

our successful defence rests on the Union of British North America. When Her Majesty's Government have arrived at the conclusion that this most vulnerable point in the Empire is only to be placed in a position that will enable England to unite successfully with the defence of these Colonies by this Union—that our future security depends upon the acceptance or rejection of Union—that this is a question of Imperial concern, since the honor and integrity of the mother country are involved in the security of every portion of the Empire; when we are told all this by those who have the best right to advise us, I ask the hon. member whether he has to hear the first argument in favor of Union—whether Her Majesty's subjects on this side of the Atlantic should not be prepared to meet the views of the Parent State, and adopt such a policy as will enable her to co-operate successfully with us in measures to defend British North America.

The hon. member rose to correct me in relation to the Intercolonial Railway. He says that railway should precede the Union. What has been the past history of the Intercolonial Railway? The hon. member himself has labored for twenty years to obtain the construction of that work. Other public men of all parties have exhausted every means, going so far as to place a burthen upon our shoulders beyond the capacity of the country to bear, for the purpose of securing the railway; but all to no purpose. Every scheme melted away like the "baseless fabric of a vision," and there is not the vestige of a chance to get an Intercolonial Railway except by that means that secures Union. When the hon. member stated that the Railway which this Union will give us was essential to the security of Halifax, he only said what every man feels. Situated as we are in the presence of a gigantic power, the only security that this country can have is to be found in the fact that the invader does not trample down the rights and privileges of 300,000 people, but of four millions of freemen bound together by the closest political and commercial sympathy, and protected by the greatest nation in the world. There is not a thoughtful man in this country, whatever may be his opinion as to the advantages in industrial and commercial aspects, who will not feel that as regards our security, our immediate Union is not only desirable but absolutely necessary. I use the term IMMEDIATE UNION with a full appreciation of its significance. His Excellency has laid on the table the Despatches in relation to the Fisheries. Is there a member in this House who does not feel what is the meaning of the silence of the British Government on the subject. The Imperial Government have been told that the territorial rights of British Americans are about to be invaded—that they have every reason to believe that the hour is approaching when our soil is to be desecrated by liberties being taken with it by foreigners. The fishermen of the United States are fitting out, and in the Senate of the county public men are coming forward and saying that the fishermen are determined to come upon our fishing grounds and asking the government to protect them by a fleet. Who is there then, that does not feel the attitude which we occupy to-day, when having implored Her Majesty's Government months ago, for the means of protecting our territory, at this hour we are unable to put before the House and country the statement that they are prepared to assume that responsibility? The Imperial Government are evidently waiting to see whether we are prepared to adopt the advice which she was bound in our interests to offer.—They have employed us time and again to combine and put ourselves in a position in which they can efficiently defend us; and they are waiting to see whether we shall respect their advice before involving Britain in a war with a great power. The hon. member for Richmond called attention to the fact, that some 400,000 desperate men, united by the deepest hatred of British institutions, and assisted by the sympathy of a powerful people, stand in a position to do everything that they can to foster and create a collision between the United States and Great Britain, if they do not attempt an invasion themselves. It is no secret that that organization have taken measures to fill the fishing vessels with men who are determined to provoke collision between the two countries. In view of circumstances like these, is it not time for every loyal subject to lay aside all party and personal considerations and unite for the purpose of preserving the rights and liberties which we now enjoy?

