you what confederation meant, in reference to the interests of the Province. I believe in my heart, having an abiding faith and confidence in the British public, and believing England to be governed by able and honorable men, that when they come to know the position of our country, and the views of its representatives, and when they are told that they have acted on false information, no matter how valuable they may regard the union in the light of Imperial interests, the British Parliament will acknowledge that a wrong has been done, and will resolve to meet out to us the same measure of justice and fair play which has been shown to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

On what principle can the British Government keep Nova Scotia in this Confederation? If she is to be united against her wishes, why should not Newfoundland be dragged in? It would be doubly insulting, when we represent our views respectfully to England, that she should coerce us into a Union simply calculated to alienate our feelings towards the mother country. It would be unfair in me to do more than lay my views briefly before the House after the length of time that this debate has occupied. The hon. member who preceded me has left me but little to say, having met many of the arguments which I was prepared to answer. I will not therefore travel over matters with which every member must be familiar. I would say, however, to the hon. member for Inverness, that if he propounds, for a moment, the idea that the people of this country intend to depart from the position they have taken; if he believes for an instant that we are misrepresenting the views of our constituents, he is greatly mistaken. It was said in the House of Commons that a reaction had taken place in this country in favor of Confederation. That is not the case. I have conversed with my constituents up to a recent period, and I can assure you that if it were possible to intensify the disgust of the people at this Union which has been forced on us, that disgust has been increased and intensified. The people have seen, sir, since the passage of the Act, during the late Session, that the interests of Nova Scotia are in the hands of men who, however faithful in the discharge of their duties, are unable to resist successfully the majority that would trample on their rights. One of the amendments says that the Act has not been long enough in operation to judge fairly of its results. That reminds me of locking the stable door after the steed has been stolen; it is too late to seek for relief when the Act has become irrevocable. Now is the time for the people to act, and nobly are they doing so. Nobly will they continue to act—faithfully and loyally—to the Crown, but with the most solemn and serious earnestness that ever affected the minds of a high-spirited people. They are determined to resist at every sacrifice but that of their allegiance. Is it to be wondered at that such is the opposition to the scheme? Is there a man here who, in the silence of his own chamber, has not had his blood boiled by the remembrance of the manner in which he and his countrymen has been treated?

True it is that one boon has be n extended to Nova Scotia by this Confederation Act—the power to tax ourselves. Precious blessing! Ungrateful Nova Scotians! Why do you not go down on your marrow bones, and give thanks for this beneficence? Ah, by the way there is another boon: we get 80 cents a head to console us for our position. When I contrast this pittance with the revenues which have been taken from us, I am reminded of the man who, after stealing a pig, gave away the tail in charity to satisfy his conscience. It was said that the delegates were going to England to ask the British Government to adopt republican institutions, but I think that it would be hard for the hon. member to shew the act constitutional and right by either British or republican authorties. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I sincerely desire a repeal of the union, and I trust that the gentlemen, whoever they may be, who are entrusted with the delicate and responsible duty of going to the authorities of England, and of placing the case of our people before them, asking them under all the circumstances to restore us to our original position, and to repeal so much of the act as affects Nova Scotia, will do their duty faithfully and with a due sense of the responsibility resting upon them. I well know that the eyes of Nova Scotia will be upon them, the heart of the country is with them, the prayers of thousands will ascend to Heaven for the accomplishment of their object. I ask the delegates to go firmly and independently, and to tell our Sovereign that the people of this country are true and faithful to her person and her throne,—that we still cherish and revere the mother country around which so many historic recollections cluster, —that there is not a Christian mother within the land who does not teach her child to lisp the name of our Gracious Sovereign with admiration and respect; but that nothing will satisfy the people of this country until they are placed in the position which their honor and interests require by the repeal of an Act passed in defiance of their wishes, and in derogation of their rights.

The debate was adjourned.

Mr. BLANCHARD called attention of the Government to the necessity of giving imme diate relief to the distressed fishermen in Inverness County.

The House adjourned.

THURSDAY, Feb. 13, 1866.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Hon. PROV. SECRETARY laid on the table a memorial on the subject of the Horticultural Society; also a money petition.

Mr. CAMPBELL presented a money petition from Rev. J. Chisholm and others, for aid for certain distressed fishermen.

Dr. MURRAY presented a petition from Dr. R. Munro and overseers of the poor in New Glasgow asking for the return of certain moneys expended; also from the overseers of the poor of Section No. 12 of the Eastern District of Pictou, asking for the return of moneys expended on transient paupers; also, from trustees of New Glasgow School Section with regard to the school tax.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON presented a petition from Low Point, C. B., in reference to a grant of land.

Dr. BROWN introduced a bill to compel the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company to pay certain dyke rates.

Mr. PINEO introduced a bill to incorporate the Scotia Coal Company.

Mr. KIDSTON presented a petition asking aid for a bridge; also, one from persons at the head of Bedeque River for the same purpose.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced Acts to amend the Act relating to the Blue Lead Mining Co., the Dominion Gold Mining Co., and the Provincial Gold Mining Co.

Mr. SMITH presented a petition praying that no substantial change be made in the School Act.

Mr. BLANCHARD presented a petition in reference to a ferry at Malagash.

Mr. WHITE called attention to the distress that prevailed among the fishermen, and proposed a resolution in connection with the distribution of moneys for their relief. He was desirous that no time should be lost in moving in this matter, and that the moneys now lying idle in the hands of the Government and the City Committee should be distributed without delay.

Mr. NORTHUP explained that it would be better to wait before passing the resolution, as a committee was now engaged on the part of the city in preparing a report on the subject.

After some remarks on the subject, Mr. White agreed to withdraw his resolution, and the following, moved by Mr. Blanchard, was substituted:—"Resolved that a Committee be appointed to take charge of the subject of the distressed fishermen for the Province of Nova Scotia, and to confer with the government and the Committee appointed on the same subject in the City of Halifax, with reference to the distribution of the moneys received by the Mayor, for the relief of distressed fishermen."

Mr. NORTHUP mentioned that the report current in some Canadian papers that the Mayor had telegraphed that no more assistance was wanted, was incorrect.

The following Committee was appointed:—Ryerson, Blanchard, Kirk, Freeman, Ross, White, Doucette, Hooper, DesBrisay.

Mr. KIDSTON presented a petition of J. McInnes and others, praying aid for a road; also, one from Murdoch McLellan and others for aid for a road to St. Anne's harbour; also from Ingonishe and St. Anne's in reference to a breakwater at McNeil's harbour, on which a considerable sum of money has already been expended.

Mr. TROOP presented a petition in reference to a bridge.

Mr. BLANCHARD asked the government whether the rumour that was current, that it was the intention to adjourn the House during the next week until the summer, was correct. It was but right that the House and country should know whether it was proposed to go on with the public business, after the resolutions now before them had been disposed of.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL replied that the hon. gentlemen had been correctly informed; it was the intention of the government to propose an adjournment after the resolutions had been passed. The term of the adjournment was not yet determined.

SPEECH OF MR. NORTHUP.

