

Debate on resolutions relative to repeal of the "British North America Act"
in the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia; session 1868
[S.l. : s.n., 1868?]

Find this Book Online: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5n87v48g>

Digitized by
INTERNET ARCHIVE

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA



Public Domain

We have determined this work to be in the public domain, meaning that it is not subject to copyright. Users are free to copy, use, and redistribute the work in part or in whole. It is possible that current copyright holders, heirs or the estate of the authors of individual portions of the work, such as illustrations or photographs, assert copyrights over these portions. Depending on the nature of subsequent use that is made, additional rights may need to be obtained independently of anything we can address.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2026-09-15 21:35 GMT

ad from books

would not have not been done but I was pro- who now loud- a right to pass- ing it to the acts some time. Tilley, in ad- ohn, said: He re is the least the people up- o them at the accordance with nest man, sub- ad our people on would have deal has also ency of certain e. It matters :. Howe was in- advocated Con- to the people ve been freely at that name is al names, that will live in the otians when the will have gone

they sprung, 3."

can be adduced England. It is people were op- n it could not . Pitt, through reach, by dis- ney and titles iament, secured But what has people feeling of their Parlia- ever since been after another, d tens of thou- iled themselves ying with them leadly hostility Its are likely to va Scotia. We ve been called and in a letter, e told us about village church, e other associat- l so forth, add- eful what com- ad that produc- aim:— hat word, heart."

nineteen-twen- elling them that of Fenians, cut- have considered in. He was sit- e that letter in upper) who had urer; with Mr. t into rebellion Cartier, who, in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned.

FRIDAY, Feb. 14th.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

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

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

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

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

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

pondence with reference to the Gilchrist Educational Trust Fund.

Mr. CHAMBERS, the petition of Laurilliard and others in reference to a bridge at Upper Stewiacke.

Mr. FREEMAN asked the government for certain information respecting a bridge in Queen's Co.

Mr. PINEO presented a petition from the Custos and Clerk of the Peace of Cumberland asking for an amendment in the License Law.

Mr. EISENHAEUER presented petitions with reference to the gathering of sea manure.

Mr. NORTUPE, a petition from Garrett O'Connor, an aged schoolmaster, asking for a grant of land; also a petition from H. Dunlap and others, in reference to a road.

Mr. BALCAM, a petition from Ship Harbor.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON, a petition of certain rate payers and inhabitants of New Boston and Catalogue, in C. B., asking for a certain quantity of potatoes and oats for seed; also a petition from the ferryman at Little Bras D'Or, asking for additional remuneration.

Dr. BROWN introduced a bill to incorporate the King's Co. Medical Society.

The adjourned debate was then resumed.

MR. PINEO'S SPEECH.

Mr. PINEO rose and said:—In rising to address the House with respect to the resolutions before the House, it is but natural that I should feel some embarrassment. But I feel in endorsing the sentiments expressed in the resolutions introduced by the hon. member for Inverness, that my views will be pretty clearly understood by the House and country, and that, therefore, it will be entirely unnecessary for me to occupy your attention for any great length of time. Like the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Smith) who addressed the House on Wednesday in such an agreeable manner and style, I feel it is a duty that I owe to the country, as well as to myself, to explain the position which I occupy with reference to Confederation and Repeal. I was not instrumental, let me say at the outset, in bringing about this Act of Union, and I do not, therefore, feel myself responsible for the Act itself or its results. It was proclaimed the law of the land—I believe it to have been constitutional; but whilst I entertain that view I still feel that it was hasty on the part of the Government to have passed the measure into law without having first submitted it to the people at the polls. But when it was proclaimed the law of the land I felt it to be my duty to accept the situation, as I consider it to be the duty of every loyal British subject to-day. Now the county I have the honor to represent, abounds in coal fields, grind stone, lime stone, and other stone quarries. It adjoins the County of Colchester, where there is abundance of copper and iron. We have the facilities for all kinds of manufacturing. We have as industrious men and women as are to be found in any part of the world, but we have not the capital to encourage and stimulate the energy and enterprise of our people, and develop our resources. Now, the Act of Confederation requires to us the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, which will pass through the two counties I have mentioned, and necessa-

rily involve the expenditure of a large sum of money. Here then will be employment for our people. The construction of this work will open up a market for everything that our country produces. The circulation of money will stimulate our people and assist them in establishing those manufactures which are so very essential to it, and will be the means of bringing back to Nova Scotia thousands of our people who have left us to seek employment elsewhere. To repeal the Act of Confederation will destroy all this. We may be differently situated in Cumberland from any other county in the Province, but situated as we are we look forward hopefully to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, which our public men have attempted in vain for so many years to accomplish, but have never succeeded until the Act of Confederation was passed.

But can we have repeal by passing the resolutions laid on the table by the Attorney General? I believe not. I believe as firmly as I believe that the Act of Confederation is constitutional that we will never have the Union repealed until it has had a fair trial, and proved to be what its enemies declare it will be. I believe that these resolutions are based on a fallacy, which will be easily seen by British statesmen. It may be expected that I should come forward to assist the hon. member for Inverness in resisting the attacks made on the late government, but I do not consider he required any assistance at my hands. He is ready and able to defend himself here and elsewhere, and actuated as I am under existing circumstances to assume a responsibility which does not naturally devolve upon me would be very rash and imprudent. I stated on a former occasion that I do not intend to indulge in any factious opposition, but no matter what minority I might be in, I would assist the Government in passing all measures that are necessary for the country. Entertaining the opinions I do of the resolutions moved by the hon. Attorney General, and believing as I do that time and circumstances will prove me to be right, I feel it to be my duty to support the amendments of the hon. member for Inverness.

MR. DICKIE'S SPEECH.

Mr. DICKIE followed and said:—Mr. Speaker, in attempting to address this House on the resolutions on the table, I shall not say anything in regard to the constitutionality of this question, for that part of the subject has been so ably handled by the gentlemen who have preceded me, that anything I might say would only be taking up the time of this House unnecessarily. I propose, sir, to look at this question in the light of a commercial transaction. In taking this view of it, I am aware it may be said that I am assuming very low ground—that I am taking a narrow and contracted view of the question, unworthy of so great a Confederation, so vast a Dominion. This may, to some extent, be the case, but you must be aware that a wise man once said, "money answereth all things," and without money what can any country be? It is necessary to the life, the prosperity, and the happiness of a country, that

large sum
ployment for
of this work
anything that
ulation of
and assist
manufactures
and will be
Nova Scotia
ve left us to
repeal the
all this. We
Cumberland
ovince, but
rward hope-
intercolonial
en have at-
rs to accom-
until the Act

ising the re-
he Attorney
ve as firmly
ederation is
ver have the
a fair trial,
ies declare it
olutions are
e easily seen
be expected
eist the hon.
ing the at-
ent, but I do
assistance at
le to defend
actuuated as
s to assume
naturally de-
rash and im-
ecession that
factions op-
minority I
Government
re necessary
he opinions I
the hon. At-
as I do that
ve me to be
support the
er for Inver-

ECHE.

—Mr. Speak-
House on the
not say any-
utionality of
e subject has
ntlemen who
I might say
time of this
sir, to look
a commercial
w of it, I am
am assuming
ing a narrow
tion, unwor-
n, so vast a
e extent, be
e that a wise
all things,"
n any coun-
fe, the pros-
country, that

its financial condition should be sound, as it is necessary that the sun should shine and the rain should fall so that the face of mother earth may be clothed with verdure. And, sir, when laying the foundations of so great a Dominion, the utmost care should be taken that no interest should suffer in the slightest degree. The slightest variation of the compass may wreck the noble ship, and send her crew and passengers to a watery grave; so the smallest deviation from the path of justice in laying the foundations of an Empire, might ultimately cause its destruction. The Legislature of this Province when (constitutionally or not) appointing delegates to arrange a scheme of Confederation, stipulated that such a scheme should be equitable and just to all the provinces, and I propose to show that they did not carry out that stipulation. In July last, I made a calculation based on the revenue and expenditure of 1866, and estimated that the Dominion Government would receive from Nova Scotia, under our tariff, \$370,000 more than she would have to pay.