The hon. member says that the Delegates are bound to answer at an early day the question put by the hon. member for Richmond, and I am only surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Annand) should not have awaited that answer before addressing the house as he has to-day. I tell the hon. member that this was the obligation that rested upon every gentleman that was engaged in that Quebec Conference; it was by every constitutional and honorable means in his power to endeavor to bring about the great results that that scheme proposed to accomplish. I ask him what is the position of this question to-day? Has it not changed in its aspect since the House was called together at this present session? Last year an appeal was made to the people of New Brunswick, and an overwhelming majority was returned opposed to the Quebec scheme; but what has taken place since? No one can believe that so great a change has suddenly taken place as we know has actually occurred. The fact is this: the question was referred to the people at the polls; but is there a man here who believes that the election was decided squarely and fairly on the question of Union? No, the Government had been in power for ten years; they had drawn upon themselves that unpopularity which all Governments must expect to encounter, conduct the public affairs as they may. The opponents of Confederation, combined with the great body of those who were determined at all hazards to have a change of government, and the result was that an immense majority was apparently returned against Union with Canada. What has occurred since? This Government, thus brought into power by the action of the people at the polls, have modified their opinions on Confederation through the force of circumstances, and influenced by the legitimate power and influence of the British Government, have come forward, and in the Speech at the opening of the session propounded a policy of Union of British North America. It is not a matter of doubt that whether a dissolution takes place or not, or whether may be the result of the vote of no-confidence that has been moved, and on which a discussion is proceeding, New Brunswick is prepared with an unanimity that cannot fail to produce the deepest impression on the mind of every man, to come forward and accept the policy of the British Government, and accomplish a Union of British North America.

The hon. member took occasion to outline a scheme. He has entirely abandoned his policy of yesterday. In the journal which he has seized for the purpose of writing down Confederation, he has had as many poli-

cies on this as he has in relation to everything else, and it is only the other day that he took the attitude that he and the opponents of Confederation would not propose any scheme whatever. Let me invite the attention of the House to the paragraph from his paper which was read by the hon. member for Inverness, and ask whether he (Mr. Annand) has yet to hear the first argument in favor of a Union of British North America. On the 24th January, 1869, he says: "And what then? Are we indifferent to the future of British America? Have we arrived at the conclusion that nothing should be done? That we can remain forever in our present condition? On the contrary, while we claim that these Colonies, at all events the Maritime Provinces, never can be bettered by any change in their political situation, we feel that they cannot, in the very nature of things, always continue as they are. They may, it is true, go on for years, and enjoy their present prosperity, but after all the time must come when they will be required to form new relations, whether with each other and the Mother Country will largely depend upon the exercise of great tact, wisdom, and forethought on the part both of British and Colonial statesmen."

"But it is because we feel that we must, sooner or later, make our choice between the mother country and the United States, that we desire to see this question of Colonial Union, now that it is fresh in the minds of the people, set at rest; it is because we earnestly and fervently pray that our connexion with England, instead of being weakened, shall be strengthened, that we repeat the opinion uttered two months ago, that, with the sanction of the Crown, a new Convention shall be held for the purpose of considering the future of British America—what are to be the relations of these Provinces with each other, what their relations with the mother country, and what guarantees will be required to secure the unity of all."

In the face of this declaration made in January last—that the time had come when the people of this colony had to choose between a connection with the United States of British North America or connection with Great Britain—he now undertakes to tell you that he has yet to hear the first argument in favor of Union.

I ask the hon. member whether leading minds of these Provinces have not assembled already to confer on this question of Union.

Mr. ANNAND—No!

Dr. TUPPER—Did not the Government act in good faith when they undertook to deal with the question, as one entirely apart from party politics? When they invited Mr. Howe, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Locke, Mr. Archibald, and Mr. McCully to combine with them? If there were gentlemen in either end of the Legislature that stood in more deep and strong antagonism to the present Government than others, they were the two gentlemen who co-operated with us on this great question. The hon. member may say we should have selected him. Why, he would not have reached Windsor before he would change his opinion half a dozen times.—(Hear, hear.) Why he would have signed his name to a declaration of his opinions, and repudiated it two months after. All that could be done in the interests of the people was done, and although the Quebec scheme may not meet with general concurrence, yet I believe, that the interests of the Maritime Provinces were pressed to the last point to which they could be carried in an Intercolonial Conference, and the only means by which an improvement could be obtained would be by some measure that would bring an independent arbitrament to bear. The hon. member has expressed great respect for the Imperial Government, and yet he degrades Her Majesty's Ministers by saying that men recognized as the most honorable and able in the civilized world—men of the most thorough education, calm judgment, and inflexible integrity—would be mere children in the hands of the Canadian Delegates. He has placed the statesmen of the Maritime Provinces in a position so contemptible that if he is to be believed it would be better that the people should throw themselves upon the generosity and fairness of Her Majesty's Government, than send Delegates who will be so insignificant in the presence of three or four Canadians, and unable to obtain justice at the hands of the most exalted and disinterested tribunal in the world.