Mr. NORTHUP then addressed the House as follows:—I rise for the first time to address this House with a good deal of embarrassment, and I trust if I shall say anything which is not strictly within parliamentary rule that I may be pardoned. I feel that the question now before this Legislature is one of rare importance to the people of this country; every other question heretofore under consideration in comparison with it sinks into insignificance. Wherever I look I see nothing but doubt and uncertainity as to the future. I know men who have spent many years in accumulating property who are now anxious to learn what the future condition of this country will be before engaging largely in enterprise as they have been accustomed to do. Under these circumstances, I feel that every gentleman in this House occupies a position of great responsibility—a responsibility which he must not and cannot avoid. As far as I am myself concerned I shall endeavor to discharge my duty to my constituents and to my country as faithfully as I can. The hon. and learned leader of the Opposition has referred to the case of Jamaica as analogous to our own, but he must be aware that when the bill in connection with that Island for the purpose of doing away with its constitution was introduced into the House of Commons it was stated that if any one member had got up in the Legislature of the colony, and objected to the change in the constitution, it would not be passed. Compare now the condition of the two countries. In Jamaica government had become almost impossible, the people were cutting each other's throats. On the other hand Nova Scotia is a wealthy and prosperous Province, occupied by a peaceable and contented people, capable of exercising all the rights and privileges of freemen. Can the hon. gentleman then draw a parallel between Nova Scotia and Jamaica? I think not. The hon. gentleman then went on to tell us that we should learn something about constitutional law. I do not pretend to be conversant with that subject, and I trust if ever I do I shall never use my knowledge as he and friends have used theirs, to sweep away the constitutional rights of the people. There is such a thing as constitutional usage, and, if these gentlemen had regarded it, Nova Scotia would not be in the position she occupies today. A thousand years ago, in the days of the Heptarchy, the king took his seat, and the barons sat on the platform, with the people all around them. There the barons discussed the questions of the day, and then the herald put it to the people whether they would have a change or not. What was done six years ago, when the king was driven out of Naples? The people had been striving for a long time for liberty, and when they had driven this tyrant out, what was done? The question of

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

connection with the kingdom of Sardinia was submitted to the people at the polls. Then, when Venice was handed over to Italy, what was done? The question was decided by the people at the polls. The United States has often been referred to by the hon. Judge in Equity for precedents,—what happened in Roxbury, in Massachusetts, a year or so ago? Roxbury had for some time enjoyed a corporation of its own; a bill was, however, passed annexing the city to Boston, and it came before the Governor. He asked if the people of Roxbury had expressed an opinion on the subject. The reply was in the negative, and he accordingly refused to assent to the measure. Again, in Germany, we saw that the States which were conquered by Prussia were consulted in the formation of their constitution, and were allowed to vote themselves into the North German Confederation. Take again the case of St. Thomas. The Danish Government have sold the Island to the United States, and the other day the question was submitted to the inhabitants at the polls, and the whole people, with a few exceptions, voted in favor of the transfer. Is it fair, then, that the people of Nova Scotia should be treated with less consideration than Englishmen were a thousand years ago—than Venetians or Neapolitans were more recently, or the people of St. Thomas are to-day? Can the hon. gentleman justify the course pursued by himself and friends in view of these precedents? Actions speak louder than words, and these gentlemen told us by their actions that Nova Scotians were not equal in intelligence to the people I referred to. I consider that a more tyrannical act was never committed on any people than the transfer of the rights and revenues of Nova Scotia to the control of Canada.

Now what has been Dr. Tupper's public career from its commencement? He went to the country first on the cry of Railways—that the county would be ruined by their construction. But when he came to this House he ran perfectly mad in building Railways. Next he got up the Retrenchment scheme, by which he pledged himself most solemnly to save $79,000 in the expenses of the Government; but the moment he got in power, he indulged in every species of extravagance, and ran the country fearfully into debt, increasing the public expenditure by $141,000. His course throughout cannot be characterized otherwise than as a political swindle. As respects Mr. Archibald, I confess I am sorry to be obliged to feel towards him as I do. I supported him for many years, and I remember when you, Mr. Speaker, opposed him in Colchester. I fought against you; but where is he to-day? He has fled to Canada amid the execrations of his people, and there holds a high position in violation of all constitutional usage, and wielding the patronage of this country in a most unconstitutional manner. You, sir, on the other hand, fought for your country's rights with a fidelity that is honourable to you, and I am proud to see you occupying the Chair of this House with so much dignity and ability. If Mr. Archibald had adhered to his friends, he would never have been driven out of Colchester; but when he turned traitor to the people, he was beaten by the Colchestar boy despite all the influence and patronage in his hands. I do not wish to say anything harsh about gentlemen who sat in the last House, but it is impossible not to feel indignant when one thinks of their unfaithfulness to their country. Dr. Tupper, it is reported, is to be made Railway Commissioner, at a large salary. Mr. Archibald has been provided for, and if we look to New Brunswick, we find Mr. Tilley provided for. These gentlemen have salaries of $5000 a year. Mr. Gray has a snug place of $4000, in connection with revising the laws. Mr. McMillan, the only New Brunswicker who voted with Mr. Tilley on the Tariff, has been made Post Office Inspector. Therefore, you see that these gentlemen take very good care of their friends, and I think the same remarks apply to the gentlemen who lately administered the government of this country. I remember talking to one of the members of the late House, and asking him "what about Confederation?" "I am the father of the House," was the reply. "I will keep them all right." But when the vote was taken on the question, that gentleman was found voting against his country, and now he sits in the other end of the building. Another gentleman told me, "I am going to England, and Tupper has promised not to bring up the question in my absence;" but he too voted for the measure, and sits in the other branch of the Legislature. I do not believe that one of those gentlemen who thus changed their sides could get a constituency to-morrow in Nova Scotia. I remember reading somewhere of an English politician whom the Government wanted to buy, and what was his answer? "I can earn sixpence a day, and I can live on it." If we had more men of that stamp in the last House, this country would not have been sold. We now find, as I have said, the Home Secretary administering the patronage of this Province, although in his present position he is without a constituency and without the confidence of his country. That is a flagrant insult to the people of Nova Scotia. I have been told of a gentleman who had been doing the duties of the Post Master at Tatamagouche, but instead of appointing him permanently, Mr. Archibald had a Confederate appointed in his place. A great deal has been said about New Brunswick, but what is the feeling there now? I have been told by a person who understands the feeling of that province that four out of five would be returned against Confederation if an election were held there to-morrow.

Much has been said about persons holding annexation proclivities, and in this connection let me read an extract from the speech of the Marquis of Normanby when the Union Act was under consideration in the House of Lords. He said:—

"If the North American Colonies felt themselves able to stand alone, and showed their anxiety to form themselves into an independent country, or even to *amalgamate with the United States, he did not think it would be wise to resist that desire.*"

I ask this House and country if, after a declaration of that kind from the noble Mar-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

quis of Normanby, annexation did not become an open question in this country. He is a nobleman who was formerly Lieutenant Governor of this Province, and no one knows the loyalty of the people better than he does. He was in this Province when the Prince of Wales visited it. Never was the loyalty of a people exhibited more clearly than then; there was not an old woman who had a sixpence but invested it in a union jack and hung it out of the window. Notwithstanding this, the Marquis said in substance—We will annex you to the Canadas, and if you don't like it you can go to the United States. I beg to state, whilst speaking of this question, that I have no ill feeling against the people of Canada; I recognize them as fellow British subjects,—but I feel that we should be allowed to govern ourselves without the interference of others, collecting and disbursing our own revenues.

Before passing from the speech of the Marquis of Normanby let me say that such expressions as he used might not have caused surprise if they had been promulgated by Goldwin Smith or any of his school, and it is certainly noteworthy that no contradiction was given to these statements in either House, and therefore we may accept them as the recognized opinions of the British Parliament. Now, the hon. member for Inverness spoke of Falmouth. My great grandfather, the person for whom I was named, left the old American States on account of his loyalist principles, bringing with him his slaves and household goods, and settled in that township, which he represented in this House, being elected to the first representative Parliament, and sat with some of your ancestors, Mr. Speaker, in the Legislature for the rest of his life, which was twenty-five years. Yet I am to be told that if I don't like Confederation I can go to the United States.

I ask permission to read to the House an extract from a paper expressing the opinion of Mr. McDougall, who is now Commissioner of Public Works in the Dominion Government:—

"In the Canadian Parliament of 1861 Mr. McDougall stated that if the evils consequent upon the union of Upper and Lower Canada are not remedied, an alliance will be made between Upper Canada and the Northern States."

