the Imperial authorities. The same year, the honourable Minister of Militia, the honourable member for Sherbrooke, and the Hon. Mr. Ross, then in England, did actually so bring it; in 1859, the Canada Reform Convention declared in general terms, for the Federal principle; as a meeting of the Lower Canada Opposition, with which I at that time acted, also did, about the same period. In the other Provinces, especially in Nova Scotia, the movement was simultaneous with our own. In '61 the honourable member for Hants, (Mr. Howe) moved and the Legislature of Nova Scotia carried unanimously, the Union resolution read for us the other

[Mr. McGee (Montreal West)]

night, by the honourable member behind me, (Dr. Tupper.) I well remember in 1862 when the honourable member with one, who, I much regret for the sake of this House, is not now with us, (Mr. Archibald), the honourable minister near me (Mr. Tilley,) and other gentlemen from New Brunswick came to Quebec in relation to the Intercolonial Railroad, how much they regretted with me, that the then Government of Canada proper, headed by the honourable member for Cornwall, could not be induced to take up the question of Union. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The honourable member said the other evening that he brought in his Union resolution to satisfy my esteemed friend, Mr. John Tobin, the former member for Halifax city; if so I am happy to know that Mr. Tobin had so much and such a salutary influence upon the honourable member; but he was not—I refer only to what I am personally a witness of—quite correct, as to what took place in consequence at Quebec. So far from "laughing over it for an hour," the joint meeting of ministers over which I had the honour to preside, listened for nearly that space to an ardent appeal from the honourable member to take up the Union question conjointly with the railroad, and when we who agreed with him found ourselves a minority, we consoled ourselves with the reflection, that the road would render the Union, bye and bye a necessity. (Loud cheers.) I mention these facts to show, that whoever else was taken by surprise by the design of a Canadian Union, the honourable member for Hants certainly was not, but though men may halt, or may drop off, events will not stand still; and accordingly in '64, we found that unexpectedly the prospects of Union, both east and west, had suddenly brightened up. Between March '62 and June '64, we had three unsuccessful Canadian administrations, a state of things which every one saw could not continue in this country. This led to Mr. Brown's Constitutional committee in the Session of '64, which proved rather a fiasco except that the Federal principle found increase of favour on both sides of the House; and this again led to the Canadian Coalition of the same summer, brought on in the first place by the disinterested interposition of the honourable members for Lanark and Compton, (Mr. Morris and Mr. Pope) and sanctioned by the honourable member for Cornwall, and the formal vote of the Opposition of that day. It has been urged against this Union as a corrupt taint in its very conception, that it was brought about so as to settle a chronic constitutional quarrel, between Upper and Lower

Canada; sir, I admit that was one reason for the Union, and a very good and excellent reason it was; but there were other motives and influences, (foreign and domestic) at work, to the same good purpose, which may not be so patent to the popular recollection. It is astonishing how apt we are to lose sight of the influence of events in which we have not been ourselves personally concerned, and I need not take a better illustration of this fact than by asking the members of this House—all of whom must well remember the date—to carry back their thoughts to the bombardment of Fort Sumter, on the 12th of April, 1861, just five weeks after the installation of President Lincoln, at Washington. Eight years have not yet passed, and who but the actors personally engaged can now recall the successive steps by which secession rose into civil war, and civil war into an American revolution, both in a military and constitutional sense of the word revolution? Who remembers the particulars of the secession of South Carolina, of Major Anderson's first movement, or General Beauregard's first order to fire on the flag of the Union? I recollect, sir, saying at the time, in a debate on our constitutional difficulties in 1861, when we sat in Quebec, that that first shot fired at Sumter "had a message for us"—Canadians; and that that message was "to sleep no more, except upon our arms." (Hear, hear.) But if my words were then considered, as they may have been, mystical, or at least premature, they were found to have a meaning before the end that same year, when in the month of December, Captain Wilkes seized Messrs. Mason and Slidell, in the Bahama channel; when the United States Government incarcerated them in Fort Warren and the British government demanded their release. (Hear, hear.) Not only at the time of the Trent affair, but at every subsequent period of the four years' civil war, American events deeply impressed themselves on every Canadian capable of observation or reflection. We saw in those four years the improvisation of a Northern Army of 800,000 men, and a navy carrying 4,900 great guns. In the miserable affair of St. Albans; in placing armed vessels on the lakes, contrary to the treaty of 1818; in the Fenian raids; in the introduction of a vexatious system of passports; in the refusal to renew the Reciprocity Treaty, we were taught at every step how powerless we were under the old state of things; we were taught that the days of the colonial comedy of Government were over and gone, and that politics has become stern, and almost tragic for the New World. (Cheers.) We needed not

the lesson taught with such personal directness in the detestable assassination of Mr. Lincoln, and the equally atrocious murder of more recent date, when the gallant Emperor of Mexico was done to death at Querataro (hear). I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, to discern more clearly than others the signs of the times on this side of the Atlantic, but I should consider it an insult to the intelligence of any member of this House, to undertake to show him how this revolution in the whole affected and continues to affect, these Provinces, and to render more and more necessary for them, a common Government, and a common policy (hear, hear.) The statesmen of England, accustomed to deal with affairs, far and near, were quick to learn the lessons of the civil war, and long before Lee had surrendered, Great Britain began to shape her new policy toward the United States. Sir, that new policy included the concentration of the forces and means of these Provinces, under one General Government, if the British connection was to be maintained; everyone knows that such was the condition of the connection; and, whoever values the connection, will not disparage the condition, (hear, hear.) So much, Mr. Speaker, as to the antecedents of the projected Union up to '64, and the coincident American Events, which seemed to many observers in England and the Provinces, to demand all possible expedition in its prosecution. The Quebec Conference I have already mentioned, but perhaps I may be permitted to refer again to the 33 gentlemen who came together there, to frame the outlines of this measure. I will not compare them with other assemblies held in other times and countries for similar purposes; but I will say this, for that assembly, that a more anxious and laborious body, never met to deliberate on the fate of their fellow countrymen. (Cheers). My honourable friend (Dr. Tupper) and my other honourable friend (Mr. Tilley,) were accused, I believe, of sacrificing their respective Provinces to the deep seated machinations of the so-called "Canadian party"; but, whoever had seen those gentlemen and their colleagues, in that conference, must have at all events, borne testimony to their zeal, for their own constituents (hear, hear.) Sir, I cannot recall the recollection of that assembly, now that its work is so far done, without reference to one bright and venerable name—that of the President of our body—Sir Etienne Taché, (hear, hear.) Those who remember that gallant old French Canadian gentleman, need not be reminded how far he was above lending his unsullied name to any miserable intrigue or corrupt