The hon. member says he is against Union. Of what use will he then be in a Conference? His only object would then be to obstruct and defeat that which is the desire of the overwhelming body of the people to-day—to carry out the wishes of Her Majesty's Government. The hon. member holds a Conference in British America, and then carries us across the water, and then sails back again. Having got the Conference to unite in a common plan—and it would take ninety-nine years to effect it if the honorable member had his own way—and having obtained the acquiescence of Her Majesty's Government, he would bring it back for an appeal to the people. I do not intend to say much just now on this point. I have most unwavering confidence in the patriotism and intelligence of the people of Nova Scotia and of British North America; but I tell the hon. member as much clamour as he has raised, there is not a man in this House that knows better than himself how impossible it is to get a direct verdict on a question like this. The facts in connection with New Brunswick prove that they did not get a verdict on Confederation pure and simple. He knows right well that let any government, I care not of what party, even the remarkable government of which he was a member, go to the country and instead of being able to obtain an issue on any measure, however loudly they may put it, they have to face the opposition of every man that wishes to displace them. They have to meet many of their own former friends and supporters whose hostility they have provoked in some particular question. Is there any one here who does not know that were this government to appeal to the people on the question of Confederation to-morrow so far from their getting an answer on that question they would have to meet first a formidable combination for the purpose of placing the gentlemen opposite in power, and again, those who were supporters of the Administration—and thousands there are of able and influential supporters—so situated—entirely at variance with them on the great question of Assessment for educational purposes.—Therefore I would defy you in that way to get a verdict, but I am not going into that question now. No gentleman who was here in the first session of the House (1864) would dare to say that it is unconstitutional for the Parliament to change the constitution. They recorded a resolution by unanimous consent on the journals of this Legislature which authorized the charge of our Constitution without any reference to the people whatever. I moved the resolution myself; it authorized the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province, in conjunction with the Governments of the other provinces, to appoint Delegates for the purpose of devising a scheme of Legislative Union for the Maritime Colonies.

There is not a man who does not know that this proposition was for a more extreme change in the constitution of this country than the one now proposed. The Quebec scheme proposes to leave to Nova Scotia her own Government and Parliament as far as local questions are concerned and to have a General Parliament with general powers in reference to matters common to all the Provinces; but the resolution of 1864 was to surrender the entire constitution of the country, and to give away the seat of Government, in all probability, from Nova Scotia and place it in New Brunswick, or wherever it might be agreed upon. It provided that scheme of Legislative Union should go into operation and become law—not when it had received the sanction of the people—but the consent of the Provincial Legislatures, and Her Majesty's approval. With that resolution recorded on our journals is there a man who can presume to rise here and say that it is unconstitutional for the Parliament of the country to change the constitution without an appeal to the people.

Mr. McLELLAN—The hon. gentleman knows that the vote was not taken on the proviso that the resolution should not be entered "unanimously" in the journals.

Dr. TUPPER—Every gentleman who did not record his name against the resolution is committed clearly to the proposition which it contains. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Miller) took exception to allowing the resolution to be entered "unanimously," but it was on different ground. He was not in favor of the proposed union—he preferred the larger one; but he did not take exception to the resolution as embodying an unconstitutional principle.

Mr. McLELLAN—I was opposed to the resolution, but I did not explain it at the time.

Dr. TUPPER—Then the hon. member is rather late. What will his constituents think of a member who said nothing on an important constitutional question, and three years after comes forward and says he was opposed to it?

