

for the ex-
galleries

r you but
er of this
ed to pre-
cted from
n converse
hen others

that never
eat in this
to be re-
other, and
gentlemen
demonstra-
House they
you do not

assume the
house, and
he members
anything,
re that this
seers in the

gers in the

l the House

7th Feby.

la petition
luced a bill
ereof, ask-
orated into

ion from a
r a larger

ney.
ertain re-

ool section,
in alteration

f the Cum-
rence to the

on the same

rawing of a
tion against
s then taken

test against
no legal and
the securi-
ouse.

ked over the
an instance
mbers of the
but perhaps
unsel, would

be heard by

JAMES Mc-
bay and ad-
lidity of the
s contrary to
at members
where they

were acting as a Court. It should be remem-
bered, he argued, that the Legislature was
the highest court from which there was no
appeal, and consequently there was greater
necessity to do nothing that might tend to
the injury of those whose interests were in
their hands. No precedents could be found
anywhere—either in England or the colonies
—for such a case as was now under consid-
eration. It had been decided in the courts
below that a member of Parliament cannot be
received as bail, because, although he may be
worth the money a hundred times over, yet
he cannot be called upon to respond on ac-
count of his privilege. In elucidation of
this point the learned gentleman cited several
cases from May, Saunton, &c. In May, he
added, it is stated that there is an order of
the House, that members of the Commons
being barristers are not to appear before the
House of Lords in matters which are likely to
come before the House. What would be
thought of a member of Parliament accepting
a fee or reward in connection with matters
before the House? The independence of the
House would not be preserved if the mem-
bers were made directly interested in matters
concerning money that came before them.

On the conclusion of Mr. McDonald's re-
marks, the galleries were cleared, and the
question considered with closed doors.

On resuming the following committee was
struck: Mr. Ross, Hon. Mr. Robertson, Mr.
Johnson, Mr. Freeman, Mr. D. McDonald,
Mr. Lawrence. The committee was called to-
gether for Wednesday.

The House then adjourned.

TUESDAY, 18th Feby.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

Mr. KIRK presented a petition from Guys-
boro' for a bridge across St. Mary's River,
and strongly urged the Government to take
the matter into consideration.

Mr. BLANCHARD also spoke in favour of the
construction of the work.

Mr. KIRK said if the Government would
not take the matter up, then the people of
Guysboro' would be obliged to ask for leave
to incorporate a Company to build the bridge,
and ask tolls thereon.

Mr. J. McDONALD presented a petition from
Black River, Fraser's Grant, Antigonish in
reference to Education. Also from Bl
Settlement, Tracadie, to change the name
thereof, and a bill in accordance with the
prayer thereof.

Mr. LANDERS, petitions for money grants.

Mr. JOHNSON, bill to legalize assessment
roll in Shelburne.

Mr. HOOPER, petition of Angus McDonald
and others, for money on a road.

Dr. MURRAY, petition, section No. 12, for
a change in a polling place; also a bill in ac-
cordance with the prayer thereof.

Hon. Mr. TROOP, petition from Annapolis,
praying the House to grant a survey of a
road between Shelburne and Annapolis; he
pointed out the necessity that exists for the
work in question.

Mr. BLANCHARD said the former Govern-
ment had a given a pledge to construct the
work, which was undoubtedly desirable.

On motion of Mr. Blanchard, Messrs. Blan-
chard, Vail, and Northup were appointed a
Committee of the House in reference to the
Legislative Library.

The adjourned debate was then resumed.

MR. DESBRISAY'S SPEECH.

(CONCLUDED.)

Mr. DesBRISAY then continued his speech:
I was interrupted in the Address which I was
making to the House on Saturday, by the
hon. member for Inverness. He found fault
with the members of this House following the
practice of the British House of Commons in
expressing their opinions of what they hear,
and I think he might have shown to me a
measure of the same forbearance which was
exhibited to himself on a previous day when
you, Sir, having given orders for the galle-
ries to be cleared, the occupants were allowed
to remain because that hon. gentleman saw
"respectable people" among them. The re-
turn I make is this: I am ready to bear my
testimony that the hon. member is very use-
ful in this House, and I know that since I
came here he has given his attention closely
to the public business. When I closed on Sa-
turday I was about referring to the cry of
disloyalty and annexation which has been
brought against the Anti-confederate party
in this country. From whom does this cry of
disloyalty and annexation come? Chiefly
from a few persons in the city of Halifax
whose stock in trade appears to me to be
slander; slander which, in the words of
Shakespeare,

"Outvenoms all the worms of Nile,
And makes the meat it feeds upon."

Slander which, as we see day after day,
spares neither the longest life of usefulness
nor the highest respectability. I am happy,
however, to know that these persons stand
alone, and that they have about as much in-
fluence now in this country as they had on
the eighteenth of September last. There has
been a good deal of lip and pocket loyalty in
Nova Scotia, expressly manufactured for the
occasion. With this loyalty I have nothing
whatever to do. I love England, the home
of my fathers and the birthplace of the free;
England that leads the nations, asking them
to accept for themselves the great and mani-
fold blessings that follow in her train; Eng-
land that in so many lands, our own in-
cluded, has erected her national flag and the
standard of the cross together, so that the
lustre of the one is made brighter by the
glory of the other—this England I love. I
do not, however, love this dear land of the
Mayflower any the less, and the rights and
interests of her people are to me objects of
special importance. A great deal has been
said about the tariff, to which the people of
Nova Scotia are subjected by the Confedera-
tion scheme. In examining it, I do not so
much care whether there are certain articles
that are admitted duty free which were not
free before. The main question which con-
cerns the people is this: Are the articles
most required for their subsistence taxed?
If those articles chiefly consumed by the poor
people are taxed, whilst those that are used

by the rich are admitted free, then it is a tariff to which the people of Nova Scotia can never give their consent; and on examination of the matter, I find what I have stated to be the fact.

The hon. member for Inverness referred to Catholic Emancipation, the abolition of the Corn Laws, and the Reform Bill, and cited the speeches of Mr. Pitt and Sir Robert Peel to shew that it was right to pass this act in the way it has been passed. All the measures referred to extended and enlarged the liberties and privileges of the people; whereas this act, in support of which he brought such matters forward, curtails and to a very large extent destroys the rights and privileges of the people of this country. I thought, when he undertook to deal with this question, he would not have taken solely the opinions of men who might rise in Parliament and give their views on constitutional subjects, but that he would have referred to those works that are text books of authority. He might without difficulty have quoted from the highest authority, and have shewn that it is not competent for a legislature to delegate its power to make laws to any other body. But he did not do that. It will be in my power also to cite Mr. Pitt, and I think he will not appear as the advocate of encroachment upon the liberties of the people. The hon. member will not forget the celebrated stamp act which was to bind the old thirteen colonies. It is constantly asserted that Confederation is necessary to the defence and security of the provinces, and it is certainly curious that the old stamp act uses the same argument. The preamble states in so many words that it was necessary for the defence, protection and security of the colonies.—Here you see that the same reason that was given for forcing the Stamp Act upon the old Colonies has been applied to us. I think I can shew that the people of Nova Scotia are now taxed by the authority of the British Parliament, because if it were not for the British North America Act the Government of Canada would have no right to levy a tax upon us. There was not even a delegated power to pass the Act given by the people, and therefore they are as virtually taxed by the British Parliament as the inhabitants of the old Colonies were in the last century. We are not represented in the British Parliament any more than were the old Colonies. How was this thing brought about? A delegation went to England, and authorized the British Government to pass the Act; it was so passed, but it was never ratified by the people of Nova Scotia. A reason given why the latter should be satisfied with this law is that power is left to the Local Legislature to tax the people for their own local wants. That is one of the arguments used by the men who defended the Stamp Act. The then Lord Chancellor said, in debate, "The nature of the Stamp Act seems to be mistaken. It binds all the Colonies in general, but it does not control the power each Province has to lay internal taxes for local purposes."

Lord Camden said, "My position is this—I repeat it—I will maintain it to my last hour—taxation and representation are in-

separable. This position is founded on the laws of nature; it is more, it is itself an eternal law of nature. There is not a blade of grass growing in the most obscure corner of this kingdom which is not, which was not ever represented since the constitution began; there is not a blade of grass which, when taxed, was not taxed with the consent of the proprietor."

If the people of Nova Scotia were taxed under this Act by their own consent, then most of the objections to it would be removed; but no man can say that the consent of the people was ever given to this British North America Act.

Let us now see what Mr. Pitt said, in the House of Commons, in the debate on the "Address of Thanks."

"It is a long time, Mr. Speaker, since I have attended in Parliament. When the resolution was taken in the House to tax America I was ill in bed. If I could have endured to have been carried in my bed, so great was the agitation of my mind for the consequences, I would have solicited some kind hand to have laid me down on this floor to have borne my testimony against it. It is my opinion that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the Colonies. Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the House what is really my opinion—it is, that the Stamp Act be repealed, absolutely, totally, and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned—because it was founded on an erroneous principle."

What was done at the end of the debate? The obnoxious act was repealed by a majority of 114, and the repealing act was carried to the House of Lords by more than two hundred members. That is what the people of Nova Scotia want the British Government now to do with this act, which is stamping out their energies and making them disheartened—to do just what they did for the old Colonies.

It has been said that this scheme was "conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity." So glaring has been the corruption leading to its passage, and so hostile is it to the interests of the people, that we may say with Macbeth, on reviewing the whole matter, we have "supped full of horrors." Even the Sabbath day, we are told, was desecrated by some of these delegates by appending their signatures to this act. The hon. gentleman from Inverness makes a note. On the principle laid down by that hon. member in reference to the Attorney General, I can prove it. He said it had been rumored that the Hon. Attorney General had incited the people not to attend their militia drill, and as it had never been denied, he took it for granted it was true. Adopting his own style of argument, it has been asserted throughout the Province that this thing was done, and it has never been denied. Therefore, according to his own logic, I take it to be true.