bargain, (hear, hear.) His sense of duty was that of a soldier of the Spartan stamp; and there is reason to fear that he may have hastened on his last illness, by this devotion to the cause of Union. (Hear, hear.) Even in death it seemed as if his high character served to promote the same good work; and I could not but think as I saw his colleagues—Protestant and Catholic—the Hon. Mr. Brown included, sitting in the sanctuary, at the Requiem Mass, and standing beside his grave in the quiet churchyard of St. Thomas, that the example of so honourable a leader, would not be without imitators among them. (Loud cheers.) Sir, it was a very proper proceeding of the last Parliament of the former Province of Canada to order a testimonial to the memory of Sir Etienne Taché to be placed in the House he led during the Confederation debates of 1865; and I feel that we could none of us wish our new Union better, than that it may have hereafter,—as I trust it will have,—many statesmen, entitled to find their effigies ranked by his side. (Hear, hear.) The President of the Quebec Conference is no longer able to defend himself or his colleagues in that Assembly, but the great majority of those who were members of it, are still here, or in the other House. If there was a corrupt intrigue, we are here to answer for it: we are here ready and willing to be tried by our peers, and for one, and for all, I challenge those who have accused us so loudly behind our backs, before audiences where we could not be heard in our own defence; who sit here not on seats alone, but on a three legged lie; I dare those bold accusers of absent men, to stand up now; here; in this debate; and to make good their charges of corruption against the authors of this Union, in any one of those Provinces. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Speaker, this challenge will not be accepted; it cannot be answered (cheers); let then, the vile calumnies of the canvass perish and be forgotten with the canvass; and let the retribution which is spared to the calumniators, be a warning to all those who come after them, that detraction at ever so great a distance, is an unsafe as well as an unworthy weapon of political warfare. (Hear, hear.) The honourable member for Hants has spoken in laudatory terms of the public spirit of those who aided him, in his abortive attempts to defeat this Union. Sir, I am quite willing that the public conduct of the friends and foes of Union, in all the Provinces, should be contrasted, as often and as openly as possible: whether greater moral courage was shown in swimming with the current of local prejudices, or against it in the Maritime Provinces

[Mr. McGee (Montreal West)]

every man can judge; and I will say for my part, that to the fortitude, the energy and the determination of the Maritime Unionists, led by my honourable friends near me (Messrs. Tilley, and Tupper), not forgetting the gallant and faithful few of Prince Edward Island, the whole Dominion owes a debt of gratitude, which I trust will be repaid, with interest. (Applause.) Whenever such a Unionist presents himself in public or in private life, throughout this wide Dominion let his very presence bring a welcome with it, and let his name be a title of honour for us and for our children. (Hear, hear.) I do not blame all those who were not original Unionists; I do not blame the many wise and good men, who could not, or who cannot yet see, this cause as we see it; but I do blame those who had recourse to prejudices, old and new, to combat a project they could not argue down; whose trust was in the mistrustfulness of poor human nature, and in its proneness to harbour evil suspicions of others. I do blame them that the intentions of the friends of Union, which were noble and upright, were so grossly misrepresented, and that this battle of great principles was, by its adversaries adjourned from the high ground to the low—was drawn off into a slough of personality, where the combatant who could throw most direct, was most at home. Among the other prejudices appealed to, in the canvass against the Union, was the frequent reference to the case of the Legislative Union, of Great Britain and Ireland, which was impudently assumed to be a case in point. This seems to have been considered a most crushing reproach as addressed to myself, and I am told great use was made of it, on both sides the Bay of Fundy, and that it had some effect with Irish electors in several constituencies. (Hear.) I am ashamed, sir, to have to bring before the House so false, and so unworthy a means of misleading the ill-informed as this was, and to charge its authorship as I must, on gentlemen, who ought to know better. The Irish Legislative Union, sir, has not one circumstance, either in its inception or completion, in common with our Federal Union. In Ireland there was an ancient Royalty, first invaded in hostile array by King Henry I, but really united, by election of its own chiefs to the Crown of England in the time of Henry VIII, (in the year 1541); an ancient historical Kingdom retaining after the annexation of the two Crowns its own Legislature, acting absolutely for that Kingdom, conjointly with its own Crown, in peace and in war; voting its supplies to the King of Ireland for the army and navy and civil service of Ireland;

