

statements. The people have become so exasperated at the idea of their privileges being swept away, that they are almost ready to come into conflict with those who would deprive them of their rights. Is this, then, the time to excite the people, when you require moderation and calmness? The hon. member says that the town has been excited by observations made on the street. In the first place, I did not believe that any hon. member, much less the hon. Provincial Secretary, could allow himself for a single moment to bring up street rumours to this house. But what are the facts? An old and esteemed friend of my own—who differs from me on this question—met me at the corner of the street, and a good deal excited uttered some very extravagant opinions—that the people should be coerced into Confederation; and I, in the spirit of our Herodotus uttered expressions that may be construed into disloyalty, but which passed away with the moment they were uttered. I say the expression was a hasty one—it was drawn forth by equally hasty expressions; and I may add I regret that it was ever made.

The hon. gentleman referred to the inconstancy of my position. He charged me with being a weather cock. I am prepared to say that in the presence of this great question my own views, like those of many others, have been considerably modified. The views that I entertain to-day may be modified as those of the Provincial Secretary himself to-morrow, before any decision on this question is arrived at. But I challenge him in the presence of his House and country, to read from any resolution passed in the House under a former Government, or from any despatch emanating from the late Government, of which I was a member, that commits me to Union with Canada. I might refer to these papers, but I shall content myself at present with challenging the hon. member to show that there was a member on either side of the House who was committed to any particular scheme of Union, Legislative or Federal, by the resolution to which he referred. What was the object of the resolution at that time? It proposed a delegation to be held with representatives of the several provinces to consider the question with a view of its being set at rest. It was considered, but so little noticed was it by the delegates at Quebec that a record was not even kept of the proceedings relative thereto. It was set at rest—no one being bound by any resolution.

The hon. gentleman has carried us to New Brunswick and talked of the change of sentiment in that colony. I have to learn that the people of that province are in favour of Confederation—or that they are prepared to unite on any terms with Canada. I believe that they are not. My view of the position is this—that the Government being composed of antagonistic elements does not unite the confidence of the people; but as respects the Quebec scheme the people, I believe, are as much opposed to it as ever before. But let us pass from New Brunswick to our own Province, and what do we see. What have we had in this country since the question came up. We have had three elections? Has any one of them decided in favour of Confederation? of the Quebec or any other scheme? I see before me the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Ray) who occupies the seat filled by the late leader of the Government, was he returned to go for the scheme? Nay, was he not elected to oppose it? Again, there is my friend Mr. Hebb, from Lunenburg, who, in spite of the Provincial Secretary's exertions, was returned by a two-third majority against Confederation. Again, in the county of Yarmouth the government could not get a man to run for them—the feeling there is almost unanimous against Confederation. Every constituency that has been opened since the Quebec scheme was propounded, has decided against it, and with the full knowledge that nine-tenths of the electors of this Province are opposed to Union, we are invited to change the constitution of the country without an appeal to the people. I am willing to assume that we may be compelled by circumstances to accept some scheme of union, and my object in such an event is not to thwart any reasonable wishes of Her Majesty's Government may have on the subject, but to point out the best mode of arriving at a result that will be less objectionable to the people of the Province than the Quebec scheme. But this is not the time; the question is not sufficiently understood, and the people are not prepared for its acceptance.

The hon. member has referred to the Intercolonial Railway. I have under my hand the speeches made by the Canadian ministers last year in discussing this question. Do we not all know that whilst Nova Scotia and New Brunswick desired the Intercolonial Railway, and were ready to fulfil their part of the obligation, the Canadians on two occasions shipwrecked the great scheme. These gentlemen would now give us an Intercolonial Railway, provided that they can couple it with Confederation? Does it follow that a union of the Provinces is necessary before the Railway can be built? We know it is not.