The hon. member said a good deal about the city of Halifax having at the last election thrown a majority in favor of Confederation, and therefore he argued that the intelligence and wealth of the city supported the measure. But is Halifax the whole of Nova Scotia? No,

only
in H
wou
peo
mer
told
had
and
kno
like
be v
peo
wh
Inve
erat
grea
cou
desc
proc
wer
and
men
and
requ
sent
men
blan
were
Afte
ince
mea
only
and
thes
ness
sinc
cour
publ
sion
hon
and
of N
will
tain
Ame
erat
their
com
sett
good
Two
the
He v
men
be o
time
sage
spir
proc
Th
app
will
of a
in th
abov
tion
just
belo
mad
to, r
beca
for
illu
borr

ended on the
itself an eter-
t a blade of
re corner of
ich was not
ution began;
which, when
onsent of the

, were taxed
onsent, then
ould be re-
t the consent
this British

said, in the
bate on the

aker, since I
hen the reso-
to tax Amer-
have endured
so great was
the conse-
some kind
this floor to
ost it. It is
has no right
Upon the
House what
t the Stamp
ally, and im-
or the repeal
ounded on an

the debate?
by a majority
as carried to
an two hun-
the people of
Government
is stamping
hem disheart-
for the old

scheme was
t forth in ini-
e corruption
ostile is it to
we may say
whole mat-
of horrors."
old, was de-
gates by ap-
is act. The
makes a note.
by that hon.
ruey General,
been rumored
had incited
militia drill,
he took it
ting his own
been asserted
his thing was
nied. There-
I take it to

d deal about
last election
onfederaton,
intelligence
the measure.
Scotia? No,

only a small portion of it. Even if every man in Halifax had voted for Confederation that would prove nothing as against the whole people of Nova Scotia. But the honest-hearted member for Halifax rose in his place and told us that since the election a great change had taken place in the feelings of the citizens, and I take for granted, from his means of knowing, that his statement is true. I would like to know what the city of Halifax would be without the rest of Nova Scotia? Some people seem to forget the relation it bears to what is outside of it. The hon. member for Inverness next referred to the Great Confederate party; let us enquire a little into its greatness. Up to the 18th September the country was deluged by pamphlets of every description bearing on the question. Bogus proclamations, with the Queen's arms forged, were issued to prevent the electors meeting and consulting on this subject. The hon. member for Halifax spoke about bill stamps, and he could not imagine why so many were required except it was for ornament. They sent down from Ottawa election notices ornamented in the highest style of art, with only blanks left for the candidates' names. Thus were the elections managed in Nova Scotia. After all the official influences of this Province and of Canada, used as they were by no means sparingly, what was the result? They only succeeded in sending one man to Ottawa and two to this House. When the division on these resolutions takes place there will be witnessed a sight that was never seen before since Nova Scotia had a Parliament—every county voting on one side on a question of public importance after a lengthened discussion. Even the county represented by the hon. mover of the amendment will come up and join hands on the same side. The people of Nova Scotia, by the vote then to be given, will wipe out the false statement contained in the preamble of the British North America Act, that they desired to be confederated with Canada. Then will the people set their seal to the demand for repeal, that is coming up from every town and village and settlement in Nova Scotia. I entertain a good hope that this Union will be repealed. Two grounds for that hope I will mention to the House. One is that I do not believe that He who guides and controls the affairs of men, will allow the people of Nova Scotia to be oppressed by those who have, in the short time that has already elapsed since the passage of the Act, shown the same tyrannical spirit towards us, that characterized their proceedings up to that time.

The second ground of my hope is that the appeal of the people, constitutionally made, will shortly be presented at the fountain head of all that is "lovely and of good report" in the widely extended British Empire, where above the noise of party, and the machinations of evil and misguided men, even-handed justice sits enthroned in the person of our beloved Queen. I believe that the appeal, so made, will be none the less patiently listened to, nor none the less likely to be granted, because it is sent from a Province which was for a time the home of that royal lady's illustrious father, and in which her own first-born son was received with an outburst of

love and loyalty second to none that has greeted him in any portion of her dominions. I thank you, sir, and the House for the attention that has been given to what I have said. I shall cheerfully give my vote, as I am happy to know will be the case with almost every other member of the House, in favor of the resolutions laid on the table by the hon. Attorney General.

MR. LANDERS' SPEECH.

Mr. LANDERS—In rising to make a few remarks on the very important subject before the House, I beg leave to say that I am not here to represent Fenians nor Annexationists, but loyal subjects of Her Majesty the Queen. I believe that to be a very good maxim which reads never let go a certainty for an uncertainty. It was a certainty that previous to the British North America Act Nova Scotia had a good constitution—one that was highly prized by all her people. It was also a certainty that Nova Scotia had a good revenue amply sufficient to meet all necessary liabilities. This Confederation has now taken us into a position of uncertainty. I am one of those who believe that Nova Scotians should manage the affairs of Nova Scotia—that the voice of the people, her own representatives, should fix the tariff, appropriate the revenues, and control her offices, and allow me to ask are we in a position to do that under the Dominion of Canada. I answer no. A people residing seven or eight hundred miles away from us, in whom we have very little confidence, with whom desire very little more political dealings than the Jews of old had with the Samaritans—they now fix our tariffs, appropriate our revenues, and control the offices of our country. If there is any one thing that I desire more than any other that appertains to this life, it is that Nova Scotians may be freed from this detestable Confederation. When I say this I am not speaking only the sentiments of my own mind, but the sentiments of those who sent me here to represent their feelings and present interests; and feeling so strongly as I do upon this point, doubtless is one reason that causes me to believe that we shall obtain the repeal we are seeking for. I remember reading in a very good book of a certain king who had very large dominions—larger than those of Canada I presume. He had also a very proud prime minister—so very proud that he required every man who went out of the king's gate to make obeisance to him. It so happened that a certain poor man at the gate refused to comply with this mandate. The consequence of this was that the minister became very angry, but he scorned to lay hands on the poor man alone, and so he devised a plan to destroy the whole nation to which he belonged. He succeeded so far as to obtain the king's permission to carry out his wicked design, but when the king was made better acquainted with the wickedness of his minister, he saw the crime of destroying this poor people, and he accordingly countermanded his order and gave them permission also to hang the minister on a gallows fifty cubits high. I am confident when our Queen, God bless her! is made acquaint-

ed with the wickedness of confederating this Province with Canada, she will certainly countermand the order, and I trust she will issue a mandate to hang the chief betrayers of Nova Scotia. It has been frequently asked during the debate if Nova Scotia is refused repeal, what then? I am not going to answer that, but I remember reading the words a wise man said, "When the wicked beareth rule the people mourn." There will be mourning in Nova Scotia if the demand for repeal be not granted. Having made these few remarks I give my most hearty assent to the resolutions laid on the table by the Attorney General.

MR. RYERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. RYERSON said:—This discussion has now lasted for some time, and it is therefore unnecessary for me to say much, but I feel I would not be doing justice to my constituents, were I to let this debate pass by without giving expression to my sentiments. This House has met for the purpose of taking into consideration one of the greatest questions that ever came before this country. We are called upon to deal with a law which has been forced upon us, and is in no way suited to the people of this country. The people have protested in the most loyal manner against the measure of Confederation, and it is now the duty of the Legislature to endeavor by every constitutional means to rid themselves of this North American Act. We have now met here to effect that object by appointing our delegates to proceed to England to lay the matter before the British Government. The Parliament of England must be told in plain terms that Nova Scotia will never agree to be confederated with Canada. With that country we have no sympathy and never can have. All that we ask is to be left alone to manage our own affairs. The people never asked for Confederation. They were contented and happy until that scheme was conceived and passed by Dr. Tupper and Mr. Archibald, who united to force it upon them, and to heap burthens upon them in the shape of taxes that are most grievous to bear, to hand over their revenues without their consent, leaving them nothing to provide for their roads and bridges and their schools, except 80 cents a head. If more money is wanted for our local services we must resort to direct taxation. Under our form of Government a ten per cent. tariff was ample to pay for our schools and roads and bridges, railway interest, and whatever we required. If went on increasing our prosperity we would have ample means for the construction of our portion of the Intercolonial Railway. When the delegates go to England there must be one thing they must be told in plain terms, and that is, to make no compromise. If they cannot get a repeal of the Act, then they must come home to Nova Scotia, and we shall see what is to be done. No doubt there will be delegates from Canada, and when the Parliament meets at Ottawa they will do everything they can to soothe down the people—they will pass any tariff we ask for in order to keep the yoke firmly on us. We must be very careful, and

not yield an inch; if we cannot get repeal from the British Government let us manage our own affairs for a while. We may be loyal to the British Crown, but let Nova Scotia manage her own affairs. If the British Government has withdrawn its protection from us we will go alone, and drive every Confederate out of the country. We have always been a happy and contented people before this act was forced upon us. Everything is now unsettled, and nobody knows where to turn.

There are a few persons called Confederates still who endeavour to hold up their heads to make people believe it is all right; but they know it is all wrong. The whole country is disheartened. We shall become a second Ireland; but I believe when these documents are laid before the British Parliament, repeal will be granted. Look at the Canadian tariff, and you see they relieve everybody who, they think, have influence in this country; they throw off the duty on 23 articles that enter into the construction of ships in order to neutralize a class of persons who possess weight and influence in this province; they take the duty off the rich man's wine and tax the poor man's bread. Whoever has known of bread being taxed until Confederation came into operation. The Canadians take the control of our light houses, our breakwaters, our revenues, and do with them as they think proper. Custom houses and Post offices are all controlled by the Canadians. If the people of Nova Scotia are going to submit to any such thing they are made of very different material from what I think they are. I do not believe the people have been sold for 80 cents a head—that they will submit to any such indignity. There is a certain class of persons certainly who are not worth half of that sum—that is to say, the Confederates—they are only calculated to bring disgrace upon us. I would like to see our delegates when they come back with the act of repeal, bring also a warrant to apprehend those arch traitors who sold this country. I believe they have yet to come here and to be tried in Nova Scotia for their disgraceful acts. Unless, indeed, they are forced to fly into the United States, and hide themselves in some remote section of that country. In conclusion, I would say that I fully endorse the Hon. Attorney General's resolutions.

MR. KIRK'S SPEECH.