choosing a Regent on its own terms, (as in 1788); a Crown co-ordinate with the Crown of Britain; a Sovereign Legislature, within its own domains, not derived from the Legislature of England, as had been solemnly asserted and admitted, in 1641, 1689, and 1782; this was the description of nationality which was extinguished in 1800, while the people of Ireland groaned under martial law, and meetings of electors were dispersed at the point of the bayonet, and yet presuming on the credulity or preoccupation of their auditors, this is the historical parallel which intelligent men—members of this House I am ashamed to say—did not hesitate to parade as an awful warning, and a case in point at the hustings in the Maritime constituencies. (cheers.) Sir, some months ago, a truly great man, on his election as Lord Rector of the University of Edinburgh in speaking of the abuses of high intelligence, was driven to ask, could there be a sadder spectacle, than “an eloquent man, speaking that which was untrue?” (Cheers.) I turn to the gentlemen who were guilty of misleading their Irish friends into hostility to this Federal Union, by false and forced parallels with the Irish Legislative Union, and I ask them in all earnestness for what purpose do they suppose did the Giver of all good gifts endow you with superior intelligence—above that of the mass of men? On what tenure do you hold those powers of expression and persuasion by voice and pen? What are the obligations of the intelligent to the unintelligent, among countrymen and fellow-citizens? Is it to trade on their prejudices, or to withstand them? Is it to foster ancient animosities and antipathies, or to abate and restrain them? Is it to tell the truth, or to pass off falsehoods for truth? (Cheers.) There can be but one answer to these questions, and I commend that answer to the authors of the unfounded parallels between the Irish Union and our Union (Cheers.) For the friends of the measure, I defy any one to show that we ever resorted to such unworthy appeals to sectional prejudices, either in the protracted debates at Quebec in 1865; or during the two elections in New Brunswick; or in Nova Scotia (hear, hear.) It is true it has been alleged elsewhere that we made use of the Fenian organization in the United States, to subserve the Union cause: it was even alleged directly, at one time, that I was instrumental in promoting the Fenian raid against Campobello, as an electioneering auxiliary to our friends in New Brunswick. If this was meant as a jest, it was a poor one; if it was seriously meant, it was a pitiful invention, of which its authors ought

to be ashamed. These were some of the prejudices against which our friends on the Atlantic had to contend; in the Province of Quebec there were not wanting sectional cries, and appeals to prejudices of creed and origin; but my honourable friend the Minister of Militia, with the moral courage which distinguishes him withstood those cries, and aided by the leading men of the British minority, he triumphed over them. In Ontario an able agitator, of whom I shall say no more in his absence than that, as I never shrunk from encountering his prejudices either as a friend or foe, neither do I exult in his defeat though much deserved, but this able man also attempted to create a sectional party—to revive rather the old and obsolete parties in his own province—and he met with his deserts. The learned gentleman at the head of the government, (Sir John A. McDonald,) met Mr. Brown and his friends on the sectional issue in Ontario, and gave them a tolerably complete overthrow. (Applause.) In this way we faced and fought every prejudice in every Province; in all but one we succeeded, and I do not at all despair, that if this Government does its duty firmly and fairly by all the Provinces, but that we shall have from that one, as the honourable Member for Guysborough, (Mr. S. Campbell,) last night assured us, a full and fair trial. (Hear, hear.) So far I have endeavoured to show that the steps taken to carry this measure were circumspectly, and constitutionally, and fairly taken; I now come to the internal merits of the Act itself; but before I proceed to that part, I must say a few words as to the circumstances immediately attending its passage through the Imperial Parliament. Sir, while I join him in that expression of very natural regret I must observe, that there was no want of interest or discussion in England generally. All the reviews, the magazines, the leading journals, were full of British American Union. The honourable member himself had plied the press vigorously while in London, and had elicited very able replies, from other Nova Scotians, also, fortunately, there at the same time; but it was quite evident to the members of the Imperial Parliament that the adoption of this measure was a foregone conclusion, and they are not apt in England, to debate matters already decided. Every statesman of every party saw the necessity for its passage; it was the measure of two administrations, and fortunately could not be made by any side a party question. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Cardwell, were as anxious for it, as Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Disraeli; one of the best speeches made in its

behalf was by the veteran Whig leader, Earl Russell, though it was brought in by a Conservative administration. These circumstances go far to explain the absence of any elaborate parliamentary criticism of the Bill; and besides, it was somewhat becalmed, by getting under the lee of the great domestic question of the day—the Reform Bill. Although, therefore, the Act was passed without an exciting debate, it certainly was not passed, either in ignorance or indifference, to the present, or future, of these Provinces. Before passing from this point, I hope I may be permitted to render what is due to the two statesmen—the then Colonial Minister, and his predecessor in that office—(Mr. Cardwell and Lord Carnarvon), to whom our delegates when in England were so largely indebted. It was my good fortune though detained behind my colleagues to reach London, as a Delegate, before the introduction of the Bill in the House of Lords, and to have listened to the very full, and clear and convincing statement of Lord Carnarvon. That speech will remain a convincing testimony of his Lordship's great abilities, and his great interest in our future: and perhaps the House will permit me as illustrative of its whole spirit, to read them one passage which occurs towards the close of that speech—

But if the advantages of Union are great in a military, a commercial, a material point of view, they are not, I think, less in the moral and political aspect of the question. When once existing restrictions are removed, and the schools, the law courts, the professions, the industries of these Provinces are thrown open from one end to another, depend upon it a stimulus greater than any that has ever been before in British North America will be applied to every form of mental or moral energy. Nor will it be the main body of the people that will alone feel this. The tone of Parliament, the standard of the Government, will necessarily rise. Colonial institutions are framed upon the model of England. But English institutions, as we all know, need to be of a certain size. Public opinion is the basis of Parliamentary life; and the first condition of public opinion is that it should move in no contracted circle. It would not be difficult to show that almost in proportion to its narrowness Colonial Governments have been subject to disturbing influences. But now, independently of the fact that in these confederated Provinces there will henceforth be a larger material whence an adequate supply of colonial administrations and colonial oppositions can be drawn, it is not, I think, unreasonable to hope that, just as the sphere of action is enlarged, the vestry element will be discarded, large questions will be discussed with the gravity which belongs to them, men will rise to a full sense of their position as members of a great Parliament, and will transmit their own sense of increased responsibility and self-respect through Parliament and the Government to the main body of the people.