The hon. member for East Halifax went on to say that when he was in England he saw there existed a great desire to get rid of these colonies. I was also in England at the same time the hon. member was there. He will admit that I had as many opportunities as he of meeting, and ascertaining the opinions of, the statesmen and people of England, from the present distinguished Premier down to the humblest person. I am proud to say, that if that hon. member came away with the belief that there was a general desire on the part of the government and the press, and leading men among the people, that England should part with these colonies, he brought back with him an impression totally at variance with those that other gentlemen, either from this or the adjoining Province, received during their visit. There is no question that there is a party in the House of Commons, familiarly known as the Cobden and Bright party, sustained by such doctrines as Goldwin Smith, who do not hesitate to say that their policy is to get rid of these Colonies, and I will tell you who strengthen their hands—feeble as they were shown to be when they were struck down by the independent action of the Palmerston Ministry, who unhesitatingly declared that this was not the policy of the British government and people. It is the hon. gentleman himself who is now giving weight to that party. It is the press and people of this country who do not hesitate to say that they are prepared to treat with contempt and derision the parental advice of the Ministers of England, given for the benefit of the colonies themselves. The only danger is, if these gentlemen are powerful enough to obstruct the union of the Provinces, and leave it doubtful to the British Parliament whether we do or do not desire to have connection with the Crown of the mother country.

The hon. member for Richmond called attention to the significant fact that the New York Herald stated that the object of the Fenian organization was to prevent a Union of British North America. You find that journal inspired by the utmost contempt of British institutions, holding the Fenian organization up to the support of the people of the United States and telling them that the opponents of Confederation deserve their confidence because their policy is a United States policy, and that it is to weaken the connection between the Crown and the Colonies. Be this as it may, it is quite apparent that the difficulties that have been thrown in the way of the policy approved and urged upon us by the British government have led the press of the United States to suppose that the reason why these Colonies have refused to accept this policy is because they prefer Annexation to the American Republic to retaining the present connection with the mother country. I say therefore that the hon. member never misrepresented the public more grossly than when he declared that there is anything like a pervading desire in Great Britain to get rid of these Colonies. Go to the Ministry, the Parliament, and the Press—every thing by which the public sentiment can be gauged—and you will find that it is in favour of keeping up the connection and preventing the dignity of the Crown being tarnished in the slightest degree.

Where is the man in this House or country that will sustain the policy which he propounds in opposition to this proposed union. The question of representation in the Imperial Parliament was propounded on the floors of this House with an ability and an eloquence such as the hon. member himself knows he has not the slightest pretension to. He knows it was put forth in the most attractive manner that it was possible to put it, but it fell still-born upon the intelligent minds of this country, and never received the slightest favour in Nova Scotia or any other part of British North America. He knows it was only a few years ago that the same eloquent speeches were reprinted and put before the public of England, and down to the present hour not a man, with the slightest pretension to statesmanship, has been disposed to give it a word of encouragement. I ask, then, in the presence of the grave emergency,—of the dangers that threaten British America—when everything we hold dear is imperilled, is this the time to revive a project which has never obtained any favour among the people of this country? This same gentleman who considers that 19 of the ablest men that this Province can send to Ottawa would be powerless (though they would constitute a number greater than is found necessary to decide the fate of parties in England), would be satisfied with two votes in a Parliament of 650 members. Suppose we had such a representation; I ask you is it for that Nova Scotians would be prepared to place the enormous and oppressive

taxation upon the shoulders that would be required to sustain the army and navy of England, and the expenses of any wars in which the mother country might be engaged?

When on a former occasion I confronted the hon. member with the statement that the Reciprocity Treaty was about to be abrogated, the country will remember that he entertained no such fears. Well the hon. member has proved a false prophet for the treaty has been abrogated. The hon. member now tells you that the United States do not want these Provinces. I do not require to labour that question. He tells you himself that the United States, if they could grasp this Province, would become the first Naval Power in the world—able to dictate terms to the world. Does he think that eludes the scrutiny of the keenest statesmen to be found in that country—whose policy is to grasp where they can gain a foothold and extend their dominion. Therefore I ask the hon. member if he has not himself shown you that there is sufficient inducement for the United States to obtain these Colonies; and I do not require to take up your time with showing that the only means we have of resisting their encroachments is Union. Therefore let every friend of British institutions, every loyal subject, every man who is not willing to see our rights and privileges torn from us, combine in this great work of elevating these comparatively insignificant Provinces into a higher position in the eyes of America and of perpetuating those institutions which are essential to our happiness and prosperity.