Mr. KIRK said—I rise to make a few remarks at this late stage of the debate on this very important question which is agitating the people through the length and breadth of Nova Scotia, under circumstances somewhat embarrassing. I would have preferred remaining quietly in my seat, and giving a silent vote on the resolutions laid on the table by the hon. and learned Attorney General, and with which I entirely concur, but I feel that I would be recreant to my constituents and to the people of this country, and would not be doing justice to myself, if I did not express my sentiments plainly on this question. The people of my county were grieved when they learned that one of their representatives on the floors of this House,

t get repeal
us manage
may be loyal
Nova Scotia
British Gov-
ection from
every Con-
have always
ople before
everything is
ws where to

Confedera-
o their heads
ht; but they
country is
second Ire-
cuments are
repeal will
n tariff, and
y who, they
untry; they
that enter
in order to
who possess
ovince; they
vine and tax
has known
ration came
ake the con-
breakwaters,
s they think
st offices are

If the peo-
bmit to any
ry different
y are. I do
sold for 80
bmit to any
tain class of
orth half of
federates—
g disgrace
r delegates
t of repeal,
l those arch
I believe
l to be tried
aceful acts.
dy into the
res in some
In conclu-
endorse the
ns.

C.H.

few remarks
n this very
itating the
breadth of
s somewhat
referred re-
d giving a
aid on the
orney Gen-
occur, but I
y constitu-
untry, and
self, if I did
nly on this
ounty were
one of their
this House,

after he had given them assurances of his opposition to Union, and in whom they placed their confidence, had walked across to the other side in direct defiance of his pledges and often repeated opinions, and voted in favor of the British North America Act. There can be no doubt as to the motives that actuated this gentleman thus to betray his constituents and pervert his principles, when we look at the other end of the building and see him occupying a seat in that body. There is another gentleman to whom I must also allude, to my great regret—I refer to the gentleman who was elected to the Dominion Parliament in my county, who enjoyed the confidence of the Anti-Union party so fully that no one dared to oppose him, who fought their battles manfully for many years in this House, and was for some time leader of the Anti-Unionists here, but who, on his first appearance in the Parliament at Ottawa, forsook his friends and accepted the Union. I can do no better to give an idea of the manner in which that intelligence was received in his county, and what the people there think of his recent action in this matter, than by reading a resolution adopted at a large and influential public meeting recently held in that county. The resolution says:—

Whereas, At the general election in this Province in September, 1867, the people of this County declared themselves against Confederation in the most emphatic and decided manner;

And Whereas, Mr. Stewart Campbell, for some time the acknowledged leader of the Anti-Confederate party in Nova Scotia, was nominated in the interest of said party, and as an Anti-Confederate returned without opposition.

And Whereas, The said Mr. S. Campbell, regardless of his solemn protestations, and in violation of the confidence reposed in him, did desert his party and "accept the Union;"

Therefore it is Resolved, That this meeting disclaim and repudiate such gross misrepresentation of his constituents, and hold up the man and his acts to the contempt and execration of honorable men.

I allude to this matter because the Confederate party here are trying to mislead the people of Canada and England by saying that were it not for a few leading politicians there would be but little opposition to the scheme in Nova Scotia. This, however, is not the case, for although the gentleman just alluded to was perhaps the most popular man even in that county at the time of the recent election, there perhaps is no public man at this moment less popular. And why? Because he accepted the Union. The people are so determined for repeal that they will sacrifice their best men, if need be, to obtain that result.

The learned leader of the Opposition ransacked the pages of British history in order to discover a precedent to justify the late Government for the manner in which they forced upon the people of Nova Scotia the British North America Act. He talked of the Catholic Emancipation Act, the abolition of the Corn Laws, and of the Reform Bill, but he miserably failed to find justification for the course pursued. It has been proved by the gentlemen who have referred to these arguments that those acts were passed in Parliament, not in direct opposition to the wishes of the people, but the Government

was forced to pass them by the pressure brought to bear on them by the people. It has also been proved that the passing of those acts was an extension of the rights and privileges of the people under the purview of the existing constitution of Great Britain. Was this the case with the British North America Act? Did the people ask that any such act should be passed? or was it the mere extension of the rights and liberties of the people of Nova Scotia under the existing constitution? No, sir; it was done in direct opposition to the wishes of the people. Petitions were sent up here from all parts of the country, numerous signed, asking that no such measure should be passed, but no notice was taken of them. It was passed despite the people. Nor was it an extension of the rights and liberties of the people of Nova Scotia; it was the very reverse. Our rights and liberties have been taken away, and handed over to a people eight hundred miles away, with whom we have but little trade or intercourse, giving them the power of taxing us as they please, of collecting our revenues and disbursing them in whatever manner they may think proper.

The experience of the last six months has proved that the Canadians are determined freely to exercise the powers they have thus unconstitutionally obtained over us. They have raised the Tariff, under which Nova Scotia had prospered, and which was found quite sufficient to meet all her wants, from ten to fifteen per cent.; they have imposed upon us a stamp tax, and they have taxed newspaper literature, and placed a duty on Corn, and Cornmeal, an article which the poor fishermen of Nova Scotia largely consume, all of which duties, previous to Union, Nova Scotia was perfectly free. And our representatives in the House of Commons, at Ottawa, were powerless to prevent the imposition of those obnoxious acts; and when the mining interests of this Province asked for the concession of one small privilege, the protecting of their interests, by placing a small duty on foreign coal, it was refused. And it is because our rights have been thus trampled upon, and that we have been so highly taxed, and the power of taxation given to a people who know little about us, or our necessities, (saying that we hitherto have been a prosperous people), that we ask repeal. And, sir, because we ask repeal, we are told we are disloyal, annexationists, &c. Now I would like to know, who are the people that ask repeal? They are the bone and sinew of the Province of Nova Scotia. Sons of loyalists, of those who fought and bled for the honor of the British flag, and men who are as willing to-day as ever before to do the same, if protection is afforded them. And they do not all comprise the poorer or less intelligent class of the people; and it is not true that all or any great portion of the intelligence is in the Confederate ranks. We ask repeal as a question of right, and nothing but repeal will suit Nova Scotia, or satisfy her people. We are frequently asked, "If you do not get repeal—what then?" What then. The people of Nova Scotia will then act as becomes loyal people; who were once free, and who have now lost their liberties.

I can only say sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

MR. TOWNSEND'S SPEECH.

Mr. TOWNSEND said :—So much has already been said on this question that I shall occupy the attention of the House for a very few minutes. I feel proud of Nova Scotia as I look around this House, and see the men who are here to represent the true sentiments of the people. I ask, where are the 31 men who sat here a year ago, and bartered away the rights and liberties of this country? Only one of them has escaped to tell the tale. When I was a young man we had a debating society, and sometimes we got a question on which we all agreed, but somebody would step forward and take the hard side, and I think the hon. member for Inverness has had the hard side all through. His financial argument is entirely swept away by the hon. members from Kings and Digby, and so it is unnecessary for me to say a single word on that subject. References have been made to a certain statement cooked by Mr. Johnson at Ottawa, and certainly I regret to find it backed up by Mr. Tilley. He only endorsed it because he had not looked it through, for I believe him to be a man of honor and great pluck. He was not afraid to go before the people and ask their opinions on the question of Confederation. If Dr. Tupper had pursued a similar policy he might have fared much better than he did. I do not think the people would now be satisfied even if he gave us back our old tariff. We want to tax ourselves and to have no connection with Canada. We do not wish to quarrel with the Canadians—all we ask is to have our old status restored. Look at the present condition of this House—reduced to little better than a quarter sessions. A good deal has been said about the constitutional part of this subject. It is one of the glories of England that her statesmen had the courage to pass the Emancipation Act. Was there a man rejected by the people because he supported that measure? Mr. Cobden preached at every polling place in the country in favor of the abolition of the Corn Laws. He was supported by the voice of the people, and Sir Robert Peel was constrained by the force of public opinion to support that measure. Was there a man turned out on account of his action on this question? So highly did the people think of Mr. Cobden that they subscribed to buy him an estate. I can think of a case like this. In Poland they could not agree among themselves, and they asked the assistance of Russia, and then she came in and divided the country. We will fight for our rights as long as we can, and I believe the Queen will let us go. We will not obey Canadian laws—we will obey every law until England says no. Then instead of being the most law-abiding we will become the most lawless. The people are aroused; they will go ahead when they are once aroused. It is this excitement that I wish to allay. When our delegates go to England let them state the case fairly. We have no wish to go into the American Republic, for I consider it the most tyrannical rule on earth.

MR. McDONALD'S SPEECH.

Mr. D. McDONALD said :—I have no intention in rising on the present occasion to detain the House for any length of time, for the subject has already been fully discussed. The question of Confederation has been discussed in every town and hamlet in the country during the last eighteen months, and the people of Nova Scotia have patiently heard the arguments and deliberately weighed their merits, and have declared with singular unanimity against the measure. Their hatred of this Act has been intensified by the recent action of the Canadian Legislature. Our power and influence in the Local Legislature is exceedingly limited. All our revenues and rights are under the control of the Canadian Parliament and Government. There is no parallel case in British history except the union of Great Britain with Ireland. There the Legislature was corrupted and the country arbitrarily annexed. The hon. member for Inverness has quoted a speech made by the great Pitt in advocacy of that measure. Pitt has passed away and so has his policy. It is no longer recognized by the people or Parliament, but is repudiated forever. His speeches are no authority on constitutional law—they are *ex parte* statements. The great men who preside over the councils of the nation would forfeit their position if they pursued the policy of Pitt. The spirit of the British constitution is truth and justice, and when fraud and corruption or force are employed in violation of that constitution to affect any object evil consequences must surely result. We have an example of that in Ireland at the present hour, and will probably have an example nearer home. I am not going into a lengthy argument on this question. I perceive that hon. members are anxious to have the debate brought to a close, but I will say a few words about the cry of disloyalty. The loyalty of the people is unimpeachable. Some may call us disloyal, but we abhor the very idea of annexation. We have an abiding faith in the justice and honor of our Queen, of the Parliament and people of England; we believe we shall receive justice at their hands; but if we do not, what then? Who can answer that question? There is one thing that can be said, that the free people can never forget such an injury—thus will Nova Scotia become discontented—the Ireland of the New Dominion. In conclusion I will only add that I have been sent here by a large majority of the electors of the County of Antigonishe, by nearly the whole body. I may say, to support any measure that will have a tendency to effect the repeal of the British America Act so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. In accordance with the wishes of my constituents, and with my own pledge to them, I support the resolutions now before the House.

DR. BROWN'S SPEECH.