[Mr. McGee (Montreal West)]

As to the measure itself I am not going to inflict on the House, an analysis of its 147 clauses; but there are some principal provisions of it, to which I must refer, in justice to the subject itself: such as the guarantee of the educational rights of the minority, in the 93rd clause; and the several clauses which define the Constitution of this House; of the Honourable Senate; of the Judiciary; and the clauses affirming the Sovereignty of Her Majesty and her successors, over British America. So far as I know this is the first Constitution ever given to a mixed people, in which the conscientious rights of the minority, are made a subject of formal guarantee. I shall never cease to remember with pleasure that I was the first proposer of that guarantee in the Quebec Conference; a guarantee by which we have carried the principle of equal and reciprocal toleration a step farther in Canada, than it has yet been carried, in any other free government—American or European. (Hear, hear.) I have no desire to go into the vast question of education at this moment; it is a question on which all men feel free to speak, rather than bound to think; but I hail this 93rd Clause of our Union, as the Magna Charta of the youthhood of this Dominion; as a solemn guarantee that no Christian parent shall ever be obliged in any part of British America to succumb to the heartless, and soulless, and godless doctrine, that religion and education can be justly divorced in a Christian country. (Applause.) As to the Constitution of the two Houses, under this Act, we have adopted here, what Ontario long ago demanded, and Quebec resolutely resisted—"representation by population." I had always declared that principle a just one, as applied to the popular, or taxing branch of the legislature, but I had always voted against its adoption, "unless as part of a general Constitutional Change." Well, Sir, that change at length arrived; Ontario got what she wanted; and the first use she made of her enlarged representation, I am rejoiced to say was to put down her sectional agitators, and to send here a sound Union majority. It cannot be concealed, however, that 81 members for one Province, out of 181, is a formidable preponderance, and it will be for my honourable friends, the leaders of Ontarian public opinion, on both sides of the House, to see that it does not become a dangerous one. I will not venture to speculate at this moment, on the probabilities of future party combinations; but it is plain to any one, that it is most undesirable for the sake of each Province, and of all, that any one should

come here en masse, as a Province, either in Government, or in Opposition. But, sir, this also I will venture to add, that no one Province politician can ever lead this Dominion Parliament; that the man must be of national dimensions to fill that place, and discharge its duties. So it will be; so it ought to be! (Applause.) As to the life Senate, we have all the best constitutional authorities with us, that a second Chamber ought not to stand on the electoral basis of the first; and, so long as our Senate continues to be a fair representation of all our real interests, so long it will be looked up to, and obeyed. If it is to be undetermined it will be by the abuse of Executive patronage, and not by the substitution of the principle of selection for that of election, as applied to that House, (hear, hear). In maintaining the independence of the judges, and reserving their appointment to the National Government. I also believe this Union Act to be wisely framed; and its establishment a cause of congratulation to all the Provinces. Speaking the other night of its imputed or imagined defects, an honourable member said, "it was only an Act of Parliament!" So I will take leave to remind him are the Bill of Rights, and the Act of Succession both included for us, in this Act; but they are fundamental acts and parts of the British Constitution, and no one as yet has argued that they belong to the same class, as the ordinary Statutes of the realm. They are looked upon, to use Lord Chatham's words, as "the Scriptures of the Constitution;" while other ordinances of Parliament are as the writings of particular commentators, open to revision and correction (hear, hear). But, sir, I will go farther than the fitness of the time, the constitutionality and circumspection of the change, and the excellence of the Act; I affirmed this, that in establishing a second Constitutional Government on this continent, we are rendering an unpurchasable service to the cause of civil and religious liberty everywhere. I say a second Constitutional Government, for I admit that of Washington to be the first, and I suppose we must leave Mexico at present out of the account, not only of constitutional, but of civilized governments. What is it to establish such a second government in America? It is, in my humble opinion, to provide all men with an opportunity of comparison, and a means of choice between two systems—the British representative system of free government, and the American, or Democratic system. It is to give the third generation of the 19th century an opportunity to observe the institutions of our

common ancestors adapted to our Canadian circumstances, side by side with the institutions of Anglo-American invention, in the last years of the last century. It is to put side by side in this new arena, filled with eager spectators, the masterpieces of Alfred and Edward I; of Bacon, Somers, and Chatham, with the masterpieces of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and Marshall; it is to compare an ancient text of freedom, enriched with the commentaries of Hall, Burke, Mansfield, and Mackintosh, with a modern text elucidated by Webster and Storey and Calhoun. They have no cause to be ashamed of their political progenitors, neither have we (hear, hear); and with all possible admiration for the age that produced the American constitution, and the illustrious men who adopted it, I hope we live in a better century than they did (hear, hear). This century, as compared with the 18th may be called a religious century; there is no Bolingbroke possible now "to patronise Providence;" no Voltaire to argue "that Christ was no charmer;" no Lichtenberg to anticipate the day when "the belief in God would be like a nursery tale;" the skeptical method of Descartes is not, thank God, the philosophical gospel of the age. Though the Republican Fathers were many of them sincerely religious men, yet many others, such as Jefferson and Franklin, were professed skeptics; and the philosophy of doubt, breaking off all traditions, and pretending that each man should start afresh on his own consciousness, acknowledging nothing he could not prove, was too congenial to the epoch and its work, not to be acquiesced in by the majority. Rationalism lies at the root of Republicanism; faith and reverence have prepared the deeper and better foundations of our form of Government; and until faith and reverence fail from our hearts, or those of our children, I have no fear that this, our Constitution, will fail. (Applause.) I come now, sir, to refer lastly, to what gives the completion of character to this work, the clause affirming the sovereign rights of Her Majesty and her successors, over British America. These clauses, declaring the Executive power to reside with the Queen, to be exercised by and with the advice of Her Privy Council for Canada; declaring the sovereign to be Commander-in-Chief of all the land and sea forces of this country; declaring the Queen the first estate of this Parliament; all these are merely declaratory clauses, repeating and renewing old maxims and arrangements. What is remarkable, however, is that whereas simi-

