

show that Canada also prospers, I may state that in 1854 her exports and imports amounted to only \$34,000,000, and in 1864 they had increased to \$89,000,000. In Nova Scotia in 1854 our trade amounted to \$12,000,000,—in 1864 it had increased to only \$18,000,000. In the increase of the revenue the same proportion obtains. To what is the prosperity of this country mainly owing? Is it not to free intercourse with other countries? If our coal mines have been developed, it has been largely by American capital, and under the influence of free trade with the United States. How do we stand now? Is there a prospect that, in view of the restrictions now about to be imposed, the coal-trade will develop itself as before? I do not think any one will contend for that. If the trade maintains its present position even, it will be something extraordinary. At this moment, in addition to the duty on coal, every one of our ships has to pay thirty cents a ton upon every voyage to the United States. What will the effect of that be upon the Arichat man, engaged in the coal trade, and making five or six voyages a year? In view of this state of matters it certainly becomes us to form more intimate relations with the neighbouring colonies. This union will give us a power of dealing with the Americans upon equal terms.

Another objection which has been urged to Union is the alleged unprincipled character of Canadian statesmen. They have been represented to us as men utterly unprincipled. We have been told that they have sacrificed, again and again, their honor and reputation when it suited the interests of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Brown.—That was the opinion of New Brunswickers and Nova Scotians on both sides of politics three years ago.

Hon. Mr. Patterson.—I contend that this state of things is the consequence of our present isolation. The representatives of Canada looked after their own interests. There are men in Nova Scotia now who would not hesitate to sacrifice the interests of Canada to those of their own Province, and while Nova Scotia and Canada are separate Provinces, such will continue to be the case. I do not believe that Canadians are as unprincipled as they have been represented to be. Men opposing the Government always represent the Government as unprincipled. Let a Canadian take up a Halifax paper. If he had taken up the organ of the Opposition during the time of the late Administration, he would have found that Administration described as men holding their positions in defiance of all law. In fact nothing was too bad to be said of them.

The Inter-Colonial Railway has been alluded to. I believe that if the Colonies had been united, every obstacle in the way of the construction of that work would have been overcome long since. Instead of that the negotiations with the British Government failed, and in consequence of that failure each colony, in its own way, went to work to construct railways on its own account. I am not going to say who was to blame for this failure. Difficulties occurred between Mr. Howe and Earl Grey, and there is a very general impression that members of the British Parliament were at the bottom of the whole difficulty. It is believed that a pressure was brought to bear on Earl Grey to make him withdraw the guarantee previously given. This was done before Canadian politicians interfered.

Because, however, the Ministry of the day has acted improperly, the whole country should not be blamed. I do not defend the acts of the Canadian Government on all occasions. I believe that they have, in some cases, pursued a policy injurious to the interests of the Colonies at large, but I do not think it right or proper, even if that be the case, to slander the whole country. I deprecate the attempts which have been made to prejudice the people of these Colonies against Canada. The people of Canada should not be held responsible for all the acts of their Government. I believe that many of the prejudices against that country are the result of misconception, misunderstanding,—and want of acquaintance. We often see this in private life. Men alienated from one another happen to meet, and then they discover that, their alienation, arose from a misunderstanding of each others' characters, which acquaintance dispels. I believe that the Canadians are as honest as Nova Scotians, and characterized by that love of fair play which marks their fellow Colonists and Britons generally.

Much has been said about the representation in the General Parliament proposed for Nova Scotia by the Quebec scheme. I am glad to find that the honorable member

from Yarmouth thinks the representation proposed fair and equitable. I think that with 19 representatives in the Lower House of the General Parliament, and with 10 in the Upper House, the interests of Nova Scotia will be sufficiently protected. It is true that it sounds as if we were to have a very small representation, when it is said that we have only 19 Representatives, in a House of 194, or, as it is said, 19 against 175. Those who say this, argue as if all the members of the General Parliament that do not come from Nova Scotia are to be banded together against her. Is it right to take that view? Are we to suppose that the representatives of New Brunswick and Newfoundland will be opposed to us, or that Upper and Lower Canada will be united against us? I think that the interests of all the Provinces will be so blended that it will neutralize and render impossible any predominating influence on the part of any one of them; and that with such a representation as we shall have, our interests will be far better protected than they possibly can be at present.

I do not intend to make any remarks on the Quebec Scheme,—it has been pretty roughly handled by most speakers, but the Government, by the resolution which they have introduced, have abandoned it. Now as to the manner in which the question is proposed to be dealt with. Under this resolution each of the Lower Provinces, even the smallest, will have an equal representation at the delegation with either of the Canadas. If, under such circumstances the interests of the Maritime Provinces are sacrificed, it surely will be the fault of the representatives of those Provinces.