Dr. BROWN said :—I cannot allow the present occasion to pass without making some observations on the question before us. I feel that the present discussion has nearly exhausted the subject, and that I can add little or nothing that is new and striking; still I

EECH.

no inten-
sion to de-
f time, for
y discussed.
s been dis-
in the coun-
ths, and the
ently heard
eighed their
h singular
their hatred
the recent
ature. Our
Legislature
revenues and
he Canadian
There is no
except the
land. There
l the country
member for
made by the
asure. Pitt
policy. It is
ple or Par-
reaver. His
onstitutional
ments. The
councils of
sition if they
spirit of the
justice, and
ce are em-
stitution to
ences must
ple of that
nd will pro-
come. I am
ent on this
members are
ht to a close,
the cry of
people is un-
disloyal, but
exation. We
ce and honor
and people
receive jus-
to not, what
tion? There
hat the free
injury—thus
ntented—the
n conclusion
sent here by
f the Coun-
whole body,
re that will
peal of the
ova Scotia is
he wishes of
n pledge to
now before

EECH.

ow the pre-
aking some
re us. I feel
s nearly ex-
n add little
king; still I

hold it to be a duty every representative owes to his constituents and to the country, to say something on a question the most vitally important that has ever been debated on these floors. My speech shall have one merit at least. It shall be short. I am a great admirer of short speeches, although I know it is common to hear public speakers and their friends boast that they had spoken for two or three or more hours. The hearer's attention is very apt to flag after listening about half-an-hour, and what follows is very likely to spoil the effect of the whole. I may say at the outset that I entirely approve of the Resolutions before the House. I have carefully conned them over, and can find little or no fault either with the sentiment or the language. They express in a plain and forcible style the feelings, the hopes, and the aspirations of the great majority of the people of Nova Scotia.

Why has this hateful connection been forced and fastened upon us? I think I can give some of the reasons. Canada wanted us. She was in trouble; she could not reconcile the adverse and conflicting sections of her population; she needed our aid to strengthen the dominant party; she wanted us to help pay the interest on her debts, and to help her fight her battles. They had tried separation and Union, and many other experiments, and ended by coming to a dead lock. Another reason was that certain leading and ambitious men of this and the sister provinces thought they saw in this measure the means of securing to themselves a higher position, a larger sphere, greater honors and emoluments than this little province could offer. They cared not for their country; they were willing to barter away its rights for their own aggrandisement. I am sure these designing men must have seen that this measure could not possibly be for the public good. No sane man, who is not blinded by interest or prejudice could, on calm reflection, see anything in it but public calamity. They hoped to affect their purposes by the junction of the two great parties that have hitherto alternately swayed the destinies of the provinces.

Another reason is to be sought, I fear, in the position of the Mother Country. It seems clear, too clear, that Great Britain would be glad to solve the question, how she could honorably get rid of us. I regret to be compelled to admit this, but I think it cannot be denied, looking at the speeches of her statesmen in and out of Parliament, the outspoken opinion of a large and respectable portion of the press, and the general tone of public sentiment, that this is a just and fair conclusion. If England really desired to retain this Province, our case would have received more consideration when brought before the two Houses of Parliament. It is probable she is beginning to perceive we are more trouble than we are worth, and think this Confederation scheme, whether it may bring good or evil to us she cares not, will serve as a decent pretext to cut us adrift. Another reason why Britain is willing to part with us, is the difficulty of defending us. We are utterly unable to defend ourselves. These colonies are like a string of beads, strung along the borders of a great and powerful nation,

which can swallow us up at any moment. The shrewd politicians of the old country fully understand that in case of war how impossible it would be to defend us at a distance of 3000 miles against an enemy with a million fighting men trained to arms, capable of being increased to five millions, possessing ample means, and all the activity, energy and sagacity of the Anglo-Saxon race. They know full well such a contest could have but the one result—defeat and dishonor. We are the weak spot of the Empire. The great Indian territory, surrounded by weak neighbors, with its millions of native soldiers, is capable, with very little aid, of self defence. The insular position of the great Pacific Colonies, Australia, New Zealand, of Jamaica, the Mauritius, and the other eastern and western isles, makes their defence easy. The same may be said of the Cape Colony and her other African possessions, which cost but little anxiety or expense. It would seem, that in the selection and planting of colonies, England always kept a careful eye to the expense of their maintenance and their defence with the single exception of the North American Provinces, which were thrown upon her by the action of the United States loyalists, with scarcely the option of retaining or rejecting them. We can hardly wonder, then, that Englishmen think these North American Colonies are a nuisance and a bore; let us make a nation of them, and let them set up for themselves.

I now approach a tender point—I mean the sentiment called loyalty. For my own part, no man could be a more sincere admirer of the British institutions than myself. I have always sympathized with British armies and generals when at war—and with her noble statesmen, her politics and literature when at peace. What I have said of myself will very generally apply to nearly all the people of this Province. I do not presume a people better satisfied with their political, commercial and social condition existed on the face of the earth. I am afraid I must refer to this matter as one of the past. The facts stated have greatly changed the popular enthusiasm. I fear this intense feeling of loyalty begins to waver, and I must say I am not surprised at it.

Hon. SPEAKER.—I must call you to order.

Dr. BROWN—I must speak my opinion plainly and distinctly. I think that loyalty should be reciprocal, and that loyalty to ourselves is the first great point. We should take care of ourselves, and Great Britain is as much bound to be loyal to us as we to her. Loyalty is often only another name for humbug and hypocrisy. If Great Britain is unwilling to take care of us we must only take care of ourselves. The learned Speaker has not called me to order, but has simply given me a gentle hint. In the House of Commons much broader language is used. We find Mr. Bright saying openly and distinctly, if it pleases Nova Scotia to go to the United States let her go. We find another—

Hon. SPEAKER.—Mr. Bright may say very rude things in the British Parliament—he don't break any rule; but I do not think the hon. member would say that the people are disloyal now.

Dr. BROWN—According to my knowledge of the feeling in my own county there are three-fourths of the people would prefer annexation with the United States to a connexion with Canada.

HON. ATTY. GENERAL—That is true.

Dr. BROWN—Still they are quite willing to remain as they have been. I find on reference to a speech delivered by Mr. Killam in the year 1866, that he gives the remarks of a certain Mr. Oliphant, a member of Parliament, made at Sterling. In speaking of republican institutions, he said:

"To his mind there was no spectacle furnished by the world at this moment so interesting as the 30,000,000 Anglo-Saxons working out by hard experience the unworked problems of Republican Government. In the first place there was no other race fit to cope with those problems, or to understand the principles they embodied, but that to which we and they belong. Although he did not believe in them for this country, he did most cordially believe in republican institutions for America. As an Englishman he had no sort of objection to the Monroe doctrine and the spread of Anglo-Saxon Republics all over the American continent—the more the better. There is no reason, because we are a constitutional monarchy, and well satisfied to remain so, that we should insist upon our colonies, which had none of the traditions or associations which had made us what we are, adopting monarchical institutions after they left us."

I will also quote from the same speech a conversation that took place between Lord Jervis, the famous Admiral:

"Lord Brougham, in his lives of eminent statesmen, says of Sir John. His sagacity no man ever found at fault, while his provident anticipations of future events. He says we shall see a remarkable example of this faculty in a matter of deep interest at the present moment. (1839. If of deep interest then, how much deeper now). When Lord Shelburne's peace was signed, (1783,) and before the terms were made public, he sent for the Admiral, and showing them, asked his opinion: "I like them very well," said Sir John, "but there is one great omission." "In what?" "In leaving Canada as a British Province." "How could we possibly give it up?" said Lord Shelburne. "How can you hope to keep it?" replied the veteran warrior, with an English republic just established in sight of Canada, and with a population of a handful of English settlers among a body of hereditary Frenchmen. "It is impossible, and rely on it you only retain a running sore, the source of endless disquiet and expense." "Would the country bear it?" "Have you forgotten Wolf and Quebec?" asked his Lordship. "Forgotten Wolf and Quebec?" No, it is because I remember both. I served with Wolf at Quebec; having lived so long, I have had full time for reflection on this matter, and my clear opinion is that if this fair occasion for giving up Canada is neglected, nothing but difficulty in either keeping or resigning it, can follow."

There is one thing I may say in connection with this question, and that is, the subject of free trade between this province and the

United States is of more importance than all other questions; it strikes me that on it depends the salvation of this country. I may say a word or two with regard to the means used to induce the House of Assembly to pass this Act. I hesitate, and it would be invidious to name the persons concerned in this unholy bargain and sale of our rights. Certainly some gentlemen here recollect the mode pursued to induce the members of this House to vote against their express convictions. I had frequent conversations with gentlemen who voted for this Act though they had expressed themselves strongly as possible against it previously. It is easy for us to comprehend how this was brought about. We know when the Union was accomplished a large number of them obtained their reward.

Then, again, others were gained by intimidation. They were compelled to vote in a certain way by a certain pressure. This pressure, I recollect, was brought to bear against me because I happened to have a brother in a subordinate position in this County. The leader of the Government at that time made me the subject of repeated, most savage, and unjustifiable attacks. To prove this I may appeal to some gentlemen now around these benches. He thought to coerce me into subjection, but I was less anxious for his good opinion and support than that of the electors and citizens of Kings.

The means used to carry Confederation was misrepresentation to the British Government and Parliament. That is well known, and it has been so much discussed that I need not dwell upon it. Mr. Watkin has been often alluded to, and no doubt he and his Nova Scotian coadjutors have been largely instrumental, by the use of unfounded assertions, in fastening this curse upon us. Another means was, by subsidizing the Press. We all know what immense sums have been given to certain publishers during the past few years. One person, you will see from the Blue Book, received \$15,000 for a period of nine months ending June last, and it is told by those who should know, that \$8,000 or \$10,000 more are included in other accounts, of which the items are not stated.