lar declaratory clauses are found in the Quebec Act, and the Union Act of 1840, they were both statutes framed in England exclusively, while the clauses, and all the remainder, were drafted and proposed by Colonists only. It is remarkable that a hundred years after the Stamp Act and Tea Tax; ninety years after the Declaration of Independence; nearly half a century after the promulgation of "the Monroe Doctrine"; the representatives of these Provinces should have taken upon themselves, so solemnly to re-assert as fundamental constitutional propositions, the sovereignty of the English Crown, over all our territory. (Applause.) What was done in this way in 1840, and in 1799, was done by others; but these declaratory clauses are our own work. I do not say that we are free to take any other course; I do not pretend that we could have raised, even if we would, the question of Sovereignty, in 1864 or in 1867; I only speak of the cardinal fact as I find it, that we have here, by our own act, selected the monarchical form of Government for ourselves and for our children; that for them and for ourselves, we have entered into this solemn compact to uphold the constitutional monarchy in this country; and that the Queen, and her Imperial Parliament and Government, have, on their part, by the passage of this Bill with these provisions, with equal solemnity, constituted themselves parties to this compact and agreement. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire, sir, to dwell at present, on all the corollaries and consequences likely to flow from this formal and solemn establishment of monarchy on this Continent, by the voluntary act of four millions of its inhabitants, but this is the path which by this Act, we have voluntarily chosen to enter—by this path, if we are not to abandon it, we are to journey on into the future, and whither it leads there we must follow. Sir, for one, I can truly say, that I saw and felt all along the solemnity of the selection we were called upon to make, but I never doubted, no not for one instant, that we had decided well in choosing to affirm so unmistakably as we have done the principles of Constitutional and responsible monarchy, for these Provinces. I am fully aware of the intense propagandist force which resides in the democratic idea. I know there are democratic fanatics who damn all other sects in politics, but their own; but looking back to the venerable centuries of Christian civilization which have preceded us, I am not taught, that it is best for the people, that the headship of the State should be frequently elective. Our Republican

[Mr. McGee (Montreal West)]

neighbours may prefer their own institutions as much as pleases them; but at all events, they must allow us to have a preference also, even though it should not quite coincide with their own. (Hear, hear.) We can honour and reverence their illustrious Martyr President, who fell a victim to his duties; but they must permit us also, to reserve some of our admiration and sympathy, for the Martyr of Queretaro, as well as the Martyr of Mexico: for that gallant gentleman, a true Prince, the worthiest to rule that Mexico had ever seen, but of whom Mexico was not worthy: that cruelly murdered Prince, whose effigy the House of Hapsburg may be proud to raise in long procession of the Illustrious Princes, his ancestors! Sir, I certainly cannot agree with the honourable member (Mr. Howe) that the time or the means chosen, ought to subject us to the displeasure of our Republican neighbours. This Union project is a very old one—as old as the country, and though hastened by recent events among them and among ourselves, it certainly dates long beyond the firing by Beauregard on Fort Sumter. No question of Sovereignty was raised by us; we merely embodied and reaffirmed a power that already existed, and which the Republic always recognized as existing in North America. If we had sought to plant a despotism by their side—without representative institutions—without securing the common rights of free men, sprung from the same source as their own; then, indeed, they might have cause for suspicion and displeasure. As it is I deny that we have given them any such cause, and I submit that such an argument, or assertion ought not to be advanced on the floor of a Canadian Parliament. (Hear, hear.) The honourable member opposite (Mr. Howe) also bestowed a good deal of his ready ridicule on the expression so often used in His Excellency's Speech—of "a new nationality." He was not precise in stating his objections to the use of that expression; but I inferred that he thought it premature as to time, and inconsistent with the continuance of the Imperial connection. He talked of walking upon stilts, and having "the stilts knocked from under us," as if our increased stature as a people in 1867, was a forced and artificial increase. I need not surely remind the honourable member, that in the year 1800 including Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, with the British mainland we were less than 400,000 souls altogether; and when the Sydenham Union was carried, about two millions, while we are now, including the same Provinces, fully 4,000,000. (Hear,

hear.) These living millions are stilts, and we are vain enough to think we can stand on them. In 1790, the United States commenced with a total population of 3,900,000 souls, but they had, it is true, no gigantic native neighbours on their flanks; still they had the power of England on this side, of Spain in the Floridas, and of France in Louisiana. They began modestly and moderately, and they have advanced by degrees, in their "new nationality". I ask the honourable gentleman this question—if he does not look forward to a new nationality here, in these Provinces, to what does he look forward? Surely he must see that a population which increased in sixty years, a hundred fold, cannot be reckoned upon as a stationary quantity? With some nations the best ambition is to keep what they have got; but these are nations of fixed population and full boundaries. Extending as we are in space—increasing in number—improving in intercourse—we cannot stand still politically, even if we tried. (Hear, hear.) But the honourable member and his followers seem to have some confused notion in their heads, that a new nation cannot exist within the Empire, consistently with the Imperial connection. Sir, I don't know where they got such a notion, but it is a very childish one, and contrary to all experience. The Federal principle is precisely adopted to meet a difficulty of that kind, and has for many centuries met it successfully. In the German Empire there never was any difficulty as to the simple existence of separate nationalities and kingdoms; in the Spanish Empire, so long as its sovereigns respected the rights and liberties of the component parts, there was no difficulty of holding together the kingdoms of the Netherlands, of Aragon, and Naples; in the Austrian Empire, when the rights of the ancient kingdom of Hungary were respected the kingdom was in fact, the mainstay of the Empire. In our own day, we have in Hindostan an Empire within an Empire, so constituted expressly on the ground of strengthening the Imperial connection by the wisest statesmen, our contemporaries. So far, therefore, as to that childish and foolish notion of incompatibility. But the honourable member will not allow, that even with our four millions, we have men enough to start in the onerous career of a new nationality. What amount of population does he suppose then to be necessary to such a start? For colonies, as colonies, to get together and keep together, four millions of inhabitants is no small achievement, and if we have not increased more largely by immigration of