I call particular attention to this speech, and ask what would be said if similar expressions were used here? Now Mr. McDougall has C. B. attached to his name, and occupies an important position in the Government of Canada as one of the Ministry. We know, too, something about Mr. Howland and Monsieur Cartier. The latter found it very convenient to lay his gun down when he was surrounded by British troops. Now, because we are desirous of getting rid of a tyrannical act, we are to be called annexationists. Mr. McGee has a great deal to say on this point, but I think it would better become him to hold his tongue. But many persons say, if we get Repeal we shall drift into the United States; but I have no fear of any such event, for Nova Scotia is able to stand alone if she gets rid of this detested Confederation. All we want is to live and die under the British flag; but if we do not succeed in accomplishing Repeal, we shall see where this skeleton of a nation, as Mr. McGee calls it, will carry us. My belief is that this whole Confederation, if it continues to exist, will drift into the United States. Under Confederation they can call our people anywhere—to any part of the Dominion, on the Militia service—it may be to fight for the Great North West Territory. Now I wish to speak of a gentleman who has been placed in charge of our fisheries, light-houses, breakwaters, &c. I mean the Hon. Peter Mitchell. Mark you, that gentleman holds that position perfectly independent of the people of this Province. I do not know much about Mr. Mitchell; I daresay he is an honorable man, but I remember seeing the report of a trial that took place in Liverpool in which he was interested.

Mr. BLANCHARD—If gentlemen are to be allowed to introduce private affairs into this debate I would like to know it; I warn the hon. member, however, of the consequence.

Mr. NORTHUP—Well, I do not wish to be unparliamentary in the least degree, and therefore I shall say nothing on the subject which I intended to refer to. It is well known, however, that Mr. Mitchell was very much interested in passing Confederation in New Brunswick, and very recently he paid a visit to his constituents. I believe they mustered not in very strong force, notwithstanding they got out every spavined horse and old waggon they could find to give him a reception, and what did he tell them? It will be remembered that the friends of Union said that capital was to flow in profusely, new markets were to be opened up, and the most glorious results follow; but what does Mr. Mitchell say? "Liberal ideas are marching on, and when the American markets are thrown open to our ships, and fair Reciprocity established, embracing a participation in the coasting trade, new life will be infused through our native country." The mountain had labored and brought forth this mouse. A small crumb of comfort indeed to the people of New Brunswick. What does he call liberal ideas? New Brunswick had, like Nova Scotia, a Government of its own, and could make such changes as would suit its exigencies, but now we have a written constitution controlled entirely by the people of Canada. I do not call this liberal. We were told by these gentlemen that we did not require Reciprocity—that we would have markets of our own—but Mr. Mitchell does not say so now. As respects Reciprocity, I believe I could show to the satifaction of this House and of the country, that we would have had it before now but for Canada. I do not mean to say that we would have had a renewal of the old treaty, but the United States would be satisfied with putting on a small duty to meet their local taxes, and more than that we could not have expected. We now find New Brunswick grumbling exceedingly about this tariff, and yet the imposition of 15 per cent. tariff does not bear so heavily upon that Province as is the case with us, for the fact was that their advalorem duties being twelve and a half per cent, and their

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

railway tax three per cent additional, the new tariff is a reduction of one half per cent of the former impositions.

Now, here I may say a word about taxation. I find, referring to 1866, that we imported from Canada 14,898 barrels flour. From the United States, flour and meal, 360,718 barrels, and 174,078 bushels of corn, which at the present rate of duty, would amount to $107,587.30. The increase under the present tariff over the ten per cents of 1866 would be $246,412. I take this year's importation as a fair index to our trade, because that trade was in that year—the last of Reciprocity—running in its natural channels. The duty collected that year on flour was $28,685.75. I believe that this country will never be prosperous until we get Reciprocity back. Upon wine, under the Dominion tariff, ten cents a gallon is charged—just the same amount as on corn. One of the papers told us that we could warehouse corn free. An importer of corn can put it into a warehouse, and then he can grind into meal,—he pays a duty on the meal and all he gets is the bran free. That is an illustration of the results of this Confederation Act, which gives to the Canadians the meal and leaves us the bran. The list of free goods contains 274 articles, on any one of which the people of Nova Scotia would prefer paying a duty than on bread. Such as cabinets of antiquities, coins, gems, drawings, paintings, busts, &c. Then they were asked to protect our coal and to give our fishermen a bounty, but they refused, although it was well known that our coal trade was perfectly stagnant from the want of a market.

Is it surprising, in view of this state of things, that trade should stand still? Many persons have come to me, and said, we cannot pay you all we owe you, for bread is so high, and we must have it for our families. They ask, "what is the meaning of all this?" We had always plenty of bread before this. "Loyalty," they say, "is a very good thing, but it will not feed our children, and we cannot send them hungry to bed." That is the feeling throughout the country; the people are ready to do anything to get back their own institutions, but it will test their loyalty when starvation is staring them in the face. Then there is the increase in the rate of interest. The people who have money like to get the most they can for it, and I have heard of gentlemen who are preparing to call in mortgages in order to get a higher rate of interest, as soon as the usury laws are so far amended as to allow them to charge it. We have heard something said about giving bounties to fishermen, but how is the tariff affecting our West Indian business which is one of our principal branches of trade. The sugar duties must very materially interfere with that trade. Mr. Jones showed most elaborately, and in a manner that was creditable to himself and the constituency that elected him, at Ottawa, how it will operate against our fishermen, and interfere with commerce generally; but all he said was of no avail in the Canadian Parliament, for Mr. Redpath, and other Canadian refiners, wanted the tariff framed to suit their interests. It will be perceived, by the Canadian tariff, that sugars pay specific duties, which are graduated according to quality, and it is well known that, in ascertaining the quality, frauds of every kind may be perpetrated. The proposal of Mr. Jones was to levy a specific duty of a cent per pound, and an advalorem duty on the original cost. Let it be remembered, too, that notwithstanding this high tariff, the Finance Minister estimates a deficit for this year of from two to three millions.

The people of Canada are whiskey drinkers, while rum is the principal article in the nature of spirituous liquors consumed here. They want to introduce their article into this Province, and that is the reason why the tariff is arranged as it is. The tariff has raised the duty on rum to eighty cents, while that on whiskey is 60 cents, thus aiming another direct blow at the West India trade. A great deal has been said about the wealth of Canada; but there can be no doubt that $20,000,000 of the debt which she takes into the Confederation was made up of the deficiencies of ten years when the revenues were inadequate to meet their expenditures. I remember hearing some years ago of one of the townships of Canada being advertised for sale to pay its debts, and I am afraid if we do not soon get out of this Confederation we shall be in the same position. A few words about county taxation. Take the county of Middlesex, Canada, for instance, where the rate was in 1866 $2 31 on every $100. In Halifax, in the same year, it was 28 cents on the $100,—this rate being, I believe, a fair criterion for the whole Province. How is this? There are many charges laid on the Canadian towns and villages which here are paid out of the general revenue. We were told that the farmers would find a better market for their produce under Confederation, whereas the fact is the Canadians are running in their pork, butter and other produce and underselling them. It may be said that this is all to the advantage of other classes, but the fact it that the consuming classes are now unable to buy even at low prices, and thus the markets are injured for our farmers without any corresponding benefit being realized by others. Again, look at the extravagance prevailing in the public service in Canada. Reading the records of the old Canadian Parliament before Confederation, what do we find? They had 9 clerks and messengers to every 8 members of the House, whilst we have only seven in all. The sessional allowance of these clerks and messengers actually amounted to more than the pay of all the members

We have been told that this Dominion is a great country, and that we may expect it to be populated with immigrants. I saw by a paper that 1678 immigrants had arrived, in one week, at a Canadian city; but how many of them do you suppose remained? Just thirty; the others went over to that ill-governed and ill-taxed country that people are so much afraid of. It is my most earnest desire that we may get repeal. We see in Great Britain the results of a forced Union, and of an attempt to govern a people against their will. Sorry I am to see such a state of things prevailing in the mother country; but the time has arrived when it is admitted on all sides that something must be done. I pray that such a state of things as prevails in Ire