We know that the sense of the people is against all union with Canada. We all know the character of the public men that have been dominant in that country for very many years. We know that the money of the country has been corruptly squandered by hundreds of thousands—that they have proved themselves unworthy of all confidence by their action in respect to the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentlemen talk about traitors, but let me turn your attention to the character of some of his Canadian friends, members of the Government in that province. We had one of the leading spirits an expatriated rebel; another, the Attorney General, had been found in rebellion with arms in his hands; the Minister of Finance was at one time openly charged with Annexation proclivities; and another gentleman is said to be looking towards Washington. And these are the loyal men who are to govern this country in the event of Confederation! With the tremendous influence that the Canadians will exercise—I would just as soon go into the British Parliament with only two Representatives. There the people of Nova Scotia might expect to obtain some justice, for their representatives would be speaking to a body of noble men, animated by a high sense of honor and justice; while at Ottawa you would be speaking to corrupt men, some of whose arms have been plunged up to their elbows in the public chest.

The hon. member said that both sides of this house were represented at the Quebec Con-

vention. I think differently. The Liberal and Conservative sides were represented, but not the two great parties which on this great question divide the people of this country. My desire is, in the event of a new Convention, not to see this house represented as to its political proclivities, but in respect to the position of the question of Confederation in this province. Will the "ablest statesman" of British North America say that this question is not now better understood than when they met at Quebec? Will they say that their ability is so great that they were able in the midst of exhaustive festivities, to have a perfect constitution for these Provinces? They might give themselves that credit, but the people of this country do not. This question should not be dealt with hastily. There is no necessity why this scheme should be forced upon the people; if it is to come, let it come quietly; let the public mind be educated up to it; but if you do not wish to make this country a second Ireland, to bring these Provinces into inextricable troubles, do not force Union upon them. I believe the people might be educated to accept a scheme of Union if it was just, I believe, influenced by a desire to meet the wishes of the British Government, they are ready to make large sacrifices; but to force the measure upon them without their consent would be a grave and fatal mistake. It would be fatal to the success of that Union which gentlemen are so anxious to bring about. We know how the Irish Union was accomplished, but I trust no such influences will prevail in this country. I can suppose a majority of this House prepared to accept Union, but unless they have the people behind them, any measure they might pass would not be worth the paper on which it was written. You must carry with you the sanction of the people. Even if you are entirely wrong on the question you should defer to their prejudices and give them time to consider the subject calmly and deliberately, but not to force it upon them at all hazards.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I am curious to know why the hon. member has occupied so much time to-day. Why should he wish to define his position?

Mr. ANNAND.—The hon. member for Inverness made a special reference to me the other day.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Why could not the hon. gentleman wait until the question came up legitimately? Why all this anxiety on his part? If I know anything about the hon. member his position was defined before, or it remains undisturbed now. He did not utter a single new idea that I have not seen in his own paper time and again. I cannot understand his course unless he feels that this position is untenable. I will only say at present that it looks to me very much as if the hon. gentleman all along had this object in view: only wait, says he, until three or four of us who have been opposing Union can be convinced by some means or other, then we are all right. That is the substance of the hon. member's remarks. If two or three gentlemen could only be induced to assist their friends of Union, then there will be no difficulty about a reference to the people.

TUESDAY, APRIL 10. UNION OF THE COLONIES. SPEECH OF HON. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY.