I showed this House the other day that, according to Mr. Rose's statement, the Dominion has received at the rate of \$366,000 per year, or \$152,400 for five months, and no gentleman undertook to gainsay the statement—it cannot be done—it stands as a record of the past and a foretaste of the future. I also showed that the difference between the tariff of Nova Scotia and the tariff of the Dominion would take from Nova Scotia in addition \$732,000. None disputed it, nor can they do so. These two amounts make \$1,097,000; add to this the Stamp Act, the Postage Act, and the Bank tax, and you have not less than 23,000 more, or \$1,120,000 for the year 1866, had we then been confederated. Is this fair, is this just? Is this such a scheme as they were charged to arrange? No—nothing of the kind. Were they ignorant of what they were doing? I would fain believe so if I could; but, sir, even the mantle of charity which covereth a multitude of sins, is not ample enough to cover so grave an error. It is utterly impossible that they should not have known that the bargain was a ruinous one for Nova Scotia; and, sir, we are compelled to look further for some cause that operated on their minds with greater force than the welfare of their country.

We have an inkling of this cropping out at the convention held in Quebec, where, it is said, they were at sixes and sevens until it was understood that the Dominion would elect three Governors for the different Provinces, and there would be a number of heads of departments and vacant senatorships to be filled. Then, as if by magic, this pipe of peace allayed all strife and differences of opinion, and each was enabled to see in this great scheme everything to admire and nothing to condemn. It could be compared in their estimation to but one thing under heaven—that to which nothing is to be added, neither anything to be taken away.

Sir, let me turn the attention of this House to what this Province has been enabled to do in the past, and from that judge what she might do in the future if left as we were. It

has been one of the great arguments of our opponents that had we remained as we were we would have had to raise our tariff. I deny it, sir, and I ask for the proof. The customs' revenues of Nova Scotia were—

\$608,939	in 1861
835,657	" 1862
861,669	" 1863
990,169	" 1864
1,047,891	" 1865
1,226,898	" 1866

This is an average annual increase in the past 4 years of 12½ per cent., and at the same average rates we might expect—

\$1,379,697	in 1867
1,552,159	" 1868
1,745,178	" 1869
1,963,200	" 1870

This is a calculation based upon the records of the past; and there is no reason why these amounts may not be realized in the future, except it be that the unsettled state of the country has been thrown into by those who have attempted to dispose of our revenues, and deprive us of our dearest rights, the rights of free men. But this is only our revenue from customs; our total revenue was:

In 1861,	\$ 892,324
1862,	1,270,817
1863,	1,249,103
1864,	1,174,918
1865,	1,731,855
1866,	1,857,148

Under an average increase, we would have:

In 1867,	\$2,089,291
1868,	2,350,452
1869,	2,644,258
1870,	2,974,790

And this, too, under our own tariff. So with our finances in this condition, we would be enabled to meet all our liabilities, and build our proportion of the Intercolonial Railroad, if required.

But, sir, if we were to collect duties under a Canadian tariff, we would have collected, in addition to what we have collected under our tariff:

In 1864,	\$ 603,531
1865,	688,522
1866,	732,000
1867,	823,500
1868,	926,544
1869,	1,042,247
1870,	1,172,252

a sum of itself sufficient to build the Intercolonial road, and pay for it too in less than 30 years, by placing the surplus in a sinking fund. And this, I hesitate not to say, is a sum paid by Nova Scotia to the Dominion Government, increasing every year as our imports increase, and for which Ontario and Quebec pay to the general fund no equivalent. But when I put the two amounts together and add to them the other taxes I have already enumerated, you would have

In 1864,	\$ 884,950
1865,	99,556
1866,	1,120,000
1867,	1,260,000
1868,	1,417,500
1869,	1,594,687
1870,	1,764,023

I may be told we will not continue to prosper in the future as we have in the past. If that is the argument, then the whole fabric falls to the ground, for has not their whole argument been that under Confederation every interest would prosper, our trade would be enlarged, and the hum of our busy workshops would be heard from one end of the Province to the other—and to quote the words of a reverend and learned lecturer, the present generation would see Halifax expanded to such an extent that Bedford Basin would be a mere frog pond in the centre of the town. If these anticipations are to be realized my estimates are a long way inside of the mark, for the greater our trade the more money Canada takes from us.

If my anticipations are not realized, it will be because this Confederation has crippled our trade, destroyed our manufactures, and reduced our people, and forced them to live more cheaply and consume less dutiable goods. You may take either horn of the dilemma you please, there can be but one result.

Now let me turn your attention to our local requirements, and ask how we can meet them under Confederation. We expended for Agriculture; Board of Works; Crown Lands; Education; Legislative Expenses; Mines and Minerals; Navigation Securities; Printing; Roads and Bridges:

In 1862,	\$318,340
1863,	396,849
1864,	555,973
1865,	629,202
1866,	851,699

And at the same rate we would require:

In 1867,	\$ 985,014
1868,	1,149,183
1869,	1,313,352
1870,	1,477,521

On the other hand we would only have under Confederation:

In 1866,	\$442,000
1867,	465,000
1868,	489,000
1869,	517,000
1870,	550,000

Sums totally inadequate to meet the wants of these services as we have met them formerly; and the consequence would be that after we had contributed millions of dollars to Canada for the support of the Dominion Government, we would either have to allow our local wants to suffer, or tax ourselves directly for large amounts to meet their increasing wants.

But, sir, I have only been arguing hitherto on the supposition that the Dominion would only require from Nova Scotia the amount raised by the present Tariff, Stamp Act, Postage Bill, and Bank tax. A vain delusion, as I will presently show. People unite and form partnerships in order to accomplish together what they could not alone. On this principle we have, for large enterprises, joint stock companies. On the same principle this Confederation was formed, and the enterprises she has undertaken are, first, the Intercolonial Railroad, at a cost, it is said, of twenty millions of dollars; the purchase and open-

ing up of the North West Territory, variously estimated at from thirty to fifty millions more; then a Welland canal is in contemplation at from twenty to thirty millions more. And where is even the interest of the money to come from? for it seems to be a settled principle with our politicians that only the interest of money is to be provided for; the principal is left to future generations,—who it is expected will be able to do what the present cannot;—but how we are not told. Why, sir, when we turn to the estimates laid before the Dominion Parliament by the Hon. Mr. Rose, what do we find? Why, we find an estimated expenditure of \$14,301,301

Estimated income 14,457,400

Leaving a surplus of only \$156,099

and this does not include \$1,925,500 expended on capital account. More than this, to my surprise there is nothing in these estimates providing for the Intercolonial railroad, North West Territory, or a Welland canal, the interest of which will amount to from five to seven millions, and of which Nova Scotia will have to pay her share in addition to all the sums I have enumerated. Yet all this is considered by the delegates and their friends fair and equitable; this is the scheme that was to do justice to all parties. If the foundation was laid thus let me ask what the superstructure is to be like.

Sir, did you ever hear of any number of persons going into partnership without taking into account the goods and chattels placed in the firm? What would you think if several gentlemen here should enter a partnership, and should place in one common fund their cash, their lands, their houses, their ships and their stocks, without putting any appraised value upon them, or without taking them into account at a certain valuation? And still you see the founders of this Dominion placing at the disposal of the Dominion the railroads of Nova Scotia without equivalent or compensation, to say nothing of our lighthouses, breakwaters, canals, and public buildings. Sir, I should have thought that one of the first things to be done would have been to have appointed a commission to appraise all the public property, and to arrange the same in a fair and equitable manner; and when they failed to do this they failed to carry out the very letter and spirit of their instructions. Had an enemy by force of arms conquered the country, he could not have done more than take all the public buildings and works as they have done, except to levy contributions on the inhabitants, and even this they have not failed in, for we see our revenues not only taken by our conquerors, but also raised 55 per cent.—and all this, in my estimation, is only a foretaste of what is to come.

When they talk of “accepting the situation”—of working the thing out, do they understand their position?—do they think where they are leading the country to? They cannot, surely! They have never carefully and honestly looked the situation in the face, or made any calculations as to the result, or they would not give such advice as that.