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

land may never occur in this country. The hon. member for Inverness told us that the men of weight and influence were in favor of Confederation. I beg to differ from him there; the merchants and bankers of this community should count for something and among the mercantile classes of Halifax you will find Unionists very scarce indeed; while among the other classes a very considerable proportion are Anti-confederates. I admit that many of the young men were in favour of Union, because young men are inclined to look hopefully to changes, but I think that by this time they also must have been undeceived. I may here observe that I have been much pleased at some of the speeches made by our representatives at Ottawa. Mr. Killam elucidated the policy of this country as to its shipping, and the condition of our mercantile marine, most creditably. But what did all these efforts amount to? Nothing at all. That is just the result which might be expected from a scheme prepared as this one was. It was framed entirely by professional men; no merchant was asked to take part in the deliberations. Who are the men, sir, who have tended to make England what she is? The merchants of that country. Who are the men who have also tended to make Nova Scotia what she is? Are they not the men whose sails whiten every sea? I ask the men of Yarmouth, who have been foremost in mercantile enterprise, with what confidence they can look forward to a career within this Confederation? Even the carrying trade of breadstuff is taken out of our hands. We have been stripped of almost every advantage. I trust that our delegates, when they go to England, will represent that Nova Scotia is prepared to build her share of the railroad, and if necessary, to pay a regular quota to defence, provided we are let out of this Confederation. I observe by the papers that the Unionists of Nova Scotia are being called upon to get up meetings, and send home their loyal sentiments to counteract this agitation for repeal, but I believe that they would have hard work to drum up a corporal's guard in many of the counties. The stand-up fight of the 18th September proved the strength of the two parties, and since then, from causes well known to this House and the country, the Confederates have been growing small by degrees and beautifully less.

DR. MURRAY'S SPEECH.

Dr. MURRAY said:—In rising to address the House on this important question—the most important that was ever before a legislature or people,—after so much has been said on the subject in the legislature, in the press, and on the platform, I may say that were I to consult my own feelings, I would remain silent, knowing as I do that it is almost impossible to throw new light upon the subject. But I would be recreant to my duty to myself, recreant to my duty to the noble county which I represent, and faithless to the people of Nova Scotia, did I fail on this occasion to express my open and determined hostility to this detested Confederation, and to stamp with my disapprobation the men who, with the late Lieutenant Governor at their head, by means the most base, and treachery the most foul, combined not only to trick the people of Nova Scotia out of their legislature, but also to deceive the people and press of England, its Parliament and Queen. Before going into the question of Confederatfon, I must address myself to the hon. member for Inverness, and I shall do so the more readily because he appeared displeased that the Attorney General paid no attention to him a few days ago. After the uncalled for and unprovoked attack that he made upon the young members of the House, he could hardly expect that we would sit silent. That attack was made in language seldom heard excepting in police courts, fish markets and back slums of cities, and seldom used excepting by persons who frequent those places. Let me review some of the hon. member's remarks: he spoke of skinning a member from neck to heels, of a gentleman getting a bowie knife between his ribs, of stabbing back with a knife when he was pricked with a pin, of the poison bag, the bullies from Pictou, and so on. When I sat and heard the hon. member using these and similar expressions, it brought to my remembrance the saying of Shakespeare:

> "Seldom he smiles; and smiles in such a sort
> As if he mocked himself and scorned his spirit
> That could be moved to smile at anything."

The hon. member challenged us to combat, I am not afraid to meet him here face to face, or in any other arena, but, as it is said "out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh," I may add that I would certainly be afraid to be in his company in a dark lane, more especially if he were behind me. He said he was a native of Pictou and was proud of it;—all I can say is, that the people of Pictou, or the large majority of them, are not proud of him or of the position which he now occupies. If he has no respect for himself or his position, he should have some respect for the memory of some who bore his name. Many years ago who was it but one named Jotham Blanchard who distinguished himself so much by his labors in the press and in the Legislature to bring our institutions into the state in which they were a year or two ago? Who was one of the fathers of Responsible Government? Could that man rise from his grave and be told that at the dead hour of night, with thirty-one other political traitors, his brother joined in bartering away those institutions, how would he blush for his kindred? The hon. member spoke also about a ragged regiment coming up from Colchester headed by their representatives;—I wondered at the assurance of the man making such a remark,—does he mean to say that a man who wears homespun, with perhaps a patch on his coat, may not be the equal of the man who wears his broadcloth and beaver hat and rides in a carriage?

> "The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
> A man's a man for a' that."

I say I wondered at his using such an expression in reference to Colchester, whose inhabitants are equal not only in intelligence but in wealth and prosperity to those of any other part of the Province. I will now take the liberty of referring to one or two remarks

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

which the hon. member made in reference to me. He said :

"The same hon. member told a remarkable thing, that he had seen the engine go out of sight,—I have seen it go out of sight very often, and I do not see that any great difficulty would result even if it did so at every half mile."

It is said that the *suppressio veri* is as criminal as the *suggestio falsi*. Now what I said was that I had seen the engine go out of sight in a distance of half a mile on a straight line. The hon. member also told us that the Pictou Railroad was the best in British America, but I find the Commissioner of Railways says in his report : "If the gradients and curvatures, owing to the rugged features of the country, are not of so favorable a character as those of some other lines." Who does not know that the very qualities which render a railroad a superior one are straightness of line and lightenness of grades. As regards the frontage of Pictou harbor, I stated to the House that a larger amount of land had been taken at Fisher's Grant than was necessary for the Provincial Railroad; but that what was worse they had taken the land between the terminus and the lighthouse. I shewed also that it was impossible that the water lots which had been taken could have been intended for railway purposes. The hon. member for Inverness said that the leases contained a reservation, but I am strongly inclined to believe that this is only for the purpose of deceiving the public. The hon. member, however, told us first that he knew nothing of the matter, but he afterwards admitted that the leases had been given by his own government, so that one of these statements must be wrong. Another assertion I made was that it was customary for the offer of the water lot to be made to the owner of the adjacent land, but that that usage had been violated recently in reference to Pictou. I stated that a number of individuals had bought land at Fisher's Grant to build a marine slip, and had made application for the water lot in front. The reply they received was that no water lots could be granted without consulting the owners of the soil, and I have Mr. Fairbanks' letter to that effect; and adding those individuals would be heard before any grant was made. Will it be believed that after that, the very lot in question was granted without notification to the owner of the soil. I wish to read another extract from the hon. member's speech, and to put the House and the country right upon another most material point : I made reference to the Reciprocity Treaty, and shewed that had it not been for the action of Canada we would probably have had the treaty yet, and what is said in reply to that? : "He told us that the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty was largely due to the local duties imposed by Canada. Did he not know that while that Treaty lasted the Canadians could not and did not impose a farthing of local taxes?" I will now show from the best authority that can be laid before Parliament that my remarks in that particular were correct and just, and for that purpose I will quote from Mr. Derby's Report on the Treaty. Here are some of the articles passing free between the two countries : grain, flour and breadstuffs, timber, cotton wool, vegetables, and indeed almost all unmanufactured goods. On page 25, Mr. Derby says :—

While the treaty was pending, Lord Elgin, the British minister at Washington, alleged that "Canada had always adopted the most liberal commercial policy with respect to the United States, as well in regard to the commerce through its canals as in regard to the admission of manufactured goods coming from this country, and if the natural products of that country (Canada) should be admitted duty free, that Government would be willing to carry out still further the same liberal policy already pursued towards the manufactures of the United States." The treaty itself recited that the parties "were desirous so to regulate the commerce and navigation between their respective territories and people, and more especially between her Majesty's possessions in North America and the United States, in such manner as to render the same reciprocally beneficial and satisfactory."