What are the effects of Confederation? The first is, we are injured financially, we lose very largely indeed. I shall not enter into details, for gentlemen who have preceded me have gone into the subject fully. It is easy for any man of common sense to see that the expense that will result from the extensive establishments kept up at Ottawa, with a Governor-General at its head enjoying a salary of \$50,000 and other offices in proportion, to prove the extravagant and wasteful expenditure of Canada. Take the fact that a prosperous and fertile country, with natural resources almost unsurpassed, contrived to swell up a debt little less than that of the United States, in proportion to population, although the latter has been engaged in a fearful civil war of more than four year's continuance. How can we help coming to the conclusion that they are most extravagant? No doubt the increase of our taxation will be about 50 per cent above what it has been previously. As an example of the extravagant

importance than all that on it depends. I may say to the means assembly to pass could be invidious in this respect. Certain rights. Certain recollect the members of this express conversations with this Act though I feel strongly as to it. It is easy for me to say that the Union was so far from obtaining

gained by intimidated to vote in a sure. This present to bear against a brother in a County. The that time made most savage, and prove this I may now around these force me into submission for his good that of the electors

Confederation was British Government all known, and it that I need not has been often and his Nova largely instructed assertions, on us. Another Press. We all have been given to the past few years. In the Blue Book, of nine months told by those who for \$10,000 more cents, of which the

Confederation? The financially, we lose all not enter into have preceded me fully. It is easy to see that the from the extensive Ottawa, with a Government enjoying a salary in proportion, to wasteful expenditure that a protest, with natural result, contrived to be more than that of the on to population, been engaged in a than four years help coming to the most extravagant? or taxation will be that it has been pre- of the extravagant

expenditures of Canada, I will give you a list of the sums paid in connection with the removal of the seat of Government from Quebec to Ottawa, in 1866:

From the "Public Accounts of the Province of Canada for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1866. Printed by order of the Legislature, Ottawa."

Paid to D. Godley—Removal expenses Gov. Genl. Secy's offices and staff from Quebec to Montreal, and thence to Ottawa	\$4,221.10
Do. do—Gov. General's establishment, do. .	520.00
E. A. McEldith—do Prov. Secy's office Quebec to Ottawa	4,506.03
G. H. Lane—do Prov. Registrar's office, do. .	2,317.26
T. D. Harrington—do Rec. General's, do. .	2,868.90
W. Dickenson—do Finance Department, do. .	3,276.90
R. S. M. Bouchette—do. do. do. Customs Branch do.	3,320.50
T. Nuduan—do Bureau of Agriculture, do. .	9,852.57
J. C. Tache—do. Public Works Department, do. .	3,495.33
W. H. Griffin—do. Post Office Department, do. .	8,708.80
A. Russell—do. Crown Land Department, do. .	18,245.03
Col. McDougall—do. Militia Department, do. .	4,447.23
J. F. Taylor—do. Legislative Council, do. .	10,168.30
W. B. Lindsay—do. House of Assembly, do. .	20,272.50
Craig & Vallin—do. for removal of departmental furniture	16,199.00
Various smaller charges	15,765.29
To Hon. Sir N. F. Belleau—to enable him to pay the employees of the several departments of the Civil Government an addition of 20 per cent. on their original allowances	22,623.57
To do—to enable him to pay amounts awarded by Special Commission for losses sustained, &c, including double rents, on account of removal of the seat of government ..	22,619.78

\$177,459.47

Here you see that the total expense of this removal amounted to the enormous sum of \$177,459. I think that a private individual might have been engaged to do the same amount of work for one-tenth of that sum. Another of the evils of Confederation is the alienation of the affections of the people, but I need not dwell on this subject. The prophecy of the Confederate party was that in a short time the people would accept the situation as their neighbors of New Brunswick had done. It appears to me the popular feeling is intensified every day. In this city you now hardly meet a person who raises his voice in favor of Confederation. In my own county it would be entirely useless for a Confederate to offer himself at the hustings. It is not that we have been defrauded and deceived, but we have been insulted—we have not had the ordinary privileges of freemen. One of the greatest wrongs connected with this Confederation is, that all the offices are filled up by persons in whom the people have no confidence—the customs and excise, the post office, the light-house service, the judiciary, and almost every other department are controlled by the General Government, and filled up by servants and favorites, and if we want any change in connection with them we must go all the way to Ottawa, and most likely fail in our application afterwards.

I wonder how my friend, Mr. Blanchard, can stand up and say that it is right that these offices should be filled by a party that forms only a fraction of the people of this

Province. In closing I will refer to an old fable which I read with interest a long time ago. Two pots, one earthen and the other iron, agreed to take a voyage together; the earthen pot was shy at first, considering its frail nature, to undertake it. But the iron pot promised its companion whatever happened to take care of it. The weather was fine, and the two sailed along very gaily on the smooth current for a while, but by and by there came up a squall, and the iron pot came into contact with the earthen pot and knocked it to pieces. That will be the way with us. If we consent to make the voyage with her Canada will sink us. In conclusion, I will only say that I hope that the application for repeal that is now being made to England will be successful. I do not know much about governments and diplomacy, but I trust a sense of justice will prevail with the rulers of the British nation, and that we shall be restored to our former happy condition.

MR. FERGUSSON'S SPEECH.

Hon. J. FERGUSSON said.—Since you, sir, have directly addressed me, I shall make a very few remarks. There is no doubt that there is a deep feeling of discontent pervading the whole Province in consequence of the Act of Union which has been recently consummated without the consent of the people. I much mistake the people of Nova Scotia if they do not resent it at some time or another. I don't wish to make any threats, but we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact—fact it is palpable through the whole country and it will be soon known in England—that never was a greater act of injustice perpetrated on a free people since the American revolution. No regard was paid to the petitions we sent home a short while ago. Now delegates are going across the water to make known the voice of the people through the constitutional channel; that is, through this House; and I have great faith in the sense of justice, in the love of fair play, in the wisdom of the people and the legislature and statesmen of England, that they will do us that justice to which we are entitled. I am confident that the time is not far distant when the Province of Nova Scotia will be gratified by the knowledge that the obnoxious Act of Union, so far as we are concerned, will be repealed, and we shall obtain our rights and liberties, of which we have been so unjustly deprived, and then content and happiness will again prevail among us as in times past.

MR. YOUNG'S SPEECH.

Mr. Young said :—In ancient times it was the custom for the younger senators to speak first, and such appears to have been the case to a certain extent in the present debate. I have no intention, let me say at the outset, to go into the financial part of this argument; the Provincial Secretary gave us all the information that was necessary on this particular point. All I can say is that last year we had both our pockets full of money, but now we have little or nothing in them. As respects the Canadian Parliament, see what was the very first thing they did—they added insult to injury; they send persons

persons here to take charge of our custom houses. A good deal has been said about the power of Parliament. Parliament has no doubt considerable power—it has been said that is able to do anything but make a man a woman. It would be a pity that this should be done now, for the poor girls find it difficult enough now to find husbands. But the power of Parliament is limited to a certain extent: suppose it passed an Act to burn the city of Halifax. It is said they could do so; but could they sustain it by public opinion? An Act just as bad has been passed. If they passed an Act to burn up all our houses, we could rebuild them; if our ships are lost, we can make new ones; but liberty and freedom, once gone, are really lost. One argument against this measure, and the strongest, is that the people do not want it. The men who brought this measure forward know as well as we do that we do not want it. They told dreadful stories on every occasion. I remember one gentleman saying that the Canadians owned 7,000,000 tons of shipping, whereas the fact is Upper Canada has not as much shipping as Nova Scotia by a good deal. I cannot understand the action of the late Legislature. The idea of men sent here with certain powers voting themselves out of power, and going back to their constituents and telling them so, is a palpable absurdity. What would my constituents say if I told them that I had not only voted myself out of power, but had also handed over their rights to others?

Now I believe that the expenditure of \$20,000,000 in connection with the Intercolonial Railroad had a great deal to do with the passage of this measure. Certain persons will get big commissions. Then some people liked to have it said—they had got the railway—notoriety is very dear to many persons—for instance, the man who set the Temple on fire. The Attorney General told us we held our institutions from the Queen. If I mistake not the Canadians had their representative institutions granted by the Imperial Parliament. There is a difference, therefore, between the two. To think we should enter into Union with over a million of French Canadians. These people buy little or nothing, as compared with ourselves; I know it from my knowledge of the same class of persons in New Brunswick. A French author has said that France is the brain of the world; but I don't know about that. At all events, in my opinion, this Nova Scotia is the brain of British North America. In the feudal days loyalty was very well; but now-a-days there is a good deal of bread and butter about it. I think I am loyal myself, but I do not make so much talk about it as some persons; I show my loyalty by my acts. As respects these resolutions, I shall vote for them. As respects Repeal, I hope we will get it; but I am not so sanguine as some are. If we do not get it, what then? Well, we have to suffer; we have to be a second Ireland; it will come to that. The world may pity us, but what good will that do? I would just say to this House and to the people, every Nova Scotian who has a soul should step forward and get rid of this hateful Union. The hon. member for Inverness talked about

poison bags. A great many persons have such things; but they keep them quiet; he unties his and scatters the contents broadcast over the House. I have seen so much of the poison that now I am not frightened at it. I am a good deal like the Eastern monarch that fed on poison, and so it lost its effect upon him.

MR. PURDY'S SPEECH.

Mr. PURDY said:—At this late stage of the debate, when the subject has been exhausted, I would much prefer giving a silent vote, but looking at the question in all its aspects, and knowing the importance of the great issue before the country, I feel that I would not be fully discharging my duty if I gave a silent vote. I shall not attempt to make any lengthy remarks, because it is already pretty much exhausted.