late years than we have—if our present population is 80 per cent native born to 20 per cent born abroad—I will tell the honourable member why we have not attracted and retained more people, from the other side of the Atlantic. We have not attracted more people, because we have not made our country attractive; because we are not known as a nation abroad; because these isolated Provinces did not impress the imagination of the emigrating classes. Who in the byeways of Germany, or even of Britain, knew anything of Canada, up to the other day? In those hives of human labour, they knew only one country—America—and one seaport—New York. But once give your Provinces united the aspect of Empire, make them a power and a name, and the reputation and credit of the Dominion will be our best immigration agents abroad. (Hear, hear.) As to our inability to stand alone, with the numbers we have, I beg to observe, sir, that in my opinion, it depends very much on our unanimity or division. No power on earth can take forcible possession of this country, if we are united as one man, in its defence. (Applause.) No population that can be stirred up against us, can put a hostile four millions, face to face with us on our own soil. If every man, woman and child in Canada, is imbued with the spirit which enabled Switzerland to hold her own against the Austrian Empire, and Spain in her decline to cast out Napoleon in his vigour, we will be safe enough, within our rivers and rapids in summer, and our snowed up roads and freezing sktes in winter. (Hear, hear.) We complain sometimes of our rigorous winters, but there is this compensation at least, that no invading force that bivouacked out for one genuine Canadian night, would ever answer to the call of the long roll again. (Hear, hear.) My own views on the subject of defence are pretty well known, and when my honourable friend (Mr. Cartier) brings down his measure, if the House desires to hear them, I shall be happy to meet its wishes: but I will now only say this, that I hope to see the military spirit of our population encouraged in every way; that I hope to see rifle matches and tournaments become as familiar municipal institutions as town meetings, of county agricultural fairs. (Applause.) I cannot, for one, agree that the best way to make ourselves respected abroad, to secure impunity from attack, is to depreciate the sources of our strength; but rather to rely upon and make the most of what Lord Bacon, in his "true greatness of Britain," considers a main element of a nation's strength, "its

breed of men." By the breed of men that bring a nation safely through its destinies, Lord Bacon must have meant—for he did not live to finish out that essay—not only the muscle of the men, their bodily hardihood, but also their morale—their courage, docility, and capacity of combination—the wisdom of the few, to command, and the wisdom of the many, to co-operate I do not disparage the power of numbers; I do not underrate the power of wealth; but above both I place the safety of any State, great or small, in the spirit and unity of its inhabitants. Now, it is in the power of our public men to depress or raise the public spirit; to strengthen or weaken the unity of the Commonwealth; and it is because the election appeals made in Nova Scotia have tended to beggar and belittle our public affairs; to estrange and render suspicious and skeptical the people; it is on these grounds that I think their authors most censurable of all, the many respects in which they are censurable. Those who have taken that line of politics have certainly not helped to elevate the minds of our population, either the constituent many, or the representative few. I need not illustrate this position by reciting instances of the many countries which have been undermined in their courage or character, conquered within before they were conquered without;—to name Greece is enough:

"Enough! no foreign foe could quell
Thy soul, till from itself it fell!
Yes! self-abasement paved the way,
For villain bonds and despot sway!"

The policy of self-abasement I cannot see in the light of policy at all. View it how we may; turn it round and round; hang it in any light you like, it will not wear the linaments of prudence, or fortitude, or patriotism. I trust this first Parliament of the Dominion will stamp its reprobation upon every mention of such a policy; and that while avoiding all bravado on the one hand, as unbecoming men in our position, we will in this place endeavour to elevate, and not to depress, the public spirit of the country (hear, hear). The honourable member (Mr. Howe), said the other night he would not take back anything he had said as to the extent of these Provinces, he leaves us, unabridged, our square miles; and I trust also he will leave us unshaken, what is more essential, the faith of our people in their own future, the faith of every man, Canadian in Canada, and of every Province in its sister Province (hear, hear). This faith wrongs no one; burdens no one; menaces no one; dishonours no one; and as it was said of

[Mr. McGee (Montreal West)]

old, faith moves mountains, so I venture reverently to express my own belief, that if the difficulties of our future as a Dominion, were (which I cannot yet see) as high as the peaks of Etna or Tolima, or Illimani, yet that the pure patriotic faith of an united people would be all sufficient to overcome, and triumph over all such difficulties. The honourable gentleman, after speaking for about two hours and a-half, resumed his seat amid the most enthusiastic plaudits, which lasted for some time.

Mr. Anglin said that the members from his province thought it better under the circumstances to let these resolutions pass without discussion on their part. Had the member for Hants moved the amendment of which he first spoke they might have taken a different course, for they deeply sympathized with the representatives from Nova Scotia. He was even surprised to hear representatives from that Province discuss the details of the scheme as far as they did; for he thought they came here to deny the competency of this tribunal. But although he and his friends had remained quiet, it seemed they must have this New Brunswick question dragged into the House. The member for Montreal West had declared that the scheme was without stain or reproach. If he (Mr. Anglin) must express his opinion he must regard the scheme as the offspring of corruption, coercion, and wrong. (Hear, hear). It was by these means it was carried in his Province, and he was here to justify his words. He proceeded to give a brief outline of the whole transaction in his Province, contending that the scheme was at first surrounded with secrecy. The question had never seriously occupied attention in the Maritime Provinces. He traced various conferences held, alleging that as (Mr. Palmer, one of the delegates, stated) considerable difference of opinion existed at Quebec until one day a piece of paper was quietly passed across the table, after which everything was made pleasant. The Irish people of the Maritime Provinces revolted against the idea of Union. Its terms were kept secret until published by Mr. Palmer, when material differences were found in different versions. The people of New Brunswick were told the scheme was to relieve them of taxation. He only hoped all his opposition on this point would prove to have been groundless. They were told that Canada had no water power, and that their Province would become a great manufacturing centre for the Confederation. He adverted at some length to the pressure from the Colonial Office and