With these intentions, thus expressed, the treaty was executed and commerce commenced.

When the treaty took effect by the President's proclamation, March 17. 1855 the duties in Canada were very moderate, but 5 per cent. on some commodities, and 10 per cent. on others, but 12½ per cent. on our boots, shoes, leather, harnesses, and many of our other products; but within a year after the treaty Canada began to advance these duties, and by 1859 had raised them 62½ per cent. on one class, and 100 per cent. on another, embracing our chief manufactures, and most of them were thus excluded and the sale of others reduced.

The Committee of Congress on Commerce in 1862 complained in their report that the duties levied on our manufactures and other products had checked their exportation from the United States to Canada, that our commerce with that country reached its height in 1856 and then began to decline with the advance of duties, that our exports which paid duties to Canada declined from $7,981,284 in 1856, the year after the treaty was adopted, to $4,157,316 in 1860, a decline of 47 per cent. in four years only, while the whole amount of our Canadian commerce declined 25 per cent. from 1856, when the duties were low, to 1862 when they were high. The committee suggest that if Canada required more revenue, her attempt to raise it by new duties on our manufactures was a failure.—It effected nothing but their exclusion. The committee in this connection draw attention to the fact that while Canada urges that she was obliged to raise duties for revenue, she has established two great free ports—the port of Gaspe on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, with a frontage of 1,200 miles on shores frequented by our fishermen, and another extending for 1 000 miles from the Sault St. Mary, at the outlet of Lake Superior, along the shores of Huron and Superior, where our settlers and seamen engaged in the growing transportation of the lakes may be tempted to buy goods and evade our duties. If legitimate trade be the object of Canada, she should reduce her duties, when they diminish revenue, and if fair reciprocal trade is desired, should she tempt our mariners, miners and settlers to evade our duties, and compel us to establish ports and custom houses at great expense upon a long frontier?

If Great Britain maintains Gibraltar to extend her trade on the coast of Spain, must we have a Gibraltar on our frontiers also?

Our committee complain of the change from specific to *ad valorem* duties on foreign goods, which are based on prime cost in gold, if they come by the St. Lawrence or by the Grand Trunk, a British Railway, but are assessed on cost, freight, and charges if not prices in currency if they come *via* Boston or New York. This the committee deem an evasion of the treaty. They complain also of discriminating tolls on the Welland Canal, by which goods destined *via* Oswego and Ogdensburg for New York or Boston pay tenfold the tolls required on goods diverted from our ports to Quebec or Montreal. They cite the reports of Messrs. Hatch & Taylor to our Treasury Department, in which they favor the extension of free trade. They refer to the trade with the Maritime Provinces under

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

their system of low duties as more satisfactory than that of Canada, and come to the conclusion, at which the legislature of New York had previously arrived and set forth in their Resolves now on file at Washington, that "the legislation of Canada subsequent to the treaty, was subversive of its true intent and meaning, and that an isolating and exclusive policy had been adopted, intended to destroy the natural effect of the treaty by heavy duties on the products the United States have to sell, and by discriminating duties and tolls imposed to exclude the United States from Canadian markets."

It is fresh in my memory that when invited to favor the treaty I declined to do so, because the programme of the treaty did not expressly authorise us to buy the staples of Canada with the products of New England, but it is now apparent that this was a dangerous omission and that Canada has not redeemed her pledges. The minister of finance urges that Canadian duties are not as high as our own, but a duty of 20 or 25 per cent. is too high if it excludes our manufactures. The duty on our clocks at Liverpool and on our drills at Calcutta were not higher, but they were just high enough to effect the purpose of Great Britain, the exclusion of the fabrics of the United States. The minister urges that the free ports of Gaspe and Sault St. Mary are to encourage the settlers; but the few settlers on these desert coasts require no such stimulus, and Canada in establishing them pays no respect to the great maxim of the law—*Sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas*—while benefiting by a treaty whose express object was to make the trade beneficial to both parties. He admits that the discriminating tolls and duties have been imposed and claims the right to impose them.

* * * * * *

We have thus examined the progress, commerce, and policy of Canada, and find that she has grown rapidly in trade, wealth and population, that her annual commerce with us is fourfold its amount before the treaty; that she has not thus far redeemed the pledges given for her by Lord Elgin, the British minister, to favor our productions, but has checked their importation without benefit to her own, for she still devotes herself chiefly to her forests and agriculture, canals and railways.

These observations and extracts I contend are material to the subject of this debate, as shewing that while Confederation lasts we will have little chance of Reciprocity. The hon. member also tried to make us believe that the feeling in Halifax had more to do with the repeal of the Treaty than the St. Alban's raid, and he threw blame on the citizens of Halifax for their conduct; but is it not well known that the chief trade with the Southern States during the war, was carried on by citizens of the Northern States. The principal trader with those States, in Halifax, happens to be a Unionist. I am well aware that Nova Scotia cannot of herself form a treaty with the States, but we could have reciprocal legislation which would serve the same purpose exactly. In his speech of Feby. 11th, the hon. member for Inverness again asked, who sent for Mr. McHeffey? All I can say about the matter is, if he advised the Lieut. Governor to send for some other person, and still Mr. McHeffey was sent for, it shows that the Governor did not think much of the advice. He told us also that a majority of the people of Halifax were in favor of Union. I doubt the assertion, but will leave it for others to answer more fully. He then referred to the repeal of the Corn Laws and Catholic Emancipation, and other acts which were advocated by Sir Robert Peel, and asked "were not these material changes in the constitution?" I say no; they were merely alterations of laws and statutes within the bounds of the constitution. He went on to refer then to the annexation of Cape Breton, and to the alterations of the franchise in this country; but all these were mere alterations in the law, and not parallel cases. If the people had been displeased with the changes, they could be repealed. Not so as to Confederation because we find ourselves unable to alter the scheme of Union in any particular. We were referred to the Washington Cabinet as an example of a ministry holding office irresponsible to the people. That system is in accordance with the constitution of the United States, and if the people desire a change there is a means by which it can be effected. But look at the Cabinet at Ottawa. Mr. Archibald, a man who was rejected by his constituency, holds a high departmental office in defiance of the opinions of the people, and dispensing the patronage of this country. The hon. leader of the opposition quoted authorities to shew that material alterations had taken place without appeals to the people, and when he came to reply to the reference to Lord Mansfield's decision, although admitting his ability, he said that no man ever committed so many errors. Did not Pitt commit errors too? Some think he went needlessly into wars with Continental powers, and thereby loaded England with an enormous debt and heavy taxes. Did not other statesmen commit errors? Lord Chatham said at one time that the Colonies should not be allowed to make even a horse-shoe nail; but are we going to adopt all the doctrines enunciated by these men so many years ago, and long since exploded. The Union of Upper Canada and Lower Canada was also referred to, but the case is not parallel at all. No person denies, I take it, that at the request of the people of a Colony, its constitution may be taken away, but where privileges have been granted, and a constitution is given, and that charter has not been forfeited by rebellion, Parliament cannot take it away.