I feel, sir, that the importance of the question demands that we should give it a careful consideration, and advance every important idea that can be brought out, in order that the matter may be laid fairly before the country and before the British Government to whom we appeal. I will not detain the House at great length, but I wish to review the principal branches of the subject. Our first Assembly met in 1758,—we were governed for years by an irresponsible government,—the Governor surrounded himself with whom he pleased, and the country had no power to make him change his councillors, so that the opinions of the people would be reflected. It was soon found that a government of that kind did not promote the prosperity of the country;—and the people spoke out, demanding a more just and equitable distribution of the patronage and power, and required that they should have the control which rightfully belonged to them. I will not delay to narrate the means by which Nova Scotians at length came to enjoy the privileges of a free people. They had a right to a free government,—they had shown themselves a loyal people, and had striven hard to maintain the British flag in this country. The thirteen old colonies felt the Stamp Act grievous to bear,—on its passage they manifested every sign of displeasure and regret, and finally rebelled, but Nova Scotia remained loyal and true even to this hour. We showed a loyalty in our early history in bringing the militia to defend this city at various times, and whilst the settlers in the country districts were clearing their lands and building their houses with one hand they were defending their families from the attacks of the Indians and other enemies with the other. I might also narrate a long chapter of events occurring in 1812 when the war with the United States broke out, and our people were called upon to suffer many privations. Privateers infested the coast, harassing our fishermen and destroying our commerce, and then, sir, our House of Assembly, although the revenues were very small, gave a large grant of money to aid the militia, fitting out armed boats, and preparing for the defence, not of only our homes but of the British flag on this side of the Atlantic. I am the descendant of British loyalists, and I feel

persons have
em quiet; he
nts broadcast;
much of the
tended at it.
ra monarch
lost its effect

ECH.

stage of the
an exhausted,
lent vote, but
aspects, and
great issues
would not be
gave a silent
any lengthy
pretty much

e of the ques-
ve it a careful
ery important
n order that
fore the coun-
overnment to
t detain the
ish to review
subject. Our
were govern-
government,
himself with
ntry had no
ouncillors, so
would be re-
a government
ne prosperity
le spoke out,
uitable distri-
wer, and re-
the control
them. I will
by which No-
enjoy the pri-
had a right to
shown them-
driven hard to
this country.
e Stamp Act
ge they mani-
and regret,
otia remained
. We showed
in bringing
various times,
country dis-
and building
were defend-
attacks of the
the other. I
ter of events
war with the
r people were
ations. Pri-
ing our fish-
commerce, and
ly, although
gave a large
ia, fitting out
the defence,
the British
. I am the
and I feel

that the history of our country warrants us in asking the justice which we are about to demand of the British Government, and in believing that our request will be heard.

I might go on to shew that this country has not only been loyal, but that she has been generous. Look back at our early history, and you will find that when fires occurred in Boston, Montreal, Miramichi, and other places, at various times, Nova Scotia contributed freely for their relief. Not only so, but when the battle of Waterloo took place, and the British soldiers had left widows and orphans to be provided for, the loyalty and generosity of this country was shewn by a contribution that was honorable and handsome. Yet we are told that because we stand up, like men of a free country should, we are disloyal. I trust the time has now arrived when no man will dare to hurl the slander of disloyalty at the Anti-confederate party in this Province. Loyalty does not surely prevent a people from claiming their rights and privileges. Among the other characteristics of Nova Scotians' enterprise has been prominent. I might enumerate the principles of trade, and shew that in none of them have we been deficient. Method of government and frugality of government might form another branch of my argument by which I might shew that we have been able to govern ourselves in a most honorable and satisfactory manner. Bravery might also furnish a topic for remark for the brave and proud hearts of Nova Scotians would never allow any aggressor, single-handed, or in a multitude, to trample on their rights. They have nerve and manliness enough to resist, and when I heard it said that our request for repeal will be unheeded, and that the British Government will carry out the Confederation Act by means of the troops in the citadel, I feel that they may crush out the free spirit of Nova Scotians; but they will have something to do which I trust never will be done. I trust that the Government will never ask British troops to fire on a Nova Scotian, and I believe that Nova Scotians will not require it, for, with fair argument and common sense they will obtain from the British Government their rights as free subjects. It is not worth while now to narrate at length what has transpired from the time when we were a Crown Colony. As intelligence advanced, and our resources were developed, a change was found to be necessary in the constitution of the Province. I refer now to the time when responsible government was obtained—to the period when the Howes and others came out and asked that the people should have more freedom and power in their Assembly, and that the government should be carried on according to their wishes. Those events are well recollected and understood in the country, but how was that change obtained? It was by going honestly to the country and asking the people whether they desired a change in their institutions; going throughout the length and breadth of the land; appealing to the sound sense of Nova Scotians, and asking them to elect men who would join in the demand for more power and freedom. The demand was made that the doors of the Council Chamber

13

should be unlocked, and though the Council asserted its rights with a great deal of dignity and force, yet those doors were opened by pressure of public opinion. The Councillors have ever since been under the public eye.

The British Government at that time gave up something—they gave up the power of taxing us and of appointing our Executive Councillors without our consent, and vested in this House the full control of the revenues; we were allowed in short to govern ourselves in the manner we thought best. I might go on to show that although from the time when the first tree was cut in Halifax to the time when Responsible Government was granted, our progress was slow. Yet from the moment when the people obtained control of their own affairs, our trade and resources were developed, and the country prospered in a ratio far beyond what it had achieved up to that period. It was obvious to any one that our own people ought to be better judges of their own requirements than persons across the water. I have said that our progress was slow since 1749 down to the time when Responsible Government was conceded, and I might cite many facts in proof of the assertion; in 1816 the first coach went to Windsor, in 1814 we had only three lighthouses, in 1825 our population was only a little over 100,000. But when Responsible Government was granted, and power given to the people to control the Government, the country advanced with a degree of prosperity which was most honorable to it. We immediately commenced building breakwaters and lighthouses, improving harbors, opening free roads, and building bridges, extending postal communication, and building railways, and yet, until after Confederation, we had no bread tax, no paper tax, no stamp act, our tariff was low, and yet our people were increasing in numbers and in wealth. We naturally enough looked about to see what resources we had that could be developed; we were nearly surrounded by the sea, we had harbors plentiful and good, timber was convenient, and there was no reason why we should not turn our attention to shipbuilding. We did so, and the result is that Nova Scotia owns more shipping in proportion to her population than any country in the world. I was struck the other day with a statement which shewed that in 1866 we owned 3509 vessels, of 409,895 tons, while New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, forming the great country which the Unionists would have us believe is a garden of Eden, owned altogether but 2873 vessels, of 459,800 tons. Let us govern our own country, and we will develop our resources and foster those interests which are most congenial to the country. The public records show that down to 1863 there took place in this Assembly constitutional debates which are fresh in the minds of most of us, and I desire to draw attention to what took place particularly in 1863. Since responsible government was established all the public grievances were brought before the people at the general election, and at that date there were no constitutional difficulties, no grave public errors, but the great question before the country, whether honestly raised or not I will not stop to inquire, was

that of *retrenchment*. I put it to the House that if there had been grievances they would have been brought forward; but that seemed to be the only question which the people were asked to decide upon. As a proof of this I refer you to Dr. Tupper's letters and speeches. In a letter dated May 16, 1863, over his own signature, he raises the issues for the elections. It is true that in that letter he turns aside for the purpose of showing that Mr. McCully was a man of most abominable character, tinctured and tainted from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet when money and his own advancement were concerned; but he puts forward as the great issue, "taxation or retrenchment." The people decided, and returned a large party to the House in favor of retrenchment, taking the issue as they found it placed before them. Then we come down to 1866, and to what more particularly concerns the subject under debate—the resolution on which the Confederation Act is said to be based. To my mind that resolution lacks the essential element of authority to the delegates to do as they have done. The word "arrange" did not authorize the delegates to *accomplish* and *complete* an act; it merely put them in a position to discuss and eliminate all the arguments for and against the scheme, and to put the matter in proper shape before the House. The delegates, under that resolution, had a right to only "arrange" the political questions of the day—to bring the material into shape; but the command remained in the Legislature, and they were bound to come back for final orders. Before the delegates went to England there were no petitions in favor of the measure, but numerous petitions against it; our condition was sound and good, and the people little thought that so great a change would be made without asking their consent. So it laid in my mind; I was convinced that the delegates would never think of having the act passed without consulting the people, and I had too much confidence in the Imperial Parliament to suppose that it would pass it under such circumstances. To dwell upon all the aspects in which Nova Scotian interests have been sacrificed would be impossible for me at present, and it is not so necessary since gentlemen have discussed one point after another so fully in this debate.

One of the points, however, which suggest themselves, is the injustice done to us by not having the debts of the different Provinces fairly and equitably adjusted. The debt of Nova Scotia has been created by the building of lighthouses, breakwaters, improving harbor, opening and maintaining free roads, building free bridges, railways, &c. Not one dollar of our debt was caused by deficiency of revenue to pay officials, whilst \$22,000,000 of the Canadian debt was incurred for borrowed money to meet current liabilities, and of course has no equivalent asset. It has always been a grave question with me whether the British Government, not being liable for our debts, can control our *assets*, and upon this point I might refer to the remark of Earl Gosford, who said that the debt of Canada, not being under the control of the British Parliament, the question could not be touched

by that body. I think there is a fair question for discussion in that suggestion. I will now turn attention to what this Assembly and the people have been doing for the last thirty years. Have they been inculcating no leading principles of Government? They have. In 1836 the policy of consulting the people at the polls was announced; Mr. Howe advocated the introduction of Responsible Government, the people accepted the principle, and the elections resulted in a majority to carry out that policy. In 1837 the issues respecting Responsible Government were fairly before the people, and the question was whether the country should continue under it or recede. It decided to continue. We are then down to 1850 when the House had under consideration a bill respecting the Legislative Council. It was thought by some that the Council should be made elective, and a discussion arose on that issue. This House at that early date enunciated the principle that in a change so material the opinions of the people should be ascertained. A resolution was carried in these words:

"*Therefore Resolved*, That it would be premature in this House to express an opinion on so material a change in our Provincial constitution, and that the sentiments of the people thereon ought to be first of all ascertained."

Here then this Legislature passed a resolution confirming indelibly the principle that not even a change in the Legislative Council, making it an elective instead of an appointed authority, should take place without an appeal to the people at the polls. Then again in 1851 the same principle was established, when the House of Assembly had again under consideration the question of an Elective Council. After debating several days, a resolution was reported from Committee of the whole. The following is an extract: "This House is of opinion that it is wise to defer the consideration of so organic a change in the constitution until the general election shall have been held during the present year;" which passed, and established the policy again of consulting the people at the polls. It would be worth while to scan the policy of the leading men of this country for the past few years. Dr. Tupper has been one of these leading men, and I will therefore be right in criticising his public acts and endeavoring to ascertain the ideas on which he acted. In 1859 he advocated strongly the principle that we should not accept the railway guarantee, and fasten a railway system on the country without going to the polls. Does not that shew that his conviction was in favor of giving the people the freest and widest expression of opinion on any important change? In 1861, during a constitutional debate, we find him again expressing a similar opinion, and bringing in petitions tallying with his views. Those petitions enunciated the principle that though the measures of the government might be supported by a small numerical number in the House, yet when the people outside expressed different views, it was the duty of the Governor to interpose his prerogative, dissolve the House, and let the people be heard. That convinces me that Dr. Tupper's mind was imbued with the idea of the power which the people ought to possess.

is a fair question. I will this Assembly for the last inculcating no ment? They of consulting announced; Mr. ion of Response accepted the sulted in a ma- . In 1837 the e Government and the ques- should continue d to continue. en the House l respecting the ough by some de elective, and ie. This House l the principle he opinions of ned. A resolu- le:

ould be premature on so material a on, and that the ough to be first

passed a resolu- principle that slative Council, of an appointed without an ap- . Then again as established, had again un- of an Elective al days, a reso- committee of the tract: "This wise to defer the l change in the l election shall present year;" the policy again the polls. It an the policy of ry for the past en one of these fore be right in endeavoring to h he acted. In ie principle that way guarantee, on the country Does not that as in favor of and widest ex- ny important institutional de- passing a similar etitions tallying ons enunciated measures of the rted by a small House, yet when different views, or to interpose House, and let nvinces me that ed with the idea e ought to pos-

sess. In 1863 we find a similar expression of his opinions in this resolution: "that on the eve of a general election it would be as unwise as it was inoperative to pass the resolution now before us."