I shall refer, before I close, to a few remarks which the hon. member has made in another place. He has taken a liberty with this house, and proclaimed to the people that there are traitors within its walls—that there are men who have treasonable designs upon the rights and liberties of the country. He would hold up gentlemen to the execration of the people by one inflammatory publication after the other. I am now going to make a statement which otherwise I would not feel called upon to make. The hon. member for Richmond, in the exercise of his privileges as an independent member of this house, put a question across the floor to the government in regard to one of the most important subjects that was ever before the people. I answered as I best could in the position in which I was placed. I listened to the hon. member as he spoke, and although I was unable to agree with him in his opinions respecting one of my pet children, the Quebec scheme, I felt there was a cogency of argument, a reasonableness and solidity in the case as presented to the house, that could not but make a deep impression on the people of this country. The hon. member gave in detail every thought and feeling which he stated has weighed upon his own mind, and which had brought him to his conclusions. I am not his judge; I know not what may animate him; I am quite free to admit that a gentleman may profess one thing and may be influenced by considerations very different to those which he portrays to the house; I can easily suppose that possible after the exhibition we have had to-day; but justice to the hon. member for Richmond compels me notwithstanding the strong antagonism that has existed between us, to say here solemnly and deliberately that if he was influenced by any consideration other than that he stated boldly to the House, it was without my knowledge. If he was looking to place—to a position in any delegation that might take place hereafter, he has not intimidated it to me. I do not know of it; I am free to assert that he has never exchanged a single word with me to that effect, nor has he done so to the present hour. I feel after the manner in which that hon. gentleman has been assailed, it is due to this House that I should make this statement. But from whom does this charge of treason come? Who is the first man to suspect dishonesty in his fellow? The man who is himself dishonest! Who is capable of giving the fullest rein to the basest suspicions? The man whose own heart tells him that he could be tempted! Whoever there is in this House in a position to accuse any of his fellow men of being a traitor, it is not the hon. member for East Halifax. I tell him at this moment the public sentiment of this town, as well as of this House, is outraged by the traitorous declaration made by that hon. member in the open streets in the presence of—

Mr. STEWART CAMPBELL—Order, order.

Dr. TUPPER—Was it a violation of the orders of this House when the hon. member rose here to-day and insinuated that the hon. member for Richmond had been bribed?

Mr. ANNAND—I never said on the floors of this House that an hon. member had been the subject of a base bribe.

Dr. TUPPER—Nobody could put any other interpretation on the statement he made. I say if there is an hon. member in this House who is not in a position to charge any man with disloyalty, it is the hon. member. Tell him more; he is known to have reflected the opinions of other gentlemen—to be in close alliance with those who have occupied positions of public trust—who have recently returned from the United States; and the most intelligent minds in this country are deeply excited at the present moment by the fact that these persons have openly declared that it is impossible for Great Britain to defend us. They feel that if they can indoctrinate the public mind with the sentiment that the safety of these Provinces lies in transferring their allegiance to the United States, the loyalty of our people will be paralyzed by despair. Is it for these men, for a Press which reflects their opinions, to accuse any hon. member of being a traitor? Sir the loyal spirit of my countrymen will repel such base and unmanly fears, and united with each other find a safe position for these Provinces under the aegis of the British Crown.

Mr. ANNAND—After the lengthy reply of the hon. Provincial Secretary, in which he exhibited a good deal of temper unprovoked on my part, it will be necessary for me to make a few remarks. That hon. gentleman has referred to an organization in this city with traitorous intent.

Dr. TUPPER—I said no such thing; I referred to traitorous language being used on the streets.

Mr. ANNAND—Gentlemen, he said, of high position were endeavoring to weaken the allegiance of this people to the mother country. I ask the hon. member in view of the dangers that he says threatens the country—in the presence of the existing emergency, when men of all parties, in all parts of the country, are arming to resist the common foe, if it is right for him to come forward to make these such