, various-
y millions
ontempla-
ons more.
he money
a settled
only the
d for; the
rations,—
o what the
not told.
mates laid
the Hon.
we find an
14,301,301
14,457,400

\$156,099

DO expend-
on this, to
these esti-
al railroad,
canal, the
om five to
ova Scotia
ion to all
all this is
eir friends
ne that was
foundation
the super-

number of
ithout tak-
d chattels
you think
ter a part-
e common
eir houses,
ut putting
or without
rtain valu-
unders of
osal of the
otia with-
say noth-
rs, canals,
ould have
ngs to be
ppointed a
ublic pro-
a fair and
y failed to
be very let-
p. Had an
the coun-
than take
s as they
butions on
y have not
not only
raised 55
imation, is
e.

the situ-
t, do they
they think
untry to?
never care-
tation in
as to the
h advice as

Allow me now to turn the attention of this House to another phase of this remarkable Confederation. The history of the Grand Trunk Railroad is to some extent familiar to most in this House. That it aways and largely influences the political affairs of Canada few will venture to deny; and, sir, I have reason to believe that the influence of that Company have had much, very much to do in bringing about this Confederation. Its influence on the politicians of Canada none can well define. When we turn our attention to England, we find the stockholders in that country throwing all the weight of their influence and position to further this scheme, and Mr. Watkin, the chairman, in his place in Parliament, standing up and deceiving that Parliament, and making them believe that the people of Nova Scotia had, at the polls, declared themselves in favour of this scheme. This closed the mouths of our friends in Parliament; they were unprepared to give him a flat denial, and under this misrepresentation they were led to pass this Act and do a cruel wrong to this country. It would be a libel on the love of justice and fair play, inherent in the breast of every Englishman to suppose for a moment that when they were shewn, as I trust they will be, the wrong they have done, that they will not take immediate steps to repair that wrong in the only way possible by a repeal of so much of it as applies to Nova Scotia. You may say what object had the Grand Trunk Directors in all this. 'Tis plain to be seen and judged of by their past history. They evidently, by their great power, will control the building of the Intercolonial, and make fortunes out of it, as Hincks did out of the Grand Trunk, and when finished will, in all probability, wind up the affair by saddling the two roads on the Dominion Government at such a price as will enable them to secure the services of members who in the past have, by their sudden commissions, laid themselves open in the public estimation to have been convinced by the strong arguments of gold and position rather than by the love of country and its welfare.

Sir, I will now turn the attention of this House to a statement made by the member for Inverness, and which he complains has not yet been answered; namely, that the Dominion Government have actually paid for Nova Scotia up to the present more than they received. Admit, for the sake of argument, that it is strictly true. If you will, what does it prove taken in connection with what I proved to the gentleman, and which it is not worth while to repeat? It proves but this, if they did so it was on account of our debt, for which they were bound to provide, and for which we pay them interest, and if they had paid in the first six months the whole eight millions, and cancelled all our bonds by bonds of the Dominion, or by cash, could any one be so bold as to declare that we had been the gainers by the sum of eight millions in the first six months? And yet this is the whole of his argument.

There is one other point I would turn your attention to, namely: In all those calculations I have, for the sake of argument, assumed that the Dominion Government will provide for all the services turned over to them in as

efficient a manner as we have done hitherto. Take for illustration the light house service; almost every man in this House and in this country is interested directly or indirectly in having the light houses of our coasts and bays properly cared for, and in the past scarcely a year has gone by that we have not added several new ones. But have we any guarantee that the Dominion Government, sitting in the backwoods of Ottawa, will take the same interest and care of those services that we have. I might apply the same remarks to other services, but I will not occupy the time of the House.

Allow me now to direct attention to a statement published by J. Johnson, Assistant Commissioner at Ottawa, attempting to show the amount that will be collected under the Dominion tariff and that collected under our late tariff, and showing an increase of only \$59,339. This statement is sent broadcast over the face of the country, and shows either the ignorance and utter incompetency of the officer, or that he is attempting wilfully to deceive the people of this country. Let me turn the attention of the House to a few of the statements, and compare them with the revenue actually received according to the Journals of this House:—

	Johnson.	Journals.
Beef and Pork,	\$6,207	\$3,409
Navy Bread,	1,650	1,450
Butter & Lard,	1,749	670
Cheese,	732	332
Flour,	70,321	28,685
Apples,	2,499	447
Brandy,	71,107	56,598
Gin & Whiskey,	101,588	83,662
Rum,	263,869	151,091
Tobacco,	29,787	17,021

And, sir, all the mistakes are on one side of the account, and these make a difference of some \$190,000. When we turn to the amount of imports he lowers those to suit himself, by what authority or right I cannot tell, except it be to deceive the people of this country, as he heads his statement as based on the same imports. He makes some singular statements: for instance, he estimates a saving in flour of \$48,821, and yet the duty on flour is exactly the same under both tariffs, and he actually makes a saving of nearly \$20,000 more than was collected, or that would be saved if flour had been free. Sir, I will not tire this House by wading through any more of his errors. Suffice it to say that the errors in this column foot up some \$265,000.

The average duty of Canada and Nova Scotia was as follows:—

	Canada.	Nova Scotia
1863,	11.2	8.4
1864,	12.6	7.4
1865,	12.	7.2
1866,	13.6	8.5

The average Canadian tariff of last year is 55 per cent. higher than the average of Nova Scotia—and the Dominion tariff of to-day only differs from the Canadian tariff in some half a dozen articles, as I showed on a former day, and which it is not worth while to repeat, and the difference to Nova Scotia is not

more than \$10,000 either way per year. And yet Mr. Johnston tells us that it will only take \$59,339 more than our late tariff. Nova Scotia imported in the year ending 30th Sept., 1866, \$14,381,000, and collected duty \$1,226,398, and the addition of \$59,339 would only be about 41.100 of 1 per cent—which would make the Dominion tariff according to Mr. Johnson only 8 94.100 per cent; call it 9 per cent. for the sake of simplifying it. Apply this to the amount of Canada's imports, and you have \$2,488,516 less than was actually collected; and if Mr. Johnston is right Canada will be relieved by this tariff \$2,488,516 per year, and we will have added to our taxes by it \$59,339. Sir, the statement is unworthy of consideration, and I beg the pardon of this House for occupying so much of their time with a statement so manifestly erroneous; and my excuse is, that it appears to have been issued by authority, and the press of this city are copying, commenting on and endorsing its errors.

In conclusion I will only add in reference to the remarks that fell from the hon. member on a previous day that he may call me what he pleases—may threaten to skin me from head to foot; but I tell him I did not come here to bandy words with any one, but to do the business of the country. I can tell him one thing, and that is, he will never make me sit down as he acknowledged he sat under the tongue lashings of a gentleman some years ago. He confessed that he did not dare defend himself, and that it hurt him so much that he could not sleep all night. When I cannot defend myself I will retire from the House, and go back to my constituents, and tell them I am not fit to fight their battles or contend for their rights.

MR. CHAMBERS' SPEECH.

MR. CHAMBERS said—I do not like to occupy the time of the House when any member is desirous of speaking, but as no one appears about to rise, I shall endeavor to express my opinions on this important subject as concisely as I can. I do not pretend to be a public speaker. There are many gentlemen in this House of whom it may be said that they did not seek these seats, but these benches sought them. They have come here for a patriotic purpose—of freeing their country from a Union into which the people have been unfairly forced, without their consent having been even asked. Many gentlemen would gladly retire from the House, and attend to their own private affairs, if they did not feel impelled by a high sense of duty to remain here.