other means which he alleged had been used to carry the scheme, and asked whether these were not of a character to destroy the object they were employed to accomplish. He mentioned the Fenian raid at Campobello, and said it was singular the Government had time to make all the preparations they did, after receiving information before the first Fenian made his appearance. He indignantly denied any sympathy for Fenianism in the Province, it being one of the arguments of the opposition that that movement was employed to further Confederation; that Killian had disappeared just at that time—why and where perhaps Government best knew. He understood that at one time some business relation existed between Killian and Mr. McGee, and some people entertained the possible suspicion that the movement on the New Brunswick frontier was the result of some common purpose of these two men. He (Mr. Anglin) was inclined to believe this, and, at any rate, there was something remarkable in the conduct of these men at that time, described the influences employed to oust the Smith Government—influences which he characterized as discreditable, and supplant it by the Tilley Government, which went to the country on cry of loyalty and managed to make the people believe that in voting for Confederation they voted for Queen and country, while voting opposition they gave countenance to Fenianism and treason. These tactics prevailed in border counties, and counties along the river Saint John; but in the city of Saint John, where the Fenian alarm was not so great, money was unblushingly used to carry elections. As much as \$50,000, he was told, had been spent that canvass. He then alluded to Mr. McGee's charges about Fenianism in Montreal, and branded them as atrocious and disgraceful for any man to make against a large and respectable body of his countrymen. It was disgraceful that the honourable gentleman should cast a burning stigma on the Irishmen of Montreal for the sake of building himself up; and, considering the antecedents of that honourable member, he was the last man who should endeavour to fasten such unfounded charges upon his countrymen. (Hear, hear). He complained that one of the first effects of Confederation in his Province was the commission of an act of proscription, against which he, as a Catholic representative of that Province, was here to utter an earnest and solemn protest. Although the Catholic body of New Brunswick numbered one-third the whole population, not one Catholic Senator had been appointed out of twelve; although,

according to numbers, Catholics would be entitled to four, and at least three. Though for reasons stated he could not join in the congratulations contained in the address; it would be the proudest day of his life, if at some future time he could stand on the platform in his own Province, to which he owed his all, and declare he had been deceived, and that this Confederation had fulfilled the fondest, highest, warmest hopes of those who had advocated it. (Applause).

Hon. Mr. Tilley replied at some length, and commented on the inconsistency of the honourable member, accepting a measure which he charged had been carried by fraud and corruption. He denied there had been any injustice to the Catholics of New Brunswick, and pointed out the fact that his colleague who had run on the same ticket with him (Mr. Tilley) was an Irish Roman Catholic who supported Confederation, and that no Catholic Senator had been selected for Ontario, but no complaint had been urged on that account against the Reform and Conservative parties that had selected them. In New Brunswick they had to take of the twelve ablest men from both sides of the Legislative Council, and it so happened none of them was Catholic. There was, however, he need scarcely say, no intention of injustice to any class of the population. (Hear, hear). He challenged the statements of the honourable member that the elections in New Brunswick had been carried through Fenian excitement, intrigue and deception. He admitted the union party had been routed in 1865, and that it had been materially aided last year by Fenian demonstrations on the frontier; but how did the honourable member opposite explain the elections of a few months ago, when the Province, by an overwhelming majority, reaffirmed its former verdict in favour of Confederation. Those elections proved New Brunswick thoroughly in favour of Union, for twelve Unionists had been returned by large majorities against three who were ready to accept the situation. In regard to another complaint that the Bank of Montreal was drawing gold for the New Brunswick Banks, and thus embarrassing trade at Saint John, he said he was satisfied that this accumulation of specie, if it existed, could be only temporary. One thing was certain—the demands on the Dominion by the local Government of New Brunswick as well as Nova Scotia, thus far largely exceeded the revenue derived from those sources, and he (Mr. Tilley) would be quite willing, if the law

permitted, to hand over the whole revenues of those Provinces for the next two years to the honourable gentlemen opposite, if they would assume the responsibilities of the Dominion in regard to those Provinces under the Confederation Act.

Hon. Mr. Smith deprecated the revival of electioneering contests which had taken place in New Brunswick. He was deeply interested in the country—his all was in it—and he would do his best to carry out the constitution, notwithstanding he believed it had been carried by corruption and fraud. He also gave his version of the manner in which the question had been treated in his Province. The last election was carried by a no-Popery cry raised by the Minister of Customs. The speaker then explained his negotiations with the Lieutenant-Governor in regard to the question of union, which he had contended should be submitted to the people, amid cries of "question."

Hon. Mr. Johnson said in reference to an appeal to the people, that it was a thing unknown in England for a ministry that could carry its measures to dissolve and appeal to the people. If that were to be the system, parliament might just as well be abolished, and every question be decided upon by the people direct. He denied that the last election was carried by the no-Popery cry on the part of the Confederate party; and the cry of Fenianism at a former election, of which complaint had been made, had no part in the last election.