Here again the thought it was a sound principle to allow the people to decide for themselves. I might go through the letters and speeches of Messrs. McCully and Archibald, and shew that they expressed the same desire to let the people rule, but I will not trouble the House with further remarks on that branch of the subject, and will come down to the action of the delegates in England in England. Here I may say it becomes necessary that there should be put on record the fact that when politicians undertake to tamper with the rights of a free people they must suffer, as the just consequences of their acts, disgrace, shame, ignominy, and consignment to private life. This view of the case should be put plainly forward.

We find after the delegates went to England something stated in the Queen's Speech, which no honest man in this Province will endorse: "that the delegates represented all parties and opinions in this Province." I think there is no man with hardihood enough to assert that Archibald and McCully led at that time the old Liberal party in this Province. It is true that years ago when the party lines were drawn they did lead the Liberal party to a certain extent, but they did not in England represent the opinions of that party. The Confederation scheme destroyed all party lines in this country, and when to-day I look around these benches and see Liberals and Conservatives joined hand in hand to free the country from the Confederation Act, I feel that all party ties are broken, and that the people have come together for a common protection. The statement therefore that the delegates represented all parties was untrue. If I am asked for further proof of my assertion, I point to the history of the Quebec scheme:—The delegates went to Quebec and prepared their scheme in secret,—they returned, and by the action of an honest Prince Edward Islander, the people became aware of its nature. As soon as the public got hold of it, meetings were held, the scheme was condemned, and Archibald and McCully were likewise condemned as the prominent men of their party. And yet after that they dared to go to England, and claim to represent the opinions of the old Liberal party in this country, and caused such a statement to be put in the Queen's Speech. It was patent to every one that the Quebec scheme was condemned as not being what the country wanted. I will next turn attention to what occurred in the House of Commons, and with all respect for that body that it deserves, with no desire to use a harsh expression concerning any man, I must say there is a responsibility resting upon every one of us to call things by their proper names, and to speak our true feelings. We look at what took place in the British Parliament, and stand aghast at the statements made and means used to pass this Act. Does any man pretend to say that there the truth prevailed, or that our delegates discharged their duties faithfully? Who was Dr. Tupper? Was he

not as it were our sentinel—the representative of our Government, bound by the ties of duty to speak the truth, nay sir, to speak the whole truth and *nothing but the truth*? What, then, was the truth which he was called upon to state? In the discussion in the House of Commons the fact came out that the question had not been submitted to the people at the polls. Mr. Bright enunciated the principle that before so material a change in the constitution could be made, tearing up our old constitutions and forming new ones, the people should in justice be consulted. That announcement struck the ear of Mr. Watkin, who was supporting the measure, as requiring an answer, and although he was trying to press the bill through at all hazards, caring little for us and much for Canada, he thought it necessary to consult Dr. Tupper about the facts. Dr. Tupper's statement of the matter at Truro was something to this effect: "Mr. Watkin left his seat, came over and spoke to me, we went aside and conversed, &c." It is plain that Mr. Watkin desired to know whether the measure had ever been before the people or not, and he should have had a prompt and candid reply. According to Dr. Tupper's own statement, Mr. Watkin got from him an answer, and it is not pretended that Watkin even conversed with any other person on the subject at that time except Dr. Tupper. After consultation, he returned to his seat, and made a statement which we all know to be *untrue*.

The SPEAKER suggested that it would be better not to discuss the proceedings in another Parliament.

Mr. PURDY continued.—The answer which Mr. Watkin gave is on record, and any man can read it for himself. I shall be clearly in order in saying that Dr. Tupper should have been there as the guardian of our rights and interests, bearing our commission, and in the discharge of his duties if he heard a man state an *untruth* he should have corrected that untruth—he should have stated that the question *never* was submitted to the people at the polls.

(The usual hour for recess having arrived, the House adjourned and resumed at three o'clock, when the debate was resumed, and Mr. Purdy continued.)—It has been contended that Dr. Tupper's answer to Mr. Watkin was based on a lecture delivered in St. John by the former; that lecture, then, has some prominence on this question. I cannot say what its contents were, for it was never published or circulated in this Province. I find, however, in referring to the *Colonist* of that period, some extracts from the press of New Brunswick which show pretty well what the views entertained there on the subject were. The *Colonist*, which was the exponent of Dr. Tupper's opinions, copied this extract from the *St. John Morning News*:—

"The lecturer was a fair type of the displeased or disappointed Conservative. It was evident, from the moment he stepped off neutral political ground, that it was his intention to have a dash at somebody; and if he could not succeed in the tournament to unhorse his adversaries, indulging in certain foolish political notions of their own, he would at least be able to shiver a lance over the backs of his audience,—let people know at all events what he thought of demagogues, governors, and colonial slavery. The burthen

of the lecture implied that responsible government was a delusion; that governors have too much power; that colonists were tied hand and foot to the chariot wheels of Downing street; that our statesmen were nobodies; that beyond the limits of their respective provinces they were unknown; that England snubbed us at every turn, and when she had a treaty to make with a foreign power the colonies were regarded with contempt, and their territories and fishing privileges taken away from them."

I will not weary the House with lengthy extracts, but I wish to direct attention briefly to the circumstances surrounding the political questions of that day, for I believe that such a view will shew the justice of the remarks which I have quoted. Dr. Tupper was fresh from a constitutional debate in which he imagined that the grievances were entirely on his side. I deny that at that time he had within his brain any practical idea about the Union of the Colonies, and if I am asked for the proof, I reply that immediately after delivering the lecture alluded to, he delivered a lecture to another audience in Portland, (St. John), not on a confederated Union of the Provinces as a whole, but on a legislative Union of the Maritime Provinces only. If he were consistent in the one lecture he was not in the other, and thus the remarks of the *News* are justified. It may seem out of place to refer to this matter, but it should be remembered that on these lectures has been based the argument that the people at the polls had taken the subject into consideration, which is not true. Much has been said on the constitutional branch of the argument, but as I not a lawyer, I cannot be expected to deal very fully with it. I would however direct the attention of that great constitutional lawyer the leader of the opposition, to the remarks of Mr. Adderly, in the House of Commons. Referring to an Act passed in the previous session, he said:

"In 1861 Nova Scotia took the lead in promoting the scheme of union, and was the first to propose that delegates should be sent to this country, to confer on the subject with the then Colonial Minister the Duke of Newcastle, who promised that, if the desire of the colonies for the union were clearly made out, the proposition would be taken into careful consideration by this country. He mentioned this circumstance, because it had been recently asserted that the Government at home had pressed this matter on reluctant colonies. In consequence of the Duke of Newcastle's reply to the proposal of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, that colony, together with the other maritime provinces, proposed at the end of 1864 to hold a conference, and then for the first time Canada came forward, asking to be permitted to form part of the conference. It was material that that fact should be borne in mind, because it had been stated that Canada had, for its own local purpose, urged the measure on the smaller provinces. It had been said that the difficulties of Canada had been the cause of the proposal for the union. It certainly was true that at that moment Canada had constitutional difficulties to contend with; but they were no more the cause of the proposition for the union of the provinces than the divorce of Henry VIII was the cause of the Reformation, though they might have been acts which precipitated what all desired."

I take it for granted that Mr. Adderley had in his mind the fact that the Colony had representative institutions, and therefore concluded that its people had a right to be consulted before their constitution was broken down. Some persons think that we had no right to discuss the propriety of the Union Act, but that we must take just whatever the

British Government may choose to give us. With all due deference to the wisdom and forethought of the statesmen who were engaged in the passage of the Act, I submit that we should be allowed to express an opinion upon the Act itself, and upon its details. I could refer back to shew that the policy of the British Government has not always been the best, and that they have made mistakes which they afterwards admitted. For example their policy towards the thirteen Colonies was not a wise one. Referring to the Confederation Act, I find in the clause respecting the Intercolonial Railway, something which goes to prove that the delegates exceeded their authority under the resolution of our legislature. This clause appears in the Act as the consideration in a bond, and is as follows:—

"Inasmuch as the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have joined in a Declaration that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway is essential to the consolidation of the Union of British North America, and to the assent thereto of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and have consequently agreed that provision should be made for its immediate construction by the Government of Canada: Therefore, in order to give effect to that agreement, it shall be the duty of the Government and Parliament of Canada to provide for the commencement, within six months after the Union, of a railway connecting the River St. Lawrence with the city of Halifax in Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof with out intermission, and the completion thereof, with all practicable speed."