The hon. member for Inverness and myself started out in life about the same time, and whilst he has pursued one course, I have taken a different one. He has been before the public for twenty years at the bar, and I have no doubt he has been successful; but I have kept steadily at my business, and have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result. If I were inclined to act the egotist, as he did the other day, I could tell him what I have done in Cumberland and Colchester to revolutionize trade. If I had not kept to trade I might be in a bad Government, or looking to

politics for my livelihood. Happy am I that I am not like others we know of, who have been driven out of this country by the indignation of their fellow-countrymen, and forced to seek refuge in the backwoods of Canada, instead of being able to return to their old friends, and received with open arms by their fellow-citizens. I am not here, I confess at once, to make the best, but the worst of Confederation. I am here to express the feelings and opinions of those who have been deeply wronged in connection with this momentous question. We have already had considerable experience of this hated scheme, and can judge of the deep injury we must sustain if we remain much longer in our present humiliating position of subjection to Canada. But I acknowledge that I am open to conviction, and if the hon. member can show us the advantages of Confederation I shall gladly listen to him. My constituents never asked Capt. Morrison or myself what we would do, but they elected us because they believed we were honest men, and therefore we are able to pursue that course which will be most beneficial to the people.

The hon. gentleman has told us that we should pause before proceeding any further, but allow me to advise him and his friends to reconsider their own policy and the consequences that must result from their efforts to thwart the wishes of the people. If he and his party had paused long ere this what an amount of irritation and agitation we would have been spared. Now we see brother against brother, and father against father, and actually in our part of the country we find the wife opposed to the husband. Nobody has done all this but the hon. member and his friends.

The hon. gentleman has asked us to strike out all the words after "that," in the Attorney General's resolutions—certainly a very cool proposition. Why did he not strike out the word "that," also, whilst he was about it? Now, a few words as to the nature of this new political connection. Suppose the hon. member goes up to Ottawa, and after a while engages his daughter to one of the magnates of that capital. Then he returns to Nova Scotia, and after some days he calls his daughter to him and says, "By the bye, my dear, you have to be married to Lord B.; I have no doubt you will be happy, and I will then no longer be at any expense for you." Suppose the daughter would reply that she was unwilling to marry Lord B., but preferred some tradesman in Halifax; or suppose she was a dutiful child, and, despite her feelings, married the individual to whom her father had engaged her without her knowledge or consent—would she ever be happy? In all probability she would drag out a miserable existence, and seek rest at last in an early grave. That is about the way we have been dragged into this Confederation. The hon. member says that it is constitutional; but though I am no lawyer, I know the difference between right and wrong. The hon. member understands the law of books, but I understand the law of common sense.

Now I intended reviewing this tariff, but it has already been so ably handled by gentle-

men
diffi
this
mos
have
plete
cons
be fa
cann
Cana
suit
coun
the
tariff
coun
"No
twine
or an
are n
only
they
see in
say,
and s
we ar
Invoi
ed to
shall
the
geoda
25 pe
led by
to pay
Mr.
would
If he
&c., h
that p
wants
care h
to con
for o
shall
lues, e
to the
chased
a part
value
purch
that?
enough
I know
to Eng
cash, I
goes to
Invoic
stead
could
will re
cash, I
less it
purch
such a
Now lo
it is fi
yellow
an arti
sumpti
they a
third o
course
Canadi
which
hence t

am I that who have the indig- and forced of Canada, their old as by their confess at rest of Cop- he feelings een deeply numentous onsiderable , and can sustain if sent humili- nada. But conviction, us the ada- lably listen asked Capt. d do, but ed we were re able to most bene-

is that we ay further, s friends to the conse- ir efforts to If he and s what an a we would ee brother ust father, ountry we band. No- n. member

is to strike the Attor- nly a very t strike out was about a nature of suppose the and after a one of the he returns ys he calls By the bye, to Lord B.; py, and I xpense for ould reply y Lord B., Halifax; or nd, despite al to whom without her he ever be ould drag ek rest at about the is Confede- at it is con lawyer, I and wrong. the law of of common

riff, but it by gentle-

men, who have preceded me that I find some difficulty in dealing with it. I consider that this tariff has imposed upon us burthens most grievous to be borne. It is true we have been told that the tariff was not complete, but surely they had time enough to consult business men, and arrange it so as to be fair to the interests concerned. This tariff cannot satisfy Nova Scotia, because it is a Canadian tariff. What suits Canada does not suit Nova Scotia, for the interests of the two countries are very different. Each has what the other has not. Take a few items in this tariff in order to see how the interests of this country are affected. First of all we read: "No deduction of charges for packing, straw, twine, cord, paper, cording, wiring, cutting, or any other expenses." These gentlemen are not satisfied to charge duty on the goods only, but actually on musty straw in which they may be packed. (The hon. member I see is taking a note, but I know what he will say, that this refers to bottled wine or porter, and so he may cross out his note.) Again we are told, "No commission charged in any invoice, for the purchase of goods or claimed to have been paid for such purchase, shall be allowed in abatement of the value of the goods for duty." On some low price goods the expenses and commission add full 25 per cent. to their value, which are compelled by these unfeeling gentlemen at Ottawa to pay the duty on the same. Probably if Mr. Blanchard was a trader, as I am, he would not be long on the side where he is now. If he was selling tea, sugar, cotton warp, &c., he would be with us; but he is now in that position that he does not understand the wants of the people, and therefore he did not care how much duty we have to pay. Again, to come to something worse, "No discount for cash shall in any case be allowed, nor shall goods be allowed to entry at cash values, except where it is satisfactorily shown to the Collector that such goods can be purchased only for cash, and then it shall form a part of the affidavit of the importer that the value of such goods was paid at the time of purchase." Whoever heard of a thing like that? I did not think they were smart enough in Canada to do a thing of that kind. I know of a gentleman who has sent an order to England for some goods, and if he pays cash, he will get 10 per cent. discount. If he goes to the Custom House and presents his invoice of an item which cost 9s. cash, instead of 10s. on time, they will ask him, could you not buy it on time? Then they will reply to him, "no discount allowed for cash, neither will a cash bill be allowed unless it be shown that such goods can only be purchased for cash." It appears to me that such a thing is preposterous in the extreme. Now look at refined sugar, and you will find it is fifty per cent. more than it was last year; yellow sugar is one-half more; the latter is an article that enters largely into the consumption of the people of this country, and they are now actually obliged to pay one-third of the value in the shape of duty. Of course this is done to fill the pockets of the Canadians. Then again there is starch, which they wish us to buy from Canada, and hence they impose a higher duty on the im-

ported article; but our ladies prefer the London starch, and will not purchase the inferior article from the Canadians. Well all I can say is, that they may determine as much as they like to make us buy their starch, but I think before we are done with them we will have taken the starch out of them.

I shall say nothing about flour, for we had a duty on it previously, but take corn meal and rye, which certainly should not be taxed, entering as they do, especially the former, into the consumption of the poorer classes. Cinnamon, nutmegs, ginger, mace, &c., are charged 25 per cent., but I do not care what duty is imposed on these things, for they are chiefly used by the rich. Tea is charged 3½ cents a lb. and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. It is urged by some that we do not pay more than a half cent a lb. additional, but I have calculated that it will amount to 2½ cents on tea, which costs 1s. 4d. sterling a lb. Now there is white lead. In Canada dry white lead is used, and therefore it comes in duty free, but if there is a little oil in it, it is taxed 15 per cent. The Canadians have their own oil wells and prepare the paint themselves. The Haligonians, on the other hand, prefer to buy the prepared article, because it saves a vast amount of trouble. We have to import the mills and the oil to prepare it, and it would therefore give us a great deal of expense and trouble. As respects molasses we cannot complain. Mr. Archibald told us on one occasion, whilst they used sugar in Canada, very many of our people used molasses. So we must give him credit for this change which is intended, doubtless, as a fly trap. Rigging, and all kinds of iron for vessels are duty free, but under our own tariff such things only paid 5 per cent. Why the ship owners can better afford to pay a small duty on his vessel's materials than any other class of persons in business. Give us our liberties, and I will guarantee that the hon. members from Yarmouth, Mr. Townsend and Mr. Ryerson, will gladly pay 5 per cent. again. The price of cotton warp has been raised, although it enters so largely into the consumption of our poorer classes, from 5 to 15 per cent. This is certainly a hard case for those people who manufacture cloth, which they sell to buy flour and other necessities of life. Just one more item for example, the duty on low price soap from England will be increased 1000 per cent. If the hon. member for Inverness will (as he said) have the Colchester boys in rags, he surely, surely, should not use his influence to deprive them of cheap soap to keep them clean. It will be remembered that the *ad valorem* duties in Canada was 20 per cent for a number of years, but last year they lowered it to 15 per cent. for the purpose, no doubt, of making Confederation acceptable to the Maritime Provinces. It is well known, however, that Canada went largely behind even with a 20 per cent tariff, and that being the case how is 15 per cent to meet her necessities? What does Mr. Rose say? The *Canadian Journal of Commerce* tells us that according to Mr. Rose's figures of the finances of last year, under a 15 per cent tariff, Canada went behind at the rate of five or six millions of dollars. Suppose they do not purchase the North West

Territory or build the Intercolonial Railway, yet they cannot meet the expenditures with the present 15 per cent duty.