The hon. member from Yarmouth has said that he would prefer that the Convention should be held on this side of the water. Now it is one of the objections to the Quebec Scheme that there is nothing in it to bind us to the British Government. I think that in any future scheme not only should the interests of the Colonies be taken into consideration, but their relation to the mother country settled on a permanent basis. I therefore think it one of the best features of the plan proposed that the British Government is to be a party to the new Conference.

The principal objection of the hon. member from Yarmouth is that he thinks there should be an appeal to the people. I can easily understand why such an argument should be advanced in the other branch of the Legislature, and I can also understand how, under some circumstances, it should have much force. If it be true, however, as he contends, that the Legislature should never pass any measure until the assent of the people is obtained to it, then we are very often doing wrong in this Legislature. I think the hon. gentleman himself is a strong advocate for assessment for schools, and yet does he think that if he put the question to the people he would get an affirmative answer? I do not think he does. I, certainly, do not. We often legislate in advance of the popular opinion when what we consider the best interests of the Province require it. The rights of people have sometimes been legislated away without an opportunity being afforded of their being consulted in the matter. The hon. gentleman himself was one of those who took away from a number of electors, who had enjoyed that privilege from the earliest history of the Province,—the right to return representatives to this Legislature, and without consulting them too.

Hon. Mr. McCully.—Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Patterson.—He may have been right in doing so, for I believe that it is sometimes right and justifiable that the interests of the few should be sacrificed where it is for the general benefit of the whole. We are here, especially in this branch of the Legislature, to guard general interests. We are here as the Representatives of the interests of the Empire. I believe that there is a large and growing feeling in favor of union, and I have yet to learn that a majority of the people of this Province are opposed to union in the abstract.

Hon. Mr. Dickey.—Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Patterson.—But even if it were so, would we be justified in withholding our assent to this union? I think not, if we are of opinion that it is for the general good of the whole people, not of this Province only, but of the Colonies as part of the British Empire.

A great deal has been said about taking away our Constitution. I do not see that union will deprive us of a single right that we now enjoy. We shall still have our local legislatures. In fact union will extend, instead of diminish, our rights. As for destroying our Constitution, I do not know a single principle of Responsible

Government that will be in any way affected by any union that is likely to be adopted.

I have one objection, however, to the resolution. I should have liked it much better had the Government proposed to refer the scheme, which may be settled by the new delegates, back to the Legislature. I do not know whether this will be practicable. I take it for granted that any scheme which may be agreed on must be embodied in an Act of the Imperial Parliament. I think that that Act should not go into effect until ratified by the different local Legislatures, and the delegates should be instructed to endeavour to have a clause to this effect inserted in the Imperial Act. If a provision of this kind were embodied in the resolution, it would take away from it the appearance of delegating to an irresponsible body powers which properly belong to the Legislature. I shall, however, vote for the resolution in its present shape.

Hon. Mr. Brown.—I must notice, first, the rather unexpected observations of the honorable member from Colchester, (Hon. Mr. Patterson) in reference to the change which union will produce in the constitution of the country. It may be a very common place view, but it is, nevertheless, one understood by all moderately informed persons throughout the country, that there is a great difference between the whole of our revenue being expended by ourselves within the Province itself, and its being left to the disposition of a General Government, even, although, we should elect members to the Parliament which creates and controls that Government. There is a great difference, I say, between the position which we shall occupy, in that respect, under Confederation, and that which we now hold. I was, therefore, surprised to hear the honorable member say that there would be no difference in the exercise of our rights in relation to the general Government of the country.

Now I am sure that the Solicitor General must be satisfied, after the long and interesting address to which we have just listened, that this subject is not quite *threadbare*. I take it for granted that the honorable member from Queens, in desiring to postpone the discussion of this question, had reference to the state of affairs in New Brunswick, because the hon. Solicitor General, as well as the honorable and learned member from Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Dickey) both connected this question, and the moving of this resolution at the present time, with the position which the matter has assumed in New Brunswick. I, therefore imagine that it might be well for the Government itself to delay. Of course it rests, entirely, with them, and from the earnestness with which the Solicitor General repelled the application, I assume that no delay will take place.

I suppose there is no great desire to continue this debate, but there are one or two points to which I may as well refer, lest it should be supposed that I agree with the delegates on those points. In the first place, as to the Quebec scheme, it is, perhaps, unnecessary to refer to it,—perhaps hardly fair to do so,—as the Government have themselves abandoned it. It is impossible, however, not to consider that, if action is taken on this resolution, a scheme something like that agreed on at Quebec on the basis of federation, must be framed, although it may be modified to a greater or less extent.