The hon. member told us that before England would allow Nova Scotia to go she would deluge the land with blood. It would appear that he has a wonderful penchant for talking about blood and bowie knives; but in reference to his assertion, I would say that the people have no desire to rebel; we desire to remain loyal, and I have yet to learn that Great Britain will employ her troops to force us into a Confederation with Canada. If she obliged her soldiers to shed the blood of Nova Scotians for that object, the glory of the British name would be sullied, and the lustre of the British bayonet tarnished. Let us contrast our position under Confederation with that of a year ago. We then had our Governor's appointment coming from the Sovereign herself; the House of Assembly owing allegiance to the Queen, controlling the customs duties, lighthouses, post offices, railroads, public works, banking institutions, &c. We alone had the power to tax ourselves; and I would here say, that in my judgment, if there is one thing more than another which a free people should resist it is the handing over to an alien country of the right to tax us. What caused the old thirteen Colonies to rebel? Was it not the attempt made by the Legislature of Great

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Britain to tax them? They did not object so much to the amount of the tax as to the principle on which it was imposed. Our condition is much the same as theirs—the Act of Confederation gives to the Canadians the power to tax us as they please. A little more than a year ago the people of Nova Scotia were living happy and contented; every four years they had their elections, in which the party contests ran rather high,—but it mattered comparatively little whether the Conservative or Liberal party ruled, so long as they administered our affairs fairly, and distributed our moneys among ourselves. Then our trade was flourishing, and our resources were being developed as quickly as could be expected in a new country. What has caused the difference? Are our people contented now? Have we the control of our legislation and taxes, and the appointment of our public officers? All these privileges are gone, and the result is that Nova Scotia is to-day, from end to end, like a boiling cauldron. It is said that we should not excite the feelings of the people, but it is the people who are impelling their representatives forward, and it requires a great deal of prudence and caution to prevent an unwise exhibition of feeling. It has been said that the country has been agitated by a few interested persons,—but such is not the case. Look over the face of the country, and you see the people rising spontaneously and holding meetings to call for Repeal. The universal cry is, "Repeal this ... Confederation."

Looking at the history of the question we ... at although the idea of a Union of the Colonies had been spoken of, and although Mr. Johnston in 1854, introduced a resolution which was seconded by Mr. Howe, both these gentlemen and others made able speeches, yet nothing tangible was done. The first practical step was taken in 1864, when a resolution was passed authorizing the appointment of five delegates to go to Charlottetown to arrange a legislative union of the Maritime Provinces. Those delegates went down to Charlottetown, but did they even look at their work? Mr. McCully said, in a speech delivered at Toronto. "I suppose you will hardly believe me when I tell you that *the representatives of the Maritime Provinces*, who had been *convened for the purpose of securing a particular constitution for themselves*, having heard your delegates, actually adjourned with their work unfinished, if I perhaps may coin a word, *unbegun*."

The very work which they were appointed to perform they left unconsidered. I refer to the fact because I believe that if these delegates had carried out the object of their appointment the result would have been beneficial to these Provinces. Lying contiguous to each other they are inhabited by the same race of people, their interests are identical, and surely there was material enough to form a considerable power. The area of the Provinces is as follows:—

Nova Scotia has square miles,	18,000
New Brunswick,	27,000
P. E. Island,	12,500
Making a total of	57,000

The population is over 700,000, the shipping about 500,000, the exports $11,316,456, the imports $17,715,716. But instead of attending to their task, the delegates were spirited away, and the next place where we find them is in Quebec, where, after the lapse of twenty days, these men accepted a scheme secretly concocted and signed it on Sunday morning. It is somewhat strange that the hours of darkness were generally chosen by these men for their deeds in connection with the Union. In 1865 the scheme was submitted to the House of Assembly, but the opposition was so strong and the petitions so numerous, that the leader of the Government withdrew the measure and confessed he had found it impracticable. In 1866 no mention of the matter was in the Governor's Speech, although it is usual for the Ministry there to indicate the important questions which will be laid before Parliament. The omission, I believe, was intentionally made to deceive the people, and they were deceived. They were confident that no measure for that object would be brought forward, and thus they were lulled asleep. Now let me refer to the question of Union in its different aspects, and without going just now into the constitutional argument I think I can show that even under the most favorable circumstances the scheme of Confederation will be most injurious to Nova Scotia. Look at our geographical position, we are nearer Europe by 500 miles than any other part of America is—and surrounded as we are by the sea, being almost an island, and having access to the water at all seasons of the year, it is our interest to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. The people of the United States are our natural customers, and although by laws you may endeavor to divert trade, yet trade and commerce, like the waters of the ocean, will find its level and flow into their natural channels,—such legislation may succeed for a time, but business will soon return to its former courses. Let us before going further, examine this statement which I have made with respect to the people of the Republic being our natural customers, and I do not make these remarks because I would much prefer our people dealing with that country rather than Canada, for other things being equal I would have no such preference;—taking things, however, as we find them, we see that nine-tenths of our flour up to a recent period came from the States. In the year 1864 our total imports were $12,600,000, the amount which we got from Canada being only the three hundredth part of the whole, $403,000. We exported to Canada $330,000 worth. From the United States we got $4,000,000, being a hundred times as much as our Canadian importations, and we sent there eighty times the amount of our exports to Canada, being $2,245,770. Our chief articles of export, as is well known, are coal, plaster, lime, grindstones, potatoes, oats, &c., and for these articles I repeat that the people of the American Union are our natural customers. Coal is almost the only article which Canada wants from us, and that only to a very limited extent.

In addition to the arguments derived from our geographical position and the nature of

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

our trade, we must consider the unfair legislation which forms one of the objections to Union. At the last session of the Ottawa Parliament, in spite of all that the members from the Lower Provinces could do or say, they put a tax on our breadstuffs,—this was done to benefit the Canadian producer, and to shut out from our markets the American breadstuffs. If there was any necessity for this step other than Canadian necessities I would not utter a word of complaint, but we found that when the coal mining agents petitioned for American coal to be taxed the request was treated with contempt—thus exhibiting an utter disregard for fair legislation. One of the arguments used in favor of Union was that our manufactures were to be increased; to shew you that that could not be the case let us look at the position of England,—what enables a country to manufacture largely and cheaply? It is an abundance of population and the cheapness of labor. There is no other country in which wages are so low as in Great Britain, and any one can see that the manufacturer who obtains workmen for half a dollar can undersell the one who has to pay a dollar. The English manufacturer can import all his raw material—cotton from the States, hemp from Russia, and silk from India, and can manufacture at a rate which enables him to undersell every other country on the globe. Now to apply the illustration: wages are lower in Canada than in Nova Scotia, and besides that in Canada they have a very large amount of water power. It would require the lapse of years before we could even under the most favorable circumstances compete with the Canadian manufactures. But it was said throughout the country, and very strongly urged in the Pictou canvass, "Oh, after Confederation manufactories will start up, Nova Scotians who have gone to the States will come back in shiploads, and every stream in the country will have a mill upon it." I need not ask how far these predictions have been realized. Again, when we look at the matter in a financial point of view we will see that Confederation must operate most materially against the interests of Nova Scotia. We formerly had a tariff of ten per cent—that tariff was sufficient to meet all the wants of the country, and during the last ten years our revenue not only increased but had trebled, and has reached the sum of $1,226,000. In the natural increase of trade and population the revenue would doubtless have been still found sufficient to meet all the demands of the country, and to extend our railroads east and west without a change of tariff. Now we have not only a tariff raised by fifty per cent., but new taxes of several other descriptions. The amount of money which we are to get in return is 80 cents per head and a bonus of $60,000. The fifteen per cent. tariff will, as every one can see, produce just a half more than the ten per cent., and that increase, calculated in the revenue of 1866, amounts to about $700,000. What is to become of that money? It goes to Canada.