The Attorney General told us the other day that we had now four governments, but we have actually six, and I will show you how that is. We have one in New Brunswick, one in Nova Scotia, one in Ontario and Quebec respectively, and two at Ottawa. They have at the capital two sets of officials, they have one class of people speaking English and the other French. I believe though they may be theoretically one government, there are two practically—two certainly in a pecuniary point of view. I think then if they could not live under a 20 per cent. tariff, they are not likely to meet all their expenditures with their system of government largely increased. Suppose we take in the Northwest Territory, what an immense tract of country will have to be opened up by roads and bridges; suppose the aborigines become troublesome on our hands; suppose we build the Intercolonial Railway, and increase the fortifications of Canada, where is all the money to come from? Must not the tariff go up? I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that it must steadily rise as long as we remain in this Confederation. In the course of time we must see it as high as 30 per cent., or 25 per cent. at the very least. Only let the Canadians get a firm grasp of us, and the tariff will go up fast enough. The hon. member for Inverness asked us the other day, "will you give up your mines and minerals to Canada?" He admits that we have given up nearly everything, and consoles us with mentioning what we have left. What did Mr. Archibald tell us at one of our meetings when he was told of the evils and burthens of Confederation? Why he actually told us that he would try and temper the wind to the shorn lamb, thereby confessing what we had to put up with. The hon. member for Inverness has gone into the constitutional part of this question; he has spoken of Catholic Emancipation, of the abolition of the Corn Laws, and has eulogized Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Pitt, and gives them as authority for this act of despotism.

Refreshing my memory from some old books in my valise, put there by my little boys, I find that it is true that the emancipation of the Catholics in 1829 was carried against the wish of the Protestants, and in five days they sent 957 petitions against the Act, while only 357 were presented in its favor, but while they gave freedom to Ireland, the Canadian Act has placed us in bondage.

In regard to the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, it was by and with the consent of the people, it gave them their bread free of the 16s. on the quarter of wheat, while the British North America Act taxes ours 1s. 3d. per barrel, advances our ad valorem duties 50 per cent., and places other taxes on us, grievous to be borne, as well as depriving us of the liberty we have so long enjoyed.

In regard to Mr. Pitt as authority for changing a constitution independent of the people, I may be safe in saying that he was not infallible. At this time he had the horrors of the French revolution on his mind, and with the cares of the state and the extra

quantity of stimulating drinks he thought he required to stay his great mind, we may put against him Mr. Gray and Mr. Erskine; they say that a "man ought not to be governed by laws, in the framing of which he had not a voice, or pay taxes to which he had not consented in the same way."

As to Sir Robert Peel, the political text book of Great Britain says, "He was not a man of original genius or inventive thought; there is not a singular *idée mere* can be traced to him through his whole career." Register, Register, Register was not his own; he borrowed it from a celebrated political journal, generally in opposition to himself, where it is to be found years before he ever gave utterance to the counsel. His mind was adoptive, not creative; he was the mirror of the age, not its director; his leading ideas and principles were taken from others. In monetary affairs he only elaborated the ideas of Mr. Homer and Mr. Ricardo, first enunciated in the Bullion Report. In supporting the Corn Laws, he adopted the arguments of Lord Liverpool and Lord Castlereagh; in assailing them those of Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden. It was the same in the Catholic Emancipation; his arguments admirable on both sides, were alternately adopted from Lord Liverpool and Mr. Perceval, of Mr. Canning and Mr. Plunkett. It was this which suggested to Mr. Disraeli the felicitous expression that his mind was a "huge appropriation clause."

So if the hon. member quotes constitutional authorities, I can also show you their value, and enable you to estimate them at their proper standard. But he has told us about Cape Breton, and asks whether that island is not content under Confederation. How could Cape Breton be otherwise than satisfied with Union with Nova Scotia? Compare the position of Cape Breton now with what it was a few years ago. The ladies then did not wear their silks and satins, or the men dress in broadcloth; they did not even put their hay under shelter. Now they are connected with Nova Scotia, and participate in its large revenues and sources of prosperity. Where we paid 5s. a head into the treasury for many years, the people of Cape Breton probably did not pay more than 1s., while they received an equal amount per head with us, and probably more. But that is not the case with respect to the Union between Nova Scotia and Canada. We being consumers of dutiable goods will pay 30s. a head, while they will pay about half that amount, and get an equal share per head with us from the revenue. It is said we will have one law—one militia system—one currency. But suppose we have one currency, how will it benefit us? In New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Canada they have had one currency, but what does it amount to? The par of exchange in Canada and New Brunswick is 9½ per cent.; ours is 12½ per cent. The latter is equal to the adding a fourth, having no fractional parts, the British shilling being 1s. 3d., and the sovereign 25s. If we are forced to adopt the Canada and New Brunswick currency, it will be equal to adding one-fifth; therefore, if you are required to pay 1s. 3d., 5s., or 25s., you will be at the trouble of adding some copper coin to each amount. We have now

be thought
id, we may
r. Erskine;
be govern-
which he had
ch he had

itical text
was not a
e thought;
nbe traced
Register,
n; he bor-
al journal,
f, where it
gave utter-
s adoptive,
f the age,
and prin-
monetary
as of Mr.
nointed in
g the Corn
ts of Lord
a assailing
Cobden.
Emancipa-
both sides,
ord Liver-
nning and
suggested
ession that
n olause."
stitutional
eir value,
their pro-
s about
ieland is
low could
ified with
the po-
at it was
did not
nen dress
put their
connected
its large
Where
for many
probably
they re-
with us,
the case
ova Sco-
rs of du-
bile they
d get an
the reve-
law—one
suppose
enefit us?
and Can-
ut what
ange in
er cent.;
equal to
ational
3d., and
to adopt
ency, it
efore, if
or 25s.,
g some
ive now

the most simple and convenient currency in British North America; and if they adopt ours it will confer no boon on us, as it is all right without them. Suppose we have one currency; while the balance of trade is against us our paper will not be taken at par in Canada unless our Banks have agents there to redeem it. I may say here that in Newfoundland the old system of adding the ninth and the premium is discontinued, and instead they add 22 or 24 per cent., according to the demand.

No one will deny but that the hon. member for Inverness has made a great speech, but so far as argument goes it reminds me of a story told me of the celebrated Whitfield. An old lady once went to hear him, but could not get near him in consequence of the crowd, but she sat herself down on a large stone where a gentleman passing by saw her weeping, and asked her what was the matter. She replied that she was converted. "But, my good woman," said the questioner, "you have not heard him speak." "Oh, no," was the reply, "but I saw the shake of his head." Neither the hon. gentleman's argument nor the shake of his head will, I think, effect us as it did the old lady.

MR. CAMPBELL'S SPEECH.