Hon. member at 3 o'clock. Dr. TUPPER then rose and said:—The house will recollect that a few days ago, the hon. member for Richmond put a question to the Government, in relation to a very important subject, and on that occasion I stated that the situation in which we stood in respect to the Union of the Colonies would preclude me from giving him an immediate reply, until I had an opportunity of placing myself in communication with my colleagues in the Government, and with the other gentlemen who had assisted in maturing the Quebec scheme. I stated, however, to the hon. member and to the house, that in view of the great importance of the subject,—of the events which were daily transpiring in connection with the question—I would take the earliest opportunity of giving, in my place, the policy which the Government and the friends of the Quebec scheme of Confederation in this Legislature are prepared to take in relation to the matter. In order to redeem the pledge and bring the attention of this Legislative Assembly to the consideration of the gravest and most important question that has ever been submitted to it,—after due deliberation with my colleagues, and consultation with the gentlemen who were associated with us at the Quebec Conference—I rise for the purpose of giving to the house and country the fullest information as to the policy which we are prepared to assume in relation to the subject. I regret deeply that in approaching a question of such gravity—which demands that the members of the house should rise to the great emergency, and look with a single eye to the interests of the country; only to this course that is calculated to promote the advancement of our common country, and perpetuate the great privileges which, as British subjects, we enjoy; I regret, I say, Sir, in approaching a question of such deep importance, that the conduct of a portion of the press in this Province, controlled by a high and responsible position, should make it my duty, at the outset to notice, not the arguments—as at that time has passed—but unfounded calumnies and misrepresentation. The time has passed when the opponents of a union of British North America can meet the friends of that great question on the platform, in the press, or on the floor of Parliament, and discuss as we become public men, and statesmen, upon the principles and leading features of the scheme proposed. Instead of that, the opponents of Union have resorted to appeals to the passions—to such an amount of personal vituperation as never before I believe in the history of this country, was dragged into its consideration as a great public question upon any occasion. I should fall in what I owe to myself and to the great question with which I am at this moment in a torturing deal, and in what I owe to the deliberative assembly, if I did not in my place in Parliament, notice at the very outset a position that the opponents of this question have assumed, and the strange liberties they have taken with this Legislature. I would be justified on the present occasion, in dealing with this matter in a very different form,—any member of that Legislature would only be discharging his duty if he dealt with it in a different spirit,—and in asking the Legislature if the inherent privileges which the members of this assembly enjoy are to be trampled under foot by our very presence, and by those holding high and responsible positions within these very walls, and at the same time, acting in the capacity of editor, publisher, and proprietor of a newspaper in this city. Is he to be allowed to assail the character and integrity

of members of this house with impunity? not simply to hold up this Legislative Assembly as a devoid of intelligence, as one of the most despicable bodies of men that have ever been permitted to deal with the public affairs of a free country; but to go further, and charge in the most direct terms members with being influenced by motives most base and corrupt? I hold in my hand the *Morning Chronicle* of April 6, last, in which a correspondent, over the signature of "Brutus"—a well-known gentleman, closely identified with the publisher and editor of this paper,—who has ventured to speak of members of this house,—of his own political associates in this Legislature as well as of those who are opposed to him,—in terms not only of opprobrium and reproach, but which are alike dishonourable and insulting to every member of this deliberative assembly. He says:—

"As it is well known, a few designing politicians, doing the work of conspirators, tentatively contemplate the destruction of our constitution, and the transfer of our revenues to a set of men who are far away, and who care nothing for us or for the preservation of those interests which are as dear to us as the crimson tides that circulate through our veins."

I ask the house what must be the position of public men in this country who are called upon to deal with a question so vital to our interests as a union of British North America, when they are obliged to descend to such language as that? I need not remind the house what the Government was called upon to deal with the question, they invited the aid and co-operation of the leaders of the political party opposed to them; and that these gentlemen, thus called upon to share the responsibility in connection with a matter of such vital import, have acted from the first in entire union with those who had asked their assistance. I do not mean to say that the members of the Government and the gentlemen opposed to them, who were delegates to the Quebec Conference, always saw eye to eye; I do not mean to say that we were not obliged on many occasions to arrive at a common result by a compromise of our individual opinions; but in the measure as a whole, that was presented to the world, we were all heartily and thoroughly united. Then, I ask, what is the position of the organ of the party of which the hon. and learned member for Colchester (Mr. Archibald) is the leader, when in dealing with this question, they denounce that gentleman in the presence of this Assembly, as a conspirator, traitorously endeavoring to strike down the rights and liberties of his country.—A cause which requires an advocacy like that must indeed be in want of arguments on which to found a claim to the support of the people. Again I read:—