It would appear from that that the delegates accepted the terms which they got in consideration of the railway, and if we leave that clause out the inference is that their assent would not have been given. No person authorized the delegates to make the railway the consideration for Union—before they did so some one must have had the right to be consulted, and the question is who should it have been? I answer that in my belief the people, whose destinies were in the hands of these men, whose interests for weal or for woe were to be affected, should have had an opportunity of adjudicating on the whole matter. But it is urged by many that because certain leading men were in favor of Confederation, therefore there was necessity for consulting the people. With all respect for the learning and discretion of the members of the learned professions who favor Union, I take it for granted that they can hardly claim to be able to judge of what our farming interests require, so well as the 48,000 farmers, head of families, do know what is likely to affect their interests as well as doctors and lawyers. Again, would you exclude the 16,000 mechanics of this Province, the merchants, and all those who represent the industry, trade and commerce of the country from saying what affects their interests? Would you take from our 15,000 fishermen the right to have their voice in a matter so deeply affecting their welfare? Must the rights of all these classes be disposed of upon the *ipse dixit* of a few individuals, however learned and intelligent they may be? Responsibility in this matter must attach to somebody, and who was it that prevented the people from being consulted? Who were the men who were bold enough to take hold of the constitution and stifle the voice of the

choose to give us the wisdom and who were engaged, I submit that press an opinion in its details. I at the policy of not always been made mistakes. For example thirteen Colonies to the Confederation respecting something which delegates exceeded resolution of our peers in the Act, and is as follows:

Canada, Nova Scotia in a Declaration of Colonial Railway is the Union of British hereto of Nova Scotia have consequently made for its immediate benefit of Canada: to that agreement, and Parliament the commencement, of a railway connecting the city of Halifax with the city of St. John, and on thereof, with all

that the delegates they got in and if we leave is that their assent. No person make the railway before they did the right to be is who should it in my belief the in the hands of for weal or for ill had an; on the whole many that before in favor of there was necessity. With all respect ion of the mem ions who favor d that they can dge of what our well as the 48,000, do know interests as well gain, would you be of this Province those who represent commerce of the affects their in- from our 15,000 their voice in a their welfare? as be disposed few individuals, ent they may be? must attach to at prevented the? Who were the to take hold of the voice of the

electors of this country? Bold men they must have been who usurped the functions of every man in the Province. They were the men who advocated the principle of going to the polls with every important measure,—some of them had placed on record that resolution declaring that no change should take place even in the Legislative Council without the people being consulted. When they undertook to undermine the constitution, to usurp the rights and stifle the voice of Nova Scotia, they should have shrunk from the responsibility, and asked themselves “are we the men to seize upon the liberties of the people after all the pledges we have given, turn reseruant to the trust reposed in, and prevent them from being heard at the polls?” I have asked “who are the men?” I mention first the name of Dr. Tupper, not because it gives me any great pleasure to do so, but because I hold him responsible in the first degree. Being the leader of the Government, he, of all other men, should not have been guilty of this arbitrary exercise of authority. If it is asked how he came to be in power I answer that when the delegates to Charlottetown had got permission of the Governor General to go to Quebec, there to arrange the terms of Union, he, as leader of the Government, should have said “no, the people have never been consulted, and I will not go unless it is understood fairly that the people will be heard before the matter is decided on.” Again, he went voluntarily to England on the delegation,—could he not then have said to the House of Assembly, “I will accept the introduction which the resolution of this Legislature will give me, but a clause must be put in which will bring the matter back to the people at the polls.” Nor is that all,—when he went to England and decided on the scheme, even supposing he considered it a good one, he should have considered the rights of the people, and made a provision in the Act by which they would have been consulted. And, coming down to a late stage, if the truth had been told by Mr. Watkin in the House of Commons in answer to Mr. Bright’s remarks, the operations of the Act would have been suspended until it came back for ratification. Where is the authority for such a course? has been asked.

The Leader of the Opposition refers us to the Corn Laws, the Emancipation Laws, and the Reform Bills. Perhaps his reasoning upon this point may be sound, but it struck me as being a piece of special pleading to say that because the British Parliament passed measures like those, it could pass an act like that which brought about Confederation, destroying our Constitution and affecting every interest of the country. True, those enactments altered, to some extent, the representation of the country, but the highmindedness and honor of British statesmen called upon them to deliver a portion of their people from injustice. Englishmen have ever been jealous of their rights, and so are we. After those measures had been passed the Parliament still remained; it could have repealed them and restored matters to their old condition. This Confederation Act, on the contrary, takes from us the power of altering the laws to suit our Province.

Coming down to a later date we have had cited as a precedent the union of Cape Breton. Now we know that if a witness is put into the box he is considered guilty of perjury if he fails to tell the whole truth. The leader of the Opposition, when he quoted that precedent, should have told us fairly that Cape Breton had no Legislative Assembly. Again the union of the Canadas was effected after the rebellion there, and when commissioners were exercising military authority. Surely these instances bear no comparison to our case: we were in peace and prosperity, legislating according to our constitution, with no sign of quarrel or rebellion. Precedents upon our side of the question have been cited in numbers, the case of the other colonies, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland being proof of the way in which our people would have been treated if the Legislature had acted fairly. I think, however, that the challenge to cite precedents came from the wrong quarter—precedents should come from those who seek to justify the charge that has been made. We asked no change, and those who urged it should be prepared with precedents to establish their authority for what they did. It is hard to find cases exactly in point, for in the history of no country possessing representative institutions has there been such an attempt to subvert the constitution. Precedents which do not apply to the condition of affairs established when the principle of Responsible Government were conceded are not in point, because the Imperial Government, having granted us certain privileges, will not revoke them. It has been clearly shewn that important measures have from time to time been submitted to the decision of the people at the polls, and surely that is the course which should have been followed in this instance. It may be considered out of place for me, a layman, to refer to any legal point, but I have found one reference which seems to me to be applicable to this question. In 1825 the British Parliament passed an Act, chap. 114, containing a clause worded in such a way that it will not be denied that thereby some rights were conceded to us, and if that be the case the Union Act cannot be successfully defended as constitutional. It has not inaptly been said that this Union Act was good for those who advocated it. Perhaps if we search all the records of history we cannot find a measure which holds out so many rewards for its friends. The system of increased salaries and multiplication of offices was one of the most objectionable features of the scheme, next to that which destroyed our powers of legislation. I need not descant at great length on the loss which Nova Scotia will experience by the change,—we lose our public works of nearly every description, and although we go into the Confederation with nearly an equal debt, yet there is in point of fact no comparison between the debt of the Canadas and of Nova Scotia, for ours does not represent a dollar of deficiency, while that of Canada represents twenty-two millions of revenue deficit.

I will now briefly allude to the operation of this Act since the 1st of July. One of the main arguments of those who supported

Union principles, was, that although our representation was small, yet our power and influence would be equal to that which controlled the former Canadian Government, and would, therefore, be equal to our wants. But when we look at the history of the Dominion Parliament we see how inadequate that representation has been found. We see that our rights have been disregarded, an injurious tariff has been enacted, and our representatives, even when aided by those of New Brunswick, were powerless to effect any change when the members from Upper and Lower Canada combined against them. Look, again, at the policy of that Parliament respecting our coal. When we asked for a small duty on American coal, we were told that for the Canadians to tax themselves for our benefit would be preposterous. One great characteristic of our Government has always been economy,—we incurred no debt beyond what was necessary for our public works, and presented a fair example of the benefits of representative institutions; but the policy of the Union Act is to create a large and expensive Government, with extravagance prevailing in every branch of the public service. The Legislative Assembly of Canada had more clerks and pages than members, and so on throughout the other Departments. Some remarks were made to the effect that if Repeal was obtained it would injure the prospects of the railway to New Brunswick. I will not detain the House further than to mention the bare facts of the case: that the railway can be built without Confederation and without an increased tariff, is surely too plain to require discussion. The branch from Truro to Amherst was put under contract some two or three years ago, and as our revenues were then considered sufficient to meet the subsidy, I take it that I need not labor the argument. The Annapolis road is to be built by subsidy, and the trunk line would be far more advantageous to a Company who would undertake it. But a still stranger fact is, that so late as June last, within the time that Confederation was to take effect, a Company actually did make an offer to build the road on the terms of the old contract. I have no doubt, therefore, that the road can be built as soon as New Brunswick is ready to connect with us, provided our financial affairs are restored to their former condition. We have always been ready to connect with New Brunswick and Canada, and the fault has lain with them, by not performing their part of the agreement.

In bringing my observations to a close, I wish to make a few remarks on the election of 1867. It has been said by some that the question of Confederation did not enter largely into the consideration of the people at that election. I think that the facts are too plain to require much discussion; if we are to judge by the amount of government influence used to defeat the anti-confederate party, we have a pretty good guide as to the struggle which the friends of union made to carry their principles. False arguments innumerable had to be met; the people were told that we were not going to have the Canadian tariff, and it has turned out that the only alteration has been in lowering the duty on liquors and raising that on the necessities of

life. In referring to the influences brought to bear in Cumberland, it may not be amiss for me to state how it was that two unionists should have been elected there. I undertake to declare that but for the government influences and the unfair means of every kind used, the unionists would have been swept off the board. What was the position of affairs in Cumberland? I declared for repeal, and that is the policy which the county favours this day, although Dr. Tupper secured a seat, and also a gentleman who sits here. I had not wealth or influence in my favor; the votes which were given for me were given voluntarily, while in favor of our opponents means such as were never before practised on any people were brought into operation. The same may be said of other counties. The road moneys have been laid under contribution without the authority of the House; salaries were increased in the same way, and other shameful devices practised to secure support. The hon. leader of the opposition is a confederate, and I may fairly ask how it is that Inverness sends a man to occupy the position? I find that in that county only 800 votes out of 2000 were polled for union; and, without going into a discussion which will come on more properly hereafter, I may say that Inverness, like Cumberland, is anti-confederate at heart. The leader of the opposition has complained a good deal of being obliged alone to combat the arguments of so many gentlemen on this side of the question. He has himself to blame for his position, and is therefore entitled to no sympathy. When I heard his complaints the other day, I was reminded of one we read of who called for a drop of water to cool his parched tongue; the hon. member may weep and wail and bemoan himself, but the fault is his own. The rights of the people have been trampled on, and any one who goes to his succor and support must take his life in his hand as he crosses the gulf of public opinion. Every man here has a solemn duty to discharge, and I trust that duty will be faithfully done. What are we here for today? To obtain the repeal of the Union Act so far as it affects us, to assert the rights of the people, and to demand the privileges which the British constitution extends to us. When the vote is taken, these duties will be discharged in a way that will do honour to the House and to the country. Let me say, finally, that whatever decision may be arrived at, the result affects not only us but every British colony. Hereafter, whenever the privileges of any people are invaded, the precedent of the violation of our constitution will be urged; and therefore it is to the interest of all the colonies to assist us in our struggle for repeal.

Mr. DOUCETTE said: Mr. Speaker, at this late hour, I will not detain the House by any lengthened observations of mine. In the name of the people which I have the honor to represent, I repudiate the British North America Act as unconstitutional and oppressive, and calculated to reduce the people of this once happy province to a state of servitude and degradation. With these few remarks, I shall support the resolutions laid on the table by the hon. Attorney General.