We were told that we had got more money back then we had sent up so far, but there is the plain fact that the large sum which I have mentioned goes into the treasury of the General Government. There would be no need for an increase if, as was said, the money was to be expended among ourselves. To have the tariff thus raised without any corresponding benefit being realized by the country, is what the people cannot see the point of. Although I was aware, when we were confederated, that, at any rate, in the lapse of a few years, our taxation would be largely increased, I had no idea that the leading men of Canada would be so bold and so dead to all sense of shame that, at the first meeting of their Parliament, regardless of what our representatives could say, these tyrannical and oppressive acts would be passed. It was said repeatedly that the balance of power would be in our hands, and there was no danger of our interests being disregarded with fifteen members from New Brunswick to join our nineteen; but when the interests of the Maritime Provinces came to clash with those of Canada, we saw the Canadians banding together, imposing taxation on us, and such I fear will always be the case while the Union lasts. To show you how oppressive the new taxation which they have imposed is, I will read from a speech delivered by Mr. McLelan at Ottawa:

"The Minister of Customs admits, that according to a statement prepared for him by some other person, the increase of taxation on tea, tobacco, sugar, and the fifteen per cent. articles, will be $273,145. I have made the calculation myself of the effect of this change of rates on some of the leading articles in use in Nova Scotia. Taking the quantities imported in 1866, the last year in which we have returns, I find the increase on sugars will be $45,185, and on tobacco $22,645. The member for Cumberland told us last night that the increase on tea is only half a cent a pound; the Minister of Customs says it is a cent; both gentlemen, I am sorry to say, is below the mark. There need be no uncertainty; the quantity and the cost value are given in the returns, and show the increase on our importations to amount to $30,472. On meal there will be $15,867; printing paper $6000; petroleum oil $20,500. Of cottons, woollens, hardware, cordage, canvas, &c., we imported, in 1866, the value of $6,287,857, paying as duties $556,386. Deducting $1,122,493 for ship's uses, and some other goods to be entered free under this tariff, the balance would pay $744,790, making an increase of $218,404. Without occupying the time of the House by going over the whole of our importations, it will be seen that on these staple goods alone there will be an increased taxation in Nova Scotia to the extent of $359,073."

Dr. Tupper, in 1864, said that owing to the large deficits in the revenue of Canada, it would not be desirable for Nova Scotia to be confederated with that country. His language was:

"But I am satisfied that whilst the condition of affairs has been such as it has been for years in Canada—the deficit now between the expenditure and revenue being more than a million of dollars—these Maritime Provinces would look very doubtfully upon a proposal which was to unite them with a country that

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

is placed in a position of such financial embarrassment."

That deficit, we know, had been accumulating for ten years with the exception of one. After a six months' trial of Confederation we are in a position fairly to ask if the promises held out to us have been realized,—if our manufactories have been built up, our mining interests improved, and the young men and women who left the country brought back by the inducements afforded? No, sir, the benefits which we have obtained are increased taxation, the stamp act, the newspaper tax, and a number of other such impositions. To show that I have not exaggerated the inducements which were held out to us as arguments in favor of Confederation, I will read from a speech of Mr. John Tobin, made in 1867. He said: "If there is one section of this Province more likely than another to to be benefitted by this Confederation, it is the city of Halifax. This must be the emporium, whence will be distributed over the Confederacy all the merchandize brought to our shores. Trade must be developed to an indefinite degree, labor will be developed, in fact all classes and interests will receive a valuable impulse. Our port will be filled with shipping, and our wharves and warehouses groan with the merchandize that will be required for the Confederation." That is a sample of the style of argumentation which was made use of to deceive the country.

I think I have shewn, Mr. Speaker, that the working of the scheme, in whatsoever light you regard it—commercially, financially, or otherwise—is adverse to the interests of Nova Scotia. But the scheme is bad in itself, as I will presently shew. And I will dwell but little upon this point, because it is not material to us; because even if the measure were good, as Mr. Tomkins said: if it had brought as many blessings as it has curses, no person with a particle of British feeling, should submit to it." We were told that the scheme contains all the beauties of both monarchical and republican systems. The admiration which some had expressed for this constitution reminds me of the Pilgrim who exclaimed in reference to the colliseum at Rome:

> "While stands the colliseum, Rome shall stand;
> When falls the colliseum, Rome shall fall;
> And when Rome falls, the world."

One would think that the world would fall if this Confederation were broken up. In my view, it does not contain the checks of either the monarchical or republican system. The very genius of the British constitution is against Federal union. The history of federation, from the earliest times, is condemnatory of the principle, and a legislative union is that which we have seen taken place in Great Britain. If a necessity existed, which I deny, for a union of these Colonies, a legislative union is certainly the one which should have been formed. Let me read an extract from Mr. Johnston's speech, in 1854, on that point. He says:

"I have never favored a Union of the Provinces, by way of federation, for it did not appear to tend to the great object we had in view. What we want is to produce a real *unity*—make the parts that are now separate a homogenous whole—give them a oneness of existence and purpose."

This opinion, coming from Mr. Johnson, ought to have had some weight with unionists at all events. But if the delegates, having decided in forming a Federal union, had only turned their eyes on the American Republic, and copied some of its most valuable features, we would have had some better checks supplied. They gave us representation by population in the lower House, and I will not here stay to argue whether that basis is correct or not; but having done that, they should have given us some safeguard in the upper House. New York, being a large State, has 30 representatives in the House of Representatives; and Rhode Island being small, has only three or four; but in the Senate the latter has as many members as the former, so that the smaller States are protected from any combination in the lower House. But even if the appointments to our Senate had been what they should have been, the complaint would not have been so great; but some of those appointments are a disgrace to Nova Scotia. I will not refer to the individual characters of the men, for they are pretty well known; some of them were men of respectability; but among them were men like Miller, who went over the country denouncing Confederation. There was Mr. Bourinot, whose feelings in the matter were so strong, at one time, that he refused to participate in social gatherings in Canada lest his attendance might be taken as an indication of a favorable leaning towards Confederation. Mr. Jones shews what made a Unionist of him, and how he received his appointment, and there were others in the same position. Only one of the number of Senators can be said to represent Nova Scotia, and that is John Locke.

We come now to the question whether this matter should have been referred to the people at the polls, and authorities have been cited to show that it should not. I will not waste time to cite many proofs, because the right of the people to decide is perfectly obvious. Is it not a common popular saying "Vox populi, Vox dei?" And there is another one, "Vox populi, suprema lex," that is; "the voice of the people is the supreme law." Parliament has no power to destroy itself, or to vote itself out of existence. Lord Plumket said in reference to the incompetency of Parliament to put an end to its own existence: "yourselves you may extinguish, but Parliament you cannot extinguish. It is enthroned in the hearts of the people—it is enshrined in the sanctuary of the constitution—it is as immortal as the island that protects it. As well might the frantic suicide imagine that the act which destroys his miserable body should also extinguish his eternal soul. Again, therefore, I warn you. Do not dare to lay your hands on the Constitution—it is above your powers!" Never I think have I read anything more truly eloquent and true than the foregoing extract.

Even common sense should suffice to teach any person in a Legislative Assembly that the people from whom the authority is derived should not be precluded from saying

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

whether that power should be transferred. But I can shew from the lips of the abettors of Union themselves that this matter should have been referred to the people. In 1864 Mr. Miller said :—

"When we were told, as we had been told to-day, that it was the intention, if possible, to consummate this Union without a special appeal to the people—to yield up our separate government without the ratification of the popular voice, he thought it behoved us to act with forethought and discretion."

It is a pity he did not continue to act with the same forethought and discretion. In 1865 Dr. Tupper said :—

"Although the attempt has been made to induce the people to oppose it (the Quebec Scheme), by petitions largely circulated, the majority of the petitioners who are here state that they are not prepared to say whether it would be for good or for evil—that we should have Confederation, and ask the House to pause before irrevocably committing itself to what would be, I believe, for the advantage of the country. I believe that at an early day these parties, having been fully informed on the subject, will be prepared to come here by tens of thousands, and ask the Legislature to consummate this scheme of Union."