Now there is one consideration which has probably led to the calmness and good temper which has hitherto been manifested in the debate in this House,—that is, that this is not a party question. The opposition to it is not a party opposition. The leaders of both parties have undertaken to negotiate and defend this scheme of Confederation. The great body, therefore, of the two parties into which this Province is divided, naturally looked to their leaders for counsel and information on a matter of this kind. They, nevertheless, refused to agree to their judgment, or to adhere to their opinion. Before the Quebec scheme had been much discussed in Halifax, it had been received in every part of the Province with marked disapprobation. This may not have reached the ears of members in the capital, or of the Government, but it nevertheless was the case. Only a month or two before the Convention was held which prepared the scheme, the idea of union with Canada was revolting to one of the delegates himself. He looked at the condition of Canada, and remembered, as the people of Nova Scotia did, how its affairs had been managed for the last ten or twelve years. In connection with this point, I may say that I differ, entirely, from the hon. member from Colchester. The people of Canada stopped their Railway works when we did, and from that time to the present they

have not found their revenue sufficient to meet their current expenses. During that period there have been times in Nova Scotia when we failed to meet the expenses of the year; nevertheless, by the exercise of a little care we have always managed not to increase our debt, except for railway objects. I assert that if for one or two years our revenue was less than our expenditure, in the two or three years succeeding, we have always paid up the deficiency. In Canada they have been obliged to borrow £1,500,000 sterling to pay off arrears. The people of this country knew that. Up to 1854 probably no country could have managed its finances better than Nova Scotia. During twenty-four years of self-government we managed so as not to increase our old debt of £100,000 by a single pound.

Hon. Mr. McCully.—And had not a public work to show.

Hon. Mr. Brown.—We had this building to show for it. It cost little short of that amount. There was a large contribution to the Canal across the water. (Laughter.) Responsible Government should not be charged with that £100,000, though it should be charged with \$5,000,000 expended in the construction of Railways. Whether that money could not have been better expended, is a question on which much might be said; it by no means follows that it might not have been expended with vastly more advantage to the people of Nova Scotia than in that way.

Now as to the Constitution of the Legislative Council of the General Parliament under Confederation. This House does not require me to tell them, as the Colonial Secretary has told them, that the Constitution of that body, as projected by the Quebec Scheme, is not calculated to work with that freedom which is necessary under Responsible Government. It is supposed that because the number of Representatives which Nova Scotia will have in that body is larger than we are entitled to, that, therefore, we should not speak of this. But look at the state of New Brunswick. At this moment there is a large majority in the Legislative Council who have voted against the Government, and it has involved the Government and Governor in difficulty. I consider that the proposed Constitution of the Legislative Council, a life tenure, is not suited to responsible Government, and to these American Provinces, and I refer to the present state of matters in New Brunswick in proof of that. A body so constituted, responsible to nobody, is not fit to be entrusted with the interests of the people.

We have been told that England passed laws of equal importance to the measure now under consideration without special reference to the people. In my observations on a former day I challenged any member of this House to name any great measure which had been so passed, and there is none that can be named analogous to that before the House. No great measure has in modern times been passed in England which has not been repeatedly before the people. Were not the Reform bills discussed at the polls year after year? So it was with the Corn laws and Catholic Emancipation. The last House of Assembly that was elected in this Province, was elected for a very different purpose, and a very different object than passing this scheme of Confederation, as the honorable member from Colchester very well knows. The question of Union, although casually spoken of in former periods, had never been practically brought before the people.

As regards free trade between the different Colonies Canada proposed it in 1862, New Brunswick had assented to it, but the Government of Nova Scotia declined to accept it. I do not say that our Government did wrong in declining to accept it,—they may have felt that our revenues were so involved, our obligations so great, that we could not afford to give up the duties. With respect to manufactures I may say that Canada, in the interest of its people employed in them, looked to a 20 per cent. tariff to enable her manufactures to prosper. That was not in accordance with the interests of Nova Scotia or the feelings of her people.

Now it has been said that Interest is a question which will be settled by this Union. I think that we can settle that in Nova Scotia without Union. The Solicitor General and a majority of this House will not agree to what is the settled law in Canada on this question. I, myself, have no objection to it, but I doubt whether the people of this country are willing to take the opinion of Canadian Legislators on the matter. Then, again, the difference of currency between the different Provinces is spoken of as a difficulty which union will settle. This is so small a matter that I am