Hon. Mr. McKeagney said:—Late as is the hour, Mr. Speaker, and much as I desire to avoid occupying the time of this House with any remarks of mine on the subject which has already become exhausted, I feel it my duty, nevertheless, in the interest of my constituents, in behalf of the Province of Nova Scotia, to enter my protest, my emphatical protest, against this Confederation scheme, because I think it unjust to Nova Scotia, and more especially do I protest against the manner—the very improper manner—in which it has been consummated. The friends of the measure have time and again attempted to justify the action of the Assembly by the fact, the bald fact, that they had the power to change the constitution. I deny the position in the sense that it can be done with beneficial results or for any practical purpose. Do we not know, sir, that theory and practice are very different things? Supposing, for the sake of argument, that Parliament in the plenitude

of its power does undertake to consummate an Act (a Constitutional Act let it be called) at variance with the wishes of the people, will there be anything gained by such a course? Nothing whatever, and the statesman who pushes his measures in advance of the public sentiment evinces in my opinion neither tact nor judgment, and must soon be borne down by the popular wave. But I deny that anything can be found in Parliamentary history to justify the mode in which Confederation has been accomplished in Nova Scotia. It is true, as a general proposition, that Parliament is supreme, but in the interpretation of this rule we must enquire what are the ordinary functions of the Legislative body; is it not to make and repeal laws for the good of the people whom it represents? Was it ever understood in any way—was there any compact or agreement either express or implied between the people of Nova Scotia and their representatives, that travelling wholly out of and beyond the track heretofore pursued by their predecessors, they were at their mere pleasure to sweep away our Constitution, and hand over our Revenues to Canada, or any other power on earth. The idea is preposterous in the extreme! Have we the example in history of any people being annexed to another without their consent? I can find none, except in the instance of a country conquered by force of arms. The case of the union of Ireland cannot be referred to as a precedent to justify the measure, as that Act has always been justly regarded as a foul blot on the Statute book, and has given rise to discontent and heart-burnings, which break out occasionally like a running sore in the bosom of that unhappy land. Who can predict then what evils may yet grow out of this act of tyranny, perpetrated upon the people of a loyal and prosperous Province? We must also look at the manner of carrying the measure in our Legislature. I make no direct charge against any one, but certainly the complexion of the transaction is more than suspicious. On ordinary occasions of less moment than this, the policy to be pursued has been enunciated in the Governor's Speech. Parliament met, and not a word was said about Confederation. Thus were the people taken wholly by surprise, nor had they the opportunity of remonstrating against the Act until it was pushed through the Legislature. Thus was it conceived in secrecy, carried through the House with indecent haste, and accomplished amid the jeers, taunts, and abuse of the Confederation party, who accused their opponents with disloyalty and annexation proclivities. Is it any wonder

[Mr. Tilley (Saint John City)]

then, that one deep feeling of indignation should pervade the people of Nova Scotia at this gross wrong and injustice? In the name of Nova Scotia then, and more particularly in the name of my own constituents, do I protest against this Act of Union. I regard the means by which it has been brought about as unjust to the people, and the measure itself as unfair in its details, and injurious to their interests. Let us pause here, Mr. Speaker, and survey the position. Confederation, it is true, has become a fact accomplished. It has become the law of the land. What is to be done then to get rid of it? Do I accept the situation? No, most emphatically no; I do not accept the situation. Am I a Repealer it may be asked. I answer yes! I am a Repealer. But how is repeal to be effected? What are the best means to be employed to accomplish this desirable consummation? Now, to accomplish repeal we must enlist on one side the sympathies and legislative action of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain. I do not think, sir, that the opportune moment has arrived for obtaining this cooperation. I think the best way to accomplish repeal is to let the Act of Union prove itself by its fruits. I much fear that this Confederation fruit will be bitter to the taste and unsightly to the eye of Nova Scotia. Well, all the better for our purpose. We will then have a case to present to the Parliament of England, a case which cannot be resisted. We can address the people of England in this language: You forced this Union upon us against our will; in vain have we remonstrated, in vain have we petitioned against its acceptance. You told us it was a good measure; the nobility of England told us so. Many of our people, some of them of unquestionable talent and worth, have also given it as their opinion that Union is good. Well, out of deference to these opinions, we have waited patiently in order to test the truth of these predictions by the working of the system, by the actual logic of events, and behold its fruit, its bitter fruit! I would point to Nova Scotia bleeding and covered with wounds from the practical working of the system;—to her children suffering from depression, in their circumstances; and with boldness and confidence would I then say, Look! see what Confederation has done, in the name of justice, in the name of right, in the name of fair play, that familiar expression so well known to Englishmen, and which finds a ready response in the great heart of England, I say loose us, and let us go! Nor would the appeal, I think, be in vain, at all events it could be made with a greater prospect of success than at present, when hasty

action for Repeal without giving the measure any trial whatever, would I fear be ascribed to prejudice and passion on our part. For these reasons, and because I do not desire to now mar the effect of the Repeal movement, I think it best for the present to suspend our action and in the interest of Nova Scotia to enter as I now do, my most solemn protest against Confederation in the mode and manner of its accomplishment, and reserve to my constituents the right of agitating for its Repeal, whenever they may think proper to do so. I will sharpen the sword of opposition and put it in the scabbard for the present, but not to sleep. Confederation is now upon its trial and by its fruits shall it be judged and estimated by the people of Cape Breton. If contrary to expectation it should after all prove to be for our benefit, we will then indeed hail it as a boon and readily assist in raising up the plant to a majestic tree, but on the other hand, should its fruits prove unsightly to the eye and bitter to the taste, the tocsin of Repeal shall be sounded with clarion notes throughout the beautiful, picturesque, and fertile plains of Cape Breton. Then shall I draw the sword of Repeal; wield it in a Constitutional manner, and never shall we rest until our deliverance has been achieved, until this forced Union shall be severed by the strong will of a suffering but united people.

Sir John A. Macdonald then moved in the usual way the formal motion appointing a select committee to draft an address to His Excellency. Carried.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Robitaille—Monday next. —Address for copies of reports and correspondence relating to Intercolonial Railway since Quebec conference.

Mr. Sproat—Address for returns of surveys and reports referring to harbours on east coast of Lake Huron.

Mr. Mills—Enquiry of Ministry whether it was their intention to make appropriations to improve navigation on Rivers Thames and Sydenham.

Mr. White—Address for amount of tolls collected on Burlington Canal from April 1864 to July 1867 inclusive.

Mr. Smith—Enquiry of Ministry whether it was their intention to introduce a measure establishing Court of Repeal.