There he admits the principle for which we contend. He says that the people will come in by thousands to ask for the enactment; but how many petitions in favor of Union were presented? Again, Dr. Tupper said at Kentville in 1866 :—

"If the people's representatives are satisfied that the country is opposed to this Union *they can yet reject it*, or they can obtain a dissolution by asking for it. *No Government could prevent it.* What we wish is, to submit the broad question on broad grounds, and leave its decision to the independent action of the Legislature. *No more groundless statement could be made than that there would be an attempt made to force this scheme upon the people.* In the discharge of my public duty I have felt bound to go wherever I would, and submit myself to the criticism of every man—to give all the information in my power, ready to submit as a member of the Government and as a public man of Nova Scotia to what I believe to be the great fountain of authority, that is, *the clearly understood wishes of the people.* I am quite certain that under the present Government and Parliament *no measure will be ever passed that will be contrary to the public sentiment of the country.*"

Do you suppose that Dr. Tupper was not well aware at that time that the people were opposed to the scheme? The mode of passing it shows their knowledge that the public sentiment was against the deed. Even Mr. Archibald acknowledged the right of the people, for he used these words in his speech delivered at Temperance Hall, in 1864 : "*It is for the people of Nova Scotia to ratify or reject what we have done.* If it will not promote their interests—if they believe the result will be injurious, and not beneficial, *let them reject it.*"

THE SPEAKER suggested that it was out of order, strictly speaking, to read from books or papers in debate.

Dr. MURRAY continued :—I would not have referred to extracts if it had not been done so largely on the other side,—but I was proceeding to shew that the men who now loudly tell us that Parliament had a right to pass the measure without submitting it to the people by their speeches and acts some time ago proved the contrary. Mr. Tilley, in addressing an audience at St. John, said : He could assure them, *that if there is the least question as to the opinion of the people upon it, it shall be submitted to them at the polls.*" Mr. Tilley acted in accordance with this opinion, and, like an honest man, submitted it to the people. Had our people consented to union their position would have been very different. A great deal has also been said about the inconsistency of certain persons, especially Mr. Howe. It matters little to the people whether Mr. Howe was inconsistent or not,—if he had advocated Confederation without an appeal to the people he was wrong. Aspersions have been freely cast on Mr. Howe's name, but that name is "one of the few, the immortal names, that are not born to die," and will live in the minds and hearts of Nova Scotians when the men who passed this measure will have gone down

"To the vile dust from whence they sprung,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung."

The only parallel case that can be adduced is the Union of Ireland and England. It is well known that the Irish people were opposed to that union, and, when it could not be carried by fair means, Mr. Pitt, through the instrumentality of Castlereagh, by distributing large sums of money and titles among the members of Parliament, secured the passage of the measure. But what has been the result? The Irish people feeling that they were swindled out of their Parliament by improper means have ever since been discontented; one rebellion after another, Fenian organizations, &c., and tens of thousands of her people have exiled themselves from their beloved land, carrying with them wherever they go the most deadly hostility to Britain. And similar results are likely to follow similar causes in Nova Scotia. We who oppose Confederation have been called Fenians and Annexationists, and in a letter, written by Mr. Archibald, he told us about two parties going up to the village church, one respectable people, and the other associating with Fenians, rebels, and so forth, adding that people should be careful what company they kept. When I read that production, I was inclined to exclaim :—

"I thank thee, Roderick, for that word,
It nerves my arm, it steels my heart."

When that man slandered nineteen-twentieths of his countrymen by telling them that they were the sympathizers of Fenians, cutthroats and rebels, he should have considered the company he himself was in. He was sitting the very time he wrote that letter in company with a man (Dr. Tupper) who had called him a briber and perjurer; with Mr. McGee, who, in 1848, went into rebellion against his Sovereign; with Cartier, who, in

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g / Public Domain
Digitized by INTERNET ARCHIVE
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

1837, stood in the same position, and only threw away his musket when the red-coats were at his heels; with J. A. MacDonald, who has been branded by the press of his own country as a common drunkard; and with Galt, an Annexationist. The Fenians have been termed "misguided men, who love their country not wisely but too well," and some of them were found to die for their country, but Mr. Archibald delighted to sell his country, and to bring her under foreign domination.

Let me here read a short extract from Putnam's Cyclopedia of Chronology. "A memorial for the annexation of Canada to the United States, received in five hours the signatures of 300 merchants, landowners and professional men in Montreal, Oct. 10, 1850." Who ever heard of anything like that occurring in Nova Scotia. Who ever heard of our people being disloyal until they were forced into subjection to another country. Some time ago, it will be remembered, the Government of the day dismissed a hundred magistrates. Mr. Johnson, our present Judge in Equity, moved the following resolution in the House, with regard to those dismissals:

"And this House is of opinion, that if such an exercise of Executive administration should be vindicated, the most sacred interests of society, would be placed in the power of every corrupt and unscrupulous Government that could command a subservient majority in the Legislature; and the people of Nova Scotia being driven to desire some constitution better balanced and protected, the connection between the Colony and the Parent State would be weakened and endangered."

If that deed was to weaken the connection with the Mother Country, how much greater is the danger when the rights of the whole people are sacrificed? The men who accomplished it may think they did a very honorable thing, and may enjoy for a time the honors which have been bestowed upon them, but I do not envy them. We remember that Montieth betrayed Wallace, and for that act of treachery was loaded with honors while Wallace was put to death; but what Scotchman hears the name of Wallace, and reads that stirring song "Scots wha hae," but lifts his head higher, and plants his foot more firmly, without his heart beating stronger, and his blood circulating more rapidly, though centuries have rolled by since the death of the warrior? Who now thinks of Montieth but with execration? In the neighboring Republic there was a man named Arnold who was honored for his treason, but how is he regarded now? In Mexico how was Lopez looked on after he had betrayed his benefactor? His wife met him and said, "Lopez, here is your son, we cannot divide him, but never more do I wish to behold his father's face." That is the way in which the men who betrayed this country will be regarded. When a hundred of years have passed, their names will stink in the nostrils of Nova Scotians. It has been often asked "will we get repeal?" I reply:

> "Freedom's battle once begun
> Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
> Though baffled oft is ever won."

When I look at the character of the Parliament to which we are applying for redress, a Parliament presided over by the best sovereign in existence, and guided by great, wise, and honorable men, I feel there is no reason to expect that when we go there and show that they were deceived—that we never favored the Scheme, but were designedly kept from passing on it, these authorities will at once say "we have done you a grievous wrong, but we will undo what has been done." I might refer at some length to the falsehood contained in the preamble to the Union Act, and to the influence which Mr. Watkin's statement must have had when he said that the question had been discussed at every polling booth in the Province. As to the Act itself, I concur with those who think it is not binding on Nova Scotia, because it has never been confirmed by statute of the Local Legislature. When the Reciprocity Treaty was entered into it was sent to us for ratification, and why not this measure? It has been said we should accept the situation. Shall we do so? No, Mr. Speaker, we will not, nor will we accept the advice of those who ask us to wait a little longer. "A day, an hour of virtuous liberty is worth a whole eternity in bondage."

We may be asked "but is our country worth contending for?" Look at her resources, her forests, her fisheries, her mines. Is it not the coal and iron that make a country great? We have them in abundance. This land is ours; it has come to us free from our forefathers, who felled the forests, and tilled the fields, and made "the wilderness to rejoice and blossom as the rose." Have we not among us the feelings of Britons? Whom do I see around me but the descendants of Englishmen, who are noted for their love of freedom; of Scotchmen—those men of iron, with lightning in them—the sons of the land which has been called "the home of the brave and the free;" and of Irishmen, whose country is the "first flower of the field, first gem of the sea," and has given birth to so many illustrious men, who, like Grattan, could exclaim in reference to their country's constitution, "I've sat by her cradle, and followed her hearse." And is there anything in the atmosphere of Nova Scotia to deteriorate the race? Have we not the same aspirations? I believe that Nova Scotia will not tamely submit and accept their present position. They must and will be free.

The debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned.

FRIDAY, Feb. 14th.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

Mr. RYERSON presented the report of the Committee appointed in reference to the distribution of the moneys for the relief of distressed fishermen.

Mr. DICKIE presented a petition with respect to a wharf in King's County.

Mr. KIRK, a petition from Fishermen's Harbour for a bridge.

Mr. COCHRAN, a petition of Mr. Archibald and others, of Musquodoboit Harbour, in reference to a road.

Hon. PROV. SEC. laid on the table corres-