Mr. CAMPBELL said—I am very happy to see that the hon. member for Colchester is far better versed in the momentous question before us than he is with the social position of Cape Breton. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has been in Cape Breton from the description he has given of the country, but the able manner in which he pointed out the disadvantages of Confederation will cover a multitude of sins in that particular. The learned gentleman remarked here to-day that in military tactics it is the usual custom to bring the small guns to the front. If such has been uniformly the practice, I find that in this campaign we have made a sweeping change. Nearly all our great guns have fired off with good effect; and now commences a fusillade of small guns, and as we are not much in danger from the enemy in front, the officers in command do not think it necessary to throw out skirmishers, and that accounts for finding us in the rear. When Union became the law of the land, I made up my mind, with many Anti-Confederate friends, to give it a fair trial, fully convinced that, before the end of the year, its greatest friends and warmest advocates would be deeply disappointed; but at the same time we determined if it should turn out such a blessing as our Confederate friends anticipated, then we would accept the situation. Now we have had eight months of this millenium, and in what position are we? Twelve months ago we were a self-governing people, we looked with pride on our past history, we indulged in hopeful anticipations for the future; but in what position are we to-day? The Canadians have full control of ourselves and our finances—our public burthens are made heavy, and to meet those burthens our tariff is increased from ten to fifteen per cent., and if we felt it would stop there, we might feel less apprehension. But when we become proprietors of the Hudson's Bay Territory,

for which we are expected to pay from 30 to 50 millions of dollars—when we become shareholders in the Intercolonial Railway, it is no stretch of the imagination to say that 15 per cent. will not meet our annual liabilities. When that occurs, shall we not, in the figurative language of one of our newspapers, have "one foot on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific?"

It is said that the most intelligent people voted in favor of Union. I admit that many highly intelligent persons, some of them my best friends, voted in favor of Union, and if it were not for such persons Confederation would long ere this have given up the ghost in the hands of that eminent accoucher, Dr. Tupper. I would say, however, with much respect to the Union party, that after the forty days legislation at Ottawa, after the humiliating position they see our representatives placed in, voted down on every subject, if after all this they still remain the advocates of Confederation, I cannot have the same high opinion of their intelligence and patriotism. We have now but one course before us, and that, I think, is clearly embodied in the resolutions on the table. I feel confident that the Act which now binds us to Canada will be repealed—that the British Parliament would scout such a policy as that Lord North upheld nearly a century ago—that the people of Great Britain who have ever been eminent for their love of liberty and fair play will not treat our petition with scorn, but instead of that will feel proud of us as the descendants of that noble stock that would rather die with their swords in their hands than yield one iota of their constitutional rights. I am proud to see so much unanimity in this Assembly; I never saw so much before among so many men on one question—so many men brought from every part of the province representing a great variety of interests. I have no doubt that before long the solitary two who now form the opposition will see the error of their ways and fall into our ranks, and if they do I can promise them they will be received with open arms. We are always glad when we see sinners repent. In conclusion, I need only say that for me to go into the merits of the case would be altogether out of place after the incontrovertible arguments brought forward during this debate by my Anti-Confederate friends. They have not left the fabric of a vision for the opposition to grasp at.

MR. KIDSTON'S SPEECH.

Mr. KIDSTON said:—In rising to address the House on this most important question, I feel that it is one fraught with the deepest interest to the people of this Province; but before commenting on the resolutions laid on the table, I may say that I shall endeavor so to modulate my voice that it will not disturb in the least the equanimity of the hon. member for Inverness. That gentleman reminded me of a passage of arms that once took place on the floors of this House between the Hon. Joseph Howe and the late Provincial Secretary, Dr. Tupper. The former said, "If you resist the devil he will fly from you, but if you resist Dr. Tupper he will fly at you." This gentleman (the member for Inverness)

acts in much the same way, and appears inclined to fly at every member who endeavors to discharge his duty faithfully to this country. I shall not travel over the ground that was traversed by the Hon. Attorney General. In laying the resolutions on the table, for I think he has himself done ample justice to the position he occupies, and it would be a waste of time for me to recapitulate those points which have been already and thoroughly grappled. I may remark with respect to the amendments moved by the hon. member for Inverness that he has taken a very superficial view of the question. I did not come here pretending to have a knowledge of law, but I assume that I am at least capable of sitting in a jury box in this country, and that I am at liberty to form my own opinions upon any facts that may be advanced by legal gentlemen around me. The hon. member for Inverness has taken the liberty of quoting certain authorities in connection with constitutional law. When he brings up Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Pitt I think the hon. member has shown to this House and to the people of this Province that he was only traversing the surface of English constitutional law instead of diving into the depths of that law. I think it one of the most important points to put the question fairly before the statesmen of England. Sir, allow me to refer back to the year 1866. What occurred then? We know that thirty-two gentlemen then on the benches, the hon. member for Inverness included, practised the most systematic deception upon the people of this Province. To such lengths was this deception practised that the Governor's speech did not contain one word about Confederation. We may presume, and I think it is the feeling of the people of this country, that they acted more as if they had been elected under the electoral privileges of Nova Scotia to represent and mature the views and interests of New Brunswick rather than the views and interests of Nova Scotia. Before proceeding further on this subject I also contend that the resolution passed by the Government then holding the reins of power, was not such as would warrant the people of this Province being deprived of their rights in the way they have been. I believe that the object of that resolution, worded as it is, left an impression on the minds of the people of this Province that after maturing this measure in England, it would be submitted again to the people at the polls, and to the Parliament of this Province. I shall not trouble the House by reading the resolution then passed, which is contained in the resolutions now before us, but I cannot in my own mind conceive how it can be so misconstrued as it is by the hon. member for Inverness, who would attempt to impress the idea upon this House and the country, that it was intended to give the power to these delegates to proceed to England and mature a law which was to deprive us of our rights, revenues and liberties. I contend that no reasonable man of sound judgment can put any other construction on the resolution, than that the same power was delegated to them then that was given when they went to Prince Edward Island to take into consideration the propriety and benefits to result from a union

of the Maritime Provinces. Sir, I repeat, from the outset and all through deception has been practised upon the people of this country.

We remember well that a resolution was passed in this House authorizing the Government of this Province to appoint a delegation to take into consideration the practicability of uniting the Maritime Provinces. How did they act with reference to that matter? They were told to treat the question in a legal and constitutional way. The people's representatives restricted them to the Maritime Provinces. They were not permitted to travel one inch beyond that. But instead of keeping within the limits of constitutional authority, without any sanction on the part of the people of this Province, they took up the question of the larger union, and left the question which they were legally authorized to deal with. What then? We find them going to Quebec at the instigation of men from Canada who came to Charlottetown, who persuaded the Maritime Delegates into usurping an authority and a power, which, constitutionally they could not exercise. Having gone to Canada, there they perpetrated an act which has brought down upon them the execration of the people of this Province. Let me suppose for a moment a case in point: a mercantile firm in this city employs an agent to transact certain business in Prince Edward Island. He is restricted and bound down to perform certain acts, and while he is engaged in this business at Prince Edward Island, some black legs come down from Canada and persuade him to ignore his master's instructions and proceed with them to Canada, and the first thing his employers hear is that he has not transacted the business for which he was delegated, but that he has taken the liberty of handing over his master's property to a party he had no authority to deal with. Now I put it to the hon. member for Inverness if a case similar to that came before him, how would he put it to a jury? How would it be dealt with? Five years in the penitentiary at hard labor would be given the offending party; and I ask you where was our Attorney General all this time that he did not protect his employer's rights? That official gentleman was among them helping them.

I may remark, in the next place that I have an abiding faith when all the facts connected with this question are faithfully and truthfully laid before the Parliament of England, that we will receive ample justice. It must be remembered, by all the people of this province, that when the elections were run in 1863 there were two questions which influenced the electors at that time very materially, and one point was, that Dr. Tupper, who was previously to that in opposition, brought down a series of resolutions into this House in favour of retrenching certain expenditures. He was opposed, and in the heat of debate he pledged his soul's salvation that he would introduce retrenchment if he should be returned to power. I know that this one element, at all events, influenced the country materially in giving him such a large majority when the elections were over, and the other question which assisted him largely

I repeat, from deception has people of this

resolution was of the Govern-
ment a delegation
practicability
ices. How did
matter? They
in a legal and
le's representa-
maritime. Pro-
mitted to travel
stead of keep-
national autho-
the part of the
y took up the
, and left the
lly authorized

We find them
gation of men
Charlottetown.
Delegates into
power, which,
not exercise.
they perpetra-
ht down upon
people of this
a moment a
in this city
certain busi-
d. He is res-
perform certain
a this business
me black legs
persuade him
ions and pro-
the first thing
has not trans-
was delegated,
ty of handing
party he had
ow I put it to
if a case simi-
ow would he
be dealt with?
at hard labor
party; and I
ey General all
at his employ-
gentleman was

place that I
the facts con-
faithfully and
ment of Eng-
le justice. It
people of this
as were run in
which influen-
ry materially,
Tupper, who
ition, brought
to this House
tain expendi-
in the heat of
salvation that
at if he should
that this one
d the country
a large major-
over, and the
him largely

was the Franchise act. The people believing that a man who had pledged his soul's salvation must be sincere, returned him and his friends with an overwhelming majority to this Legislature. This House and the country know how far he has redeemed that pledge—the language which he used was that of an irreligious libertine. What right has any man to pledge his soul's salvation? Look at the extravagant waste of money in worse than useless delegations—the very reverse of his pledge to the people. I ask you now, is that man to be believed, and is he now wandering about the world with his lost soul. Will any man hesitate to believe that we will not obtain justice from the British Parliament when the case is fairly and fully put before them? When they are fully convinced that they have been grossly deceived, they will feel more annoyed than we do at this moment, and will take such action as will heap upon the heads of the guilty parties the just reprobation which they deserve.

Mr. Bright, who was the able advocate of the people's right in the House of Commons, stated that this question should be submitted to the people at the polls, and knowing that the elections would take place in a few months, he asked that the law might not be forced upon the Province. Mr. Watkin, misled by Dr. Tupper, said the question had been discussed at every polling booth at the previous general election—that he, (Dr. Tupper,) had preached it from one end of the Province to the other. I ask you could Mr. Watkin have perpetrated such a statement as that? Could it have emanated from him? Any one who takes the trouble to read the speeches in the House of Lords, will see that the same belief pervades every line of them. They do not deny our right to be heard at the polls, but believed we had been consulted. If the hon. member for Inverness is correct in his views, how comes it that the Dominion Parliament, at the present moment, have passed a measure authorizing them to negotiate for the purchase of the Hudson's Bay Territory? If the British Parliament is entrusted with the control of such matters, why do they not legislate away the rights of the Hudson Bay Company, and bring it into the Dominion, as has been the case with Nova Scotia? It appears, however, that they have to enter into negotiations with the Company and purchase it. But I would remark that I have always understood that the right with regard to our mines and minerals was vested in the Crown, and it is a notorious fact that, although the Duke of York fully intended to make a conveyance to Rundell & Bridge, it was never done, but, as it was intended to have been done, it was decided that Rundell & Bridge should be treated and negotiated with, as though the lease had been executed, before we could get control of our mines and minerals. On a former occasion I promised to show the hon. member for Inverness that, in a financial point of view, great injustice had been done, as we find the framers of this Bill have given the power to the general Government not only to tax us indirectly, but by every mode they may think proper. I stated that I was ready to prove satisfactorily in point of fact, that we did not receive one

cent from the Dominion Government. Our revenue at the end of the year 1866 is set down at \$1,126,670. We find now by the Tariff introduced at the first session of the Dominion Parliament, we have some \$600,000 of an addition in taxes. Then the 80 cents a head we receive can be taken out of that \$600,000, therefore they gain over \$200,000 by the transaction. But the matter does not end here. Our revenues during the past ten years have increased something like 250 per cent., and, in all probability, our financial prosperity would continue to increase. But however greatly the revenues of this country may increase, we are tied down to this 80 cts: although our revenue should realize three or four millions, we will derive no further benefit. I believe the Union Act was hurried through the House of Commons in such a hasty manner that they have overlooked these facts, or otherwise they would never have perpetrated such a wrong upon this country.

The gentleman who addressed the House before me has given many useful details respecting the tariff. He forgot, however, whilst noticing a variety of items, to notice the tax on Indian corn. The hon. member for Inverness treated it with a sneer; but look at the state of our province at this moment. From Cape North to Cape Sable our fishermen are in great distress, and the very article they require the most is taxed. Not only are our fishermen deprived of the means of getting their bread cheap, but the article we might have imported and ground into food in the province is taxed; hence our millers are deprived of a benefit also. The hon. member for Inverness told us that any country under the British Crown that would attempt to introduce a tariff that would be restrictive would be acting contrary to its true interests. I ask the hon. member for Inverness if the tariff that has been introduced by Canada is not to a great extent carrying out this principle? I think he must be blind if he cannot see this. I endorse the opinions of gentlemen on the anti-confederate side with regard to this tariff that has been passed by Canada, and I have no doubt whatever that instead of seeing the tariff decreased, it will be largely increased, and be made more distasteful than ever to our people. In connection with this, let me take up the address of the Financial Minister of Canada, Mr. Rose, when he brought down the tariff into the Dominion Parliament. He said:—"It cannot be supposed, from the circumstances surrounding me, that I could bring down such a tariff as would suit all parties and purposes at present, but by the time we meet in March I have no doubt in my own mind that I will furnish such a tariff as will stand and meet all the burthens for five or six years." I believe in my own mind, and from what Mr. Rose said, that the tariff will be largely increased.—for what have we seen? The Dominion Government have succeeded in having a bill passed in the Parliament authorizing that Government to negotiate for the purchase of the Hudson's Bay Territory, and for assuming the whole control of the Intercolonial Railway. When a government becomes possessed of such a gigantic power as that, depend upon it, ex-

travagance and corruption will be the inevitable result. When we come to look at the burthens the government will be obliged to meet, who doubts that the tariff must go up to 24 or 30 per cent. before three years have passed away?

Now, I will turn the attention of the House for a few moments to the history of the old thirteen States, and I would say that they, like ourselves, were once Colonies of Great Britain—they were once desirous of remaining in that Empire; but the stupidity of British statesmen imposed taxes and burdens upon them without their consent, and what was the result? They rebelled, and the consequence was that the mother country lost these Colonies; and if the hon. member for Inverness had studied a little deeper than he did, this question, he would have found that serious collisions took place at that time in the House of Commons between the very statesman he has cited as an authority and Lord North. I need not recapitulate all the circumstances that occurred, but the loss of those old Colonies has by all right-thinking men been considered a misfortune. But times are changed, and in our day we will find a very different spirit actuating the statesmen of England; and I feel also, when this case is brought fairly before the British Parliament they will reflect carefully on the matter, and in all probability remember how it fared with the old thirteen Colonies on this side of the water simply because they would not submit to acts of injustice.

We have been assailed by the hon. member for Inverness, and it has been spread broadcast over the country, that every member who opens his mouth in defence of his constitutional rights must be a Fenian or a traitor. No, sir, it is the very reverse. It is because loyalty has been born with us—because it has grown and strengthened with our strength, that we feel it to be our duty to go fearlessly to the Parliament of England and warn the statesmen of that country of the consequences that may ensue from forcing us into a detested Union. We should be recreant to our duty and to our Queen if we acted otherwise than the way we are doing. Any gentleman who pretends to know anything about the political agitation that prevails at the present time can see, North and South, East and West, a heavy swell on the political ocean of our country, which indicates a storm. A storm will arise, and the only thing that can allay it is the knowledge that our wrongs will be righted, and our constitution restored to us. Will any member rise and tell us that a Government like that of Great Britain, who have spent their thousands and thousands to liberate the African slave, will willingly keep 350,000 loyal subjects in a position of abject servitude and humiliation? None of us will believe that they will act otherwise than with justice to us until we learn it from the acts of the Imperial Parliament itself.

Now I will make one or two observations with reference to the resolutions before the House. In view of all the circumstances connected with our present position, I think it is incumbent upon every man who has been sent here to represent the interests and

wishes of the people of this country, and bring as far as practicable the fact to the notice of the British people and the Parliament of England that there is a feeling existing in this country which can by no means be abated except by the repeal of this obnoxious Act. I feel that I would not be discharging the duty imposed upon me unless I took the first opportunity of expressing these sentiments distinctly to this House and country. They tell us that people have been influenced by other matters than the mere question of Confederation. I reply that as far as our country is concerned I see that no other reasons influenced the elections except the hatred of the people to this union. I will venture to say that if this question was submitted tomorrow, and every other question shut out, the people would return to this House the same gentlemen who now sit on these benches and no others. Am I to be told that the Parliament and people of England will not understand all this? Am I to be told that because the wealth and intelligence of the city of Halifax (supposing that to be so for the sake of argument) are in favor of union, therefore the Parliament of Great Britain should decide against us? Will any one argue that the Parliament of England would adhere to a particular question effecting the empire because the wealth and intelligence of the city of London happened to be on a certain side. As respects the Province generally, where is the difference, and I do not except the city, despite what the hon. member says to the contrary—there is a widespread aversion to our continuance in this union.

I may say that I have listened with great pleasure to every address that has been offered on this question in favor of these resolutions. I am gratified to see so much unanimity and such determination of purpose. Let no one attempt to mark us as disloyal now. If we were inclined to exhibit disloyalty we would not seek redress in the constitutional manner we are doing. Here you see this body of representatives and His Excellency carrying on the public affairs most harmoniously. We are going to fight our battle constitutionally, but I feel and realize the position that the gentlemen who have bartered away our rights occupy. They went home to England high in power and persuaded the British Parliament to pass an Act of a most tyrannical character—such an Act as cannot be found in the annals of any British dependency—an Act handing over all our rights, revenues and privileges to Canada. Now we go home to represent the people, and show our Sovereign and Parliament the great injustice that has been perpetrated upon us. We say to Her Majesty in so many words:—“The gentlemen who were here before were men whose words were worthless, they were men who betrayed their country, and deceived your Government.” Do we wonder then that the men who carried this scheme shrink and tremble as they now do. They know that misrepresentation will no longer avail them. I believe that a fabric built upon a foundation of falsehood, misrepresentation, and corruption can never stand, but that the spirit of liberty will tear it down to the ground. Let our opponents say what they

may
const
prosp
have
and
every
The

The
Hon
tled a
the M
Mr.
truste
alter
law.
Scotia
but hi
might
lution
Mr.
ferenc
The

Mr.
servat
it was
be the
mind i
fabric
dation
force
This
dote w
horse
man
horses
money
bargai
we tak
was
one is
to cat
caught
bargai
of the
full ev
cern d
British
tic in t
eviden
that i
there
hers v
Anti-co
Canadi
walk;
this, t
is the
fine m
clause
great d
said th
that t
\$600,0
Nova S
say in
the hon
fact, h
ment
Confed

his country, and the fact to the no- the Parliament of feeling existing in by no means be of this obnoxious not be discharging unless I took the essing these senti- use and country. ve been influenced mere question of that as far as our at no other reasons ept the hatred of I will venture o was submitted to- question shut out, o this House the it on these benches told that the Par- land will not un- to be told that be- igeance of the city to be so for the a favor of union, of Great Britain Will any one argue gland would ad- on effecting the and intelligence of ed to be on a cer- rovince generally, d I do not except n. member says to despread aversion union. atened with great hat has been offer- of these resolu- e so much unani- n of purpose. Let as disloyal now. ibit disloyalty we the constitutional ere you see this d His Excellency ists most harmo- fight our battle l and realize the n who have bar- cupy. They went power and per- to pass an Act ter—such an Act e annals of any t handing over all vileges to Canada. ent the people, and rliament the great etrated upon us. o many words:— here before were rtless, they were country, and de- Do we wonder ried this scheme y now do. They n will no longer e fabric built upon misrepresentation, and, but that the it down to the ts say what they

may we shall have restored to us that glorious constitution under which we have lived and prospered so long—under which our revenues have largely increased from year to year, and under which the people have enjoyed every happiness.

The House then adjourned.

SATURDAY, February 15.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

Hon. J. FERGUSSON introduced a bill entitled an Act to amend the Act incorporating the Mira Bay Harbour Co.

Mr. PINEO presented a petition from the trustees of Picton Academy, praying that no alteration be made in the existing school law. He asked that the bill relative to the Scotia Coal Company be read a second time, but his request could not be granted, as it might interfere with the debate on the resolutions.

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition in reference to a poor section.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

(Mr. Kidston's speech concluded.)

Mr. KIDSTON continued:—I closed my observations last evening with the remark that it was my firm conviction, and I believe it to be the firm conviction of every well regulated mind in the Province of Nova Scotia that the fabric which we have seen raised on the foundation of corruption when assailed by the force of truth and fact will crumble into dust. This Confederation reminds me of an anecdote which I remember hearing of a certain horse trader who was thus accosted by the man who had just purchased one of his horses: "my good man you have got my money, and I have your horse—now that the bargain is concluded tell me his faults while we take a bottle of ale together." The reply was "well the horse has only two faults,—one is that when you let him loose he is hard to catch,—the other is that when you have caught him he is not worth a cent." Our bargain is as bad as that one. The measures of the very first Ottawa Parliament give us full evidence, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, that the legislature of Canada is un-British in its principle, arbitrary and despotic in the exercise of power. We have full evidence, as far as patronage is concerned, that it has been denied to those who went there to advocate our interests; for our members were told "you must swallow your Anti-confederate principles and support the Canadian Government at all hazards, or walk; you need not otherwise ask us to make this, that, or the other appointment." That is the actual state of affairs. I will now confine myself more particularly to the 5th clause of the resolution, for that embodies a great deal. The hon. member for Inverness said that we had been generously dealt by—that the Dominion Government had paid \$600,000 more than they had received from Nova Scotia since Confederation. All I can say in that case is that he has placed himself on the horns of a dilemma, for if that be the fact, how has it come to pass? By the statement of the Finance Minister, just before Confederation took effect, it was shewn that

we had an overflowing treasury, money sufficient for all our demands, and with only six months experience of the Union, we are told that the Dominion Government have been obliged to advance us \$600,000 over and above what we have paid into their treasury. But the change is easily accounted for. Look at the system on which the Union is financially founded. Look at the Governor General's salary, and take that as a criterion. \$50,000 has to be raised in a Dominion comprising four millions of people to pay its first officer. Contrast that with the sum which the United States, with a population of 34 millions, pay to their President. The sum paid in that country is \$25,000, and the difference is greater than at first would appear, for the salary of the Governor General is paid in sterling money, the amount in gold being equal to-day to \$80,000 of the currency of the United States. And are not the salaries of all the officials appointed under the Dominion Government proportioned to that enormous salary of the Governor General? Is that the management that was to be expected? One would have supposed that the Government of Canada, with the experience of the past before them—with a knowledge that, through financial bungling, they have reduced the state of their country almost to bankruptcy, would have had a care how they governed the Dominion. Take the statement exhibited in the Journals of 1866, and what do we find? The figures shew that their whole system was unsound.

The Canadas were involved in a debt of sixty-four millions or more, and at the present moment I think I am correct in saying that that debt is nothing less than seventy-five millions. Mr. Archibald tried to persuade us that our debt exceeded that of Canada, taking man for man of the population. Let us see how that assertion tallies with the fact. Assuming the debt of Canada to have been sixty-four millions and upwards, and her population 3,560,000, while the population of Nova Scotia may be put at 350,000, we see the debt per head on the Canadians will be \$25 while that of the Nova Scotians will be only \$15. Now, then, to show the unsoundness of the arrangement, put down the debt of Canada for two Canadians at \$50, and the debt of two Nova Scotians at \$30,—this produces \$80; and if you divide by four you will have the debt per head of the Dominion, and the calculation will prove that every man, woman and child in this country is put in for \$3 per head more of debt than he has any reason to pay. This \$3 per head gives us for the whole Province nearly a million of dollars which we have done nothing to make ourselves liable for. I find, circulated through the country, the statement that if we had not been confederated we must have increased our tariff. This is merely one of the assertions, used by the Opposition, which they are unable to prove. I contend that such would not have been the case. It is acknowledged on both sides that at the date of Confederation coming into force we were in a most prosperous condition. Our revenues had risen from \$660,000 to \$1,226,570. Judging the future by the past, I should say that it would not be neces-