"Yesterday, however, on the floor of the Assembly Room, bygone promises were unceremoniously repudiated, confidence betrayed, and bold treachery exhibited. I sat in the gallery, and witnessed the perpetration of this act of political turpitude, and heard the whisper circulated from ear to ear:—'The traitor has been bought.' The scene reminded me of what transpired in the Parliament House in Dublin, at the commencement of the present century, when the seductive influence of British gold, corrupted a Parliament, and professed patriotism was bought and sold like bank stock, or any other marketable commodity. I asked myself whether the temptations of either proffered official aggrandisement and emoluments, or the rejection of a candidate's claim to membership of a social club, was a sufficient pretext for party treachery, for the glaring tergiversation of oft-repeated and publicly avowed opinions,—and what is more, for the betrayal of a country's dearest interests, and the dishonourable destruction of its constitution."

When the opponents of Union have been obliged to take a course like that, they have given the best evidence that their cause is an untenable one, which cannot be sustained by public men. Here we find the best leading minds of the party with which the hon. member is associated, denounced by their own press, as men who have been recreant to the best interests of the country. Again, in the editorial of the *Morning Chronicle* of April 9, we read:—

"But whatever the people of this country believed, at the period referred to, there is too much reason to apprehend that their hopes and expectations will never be realized. A majority of the members of this Assembly, it is said, has been secured, corrupted by influences frightful to contemplate, to vote our free Parliament out of existence, and with it the rights and privileges we so dearly prize."

Here is a charge made in the most emphatic language that it is possible to make it—that a majority of the members of the House have been basely bribed and corrupted by means that it is frightful to contemplate. What is the position of a man who thus degrades the Legislature, who holds up to the public execration the representatives of the people as men that are to be bought and sold. Further on I read:—

"But might, we are told, makes right, and in this spirit the Provincial Secretary and his aids and abettors in the house, propose to lay their sacrilegious hands upon the constitution of our country. Let them beware ere they attempt the unholy deed. The people of Nova Scotia are proverbially loyal, but they will have need of it all if their feelings are thus violently outraged and their rights basely betrayed.—Nova Scotians will not pass under the yoke of Canada without a struggle, and a resolution to condone us may receive the assent of a majority of the house of Assembly; but the end is not yet. Our countrymen, if true to themselves, will triumph in the end."

You have then this same paper using this inflammatory and seditious language, with the object of exciting the loyal people of this province to rise against the action of the Legislature of their country. That is the position to which an hon. member has been drawn; in his inability to find arguments to sustain his cause. Again, in the *Morning Chronicle* of April 10th, we find:—

"In the course of the Canada rate Debate in the Canadian Assembly, last winter, the Hon. George Brown referred to the large sum that was given for the purchase of the State of Louisiana, and suggested that the expenditure of as large, or even a larger sum, in the purchase of the Maritime Provinces, would be profitable Canadian investment. Mr. Brown's hint, we have reason to believe, has not been lost sight of by the Confederation. Canadian gold, it is said, has been, and is sufficient abundance to overcome the scruples of a sharp eye on the part of the people, and was daily appropriating the sudden contributions of members, who unapprehensively found willing to accept the base bribe."

I ask the hon. member if the most spiteful member is prepared to allow a foul stigma like that to be placed upon his character? I feel that all the hon. member has been doing is bringing down discredit and dishonour upon himself and the cause he thus upholds. I may have occasion to draw the attention of this house to the question as to how far these imputations of base, corrupt and dishonourable motives influence the members of this Legislature, who are sprung from the better in the mind of the hon. member; that there are other gentlemen open to such imputations as he himself may be. Now when a base and dishonourable man is imputed to a man of fair character, the party who attempt to get such a stigma upon him, has a right to stand up by saying that there is some reason for the belief that it may possibly apply to the person in question. I have already said that these imputations are levelled against the gov't party alone, and fall with the same weight upon gentle-

men politically identified with the hon. member. It may be argued with reason that these imputations fall with far greater force upon the leader of the Opposition, with whom the hon. member has been long closely associated, and whose motives he may be supposed to know better than those with whom he has not been politically identified.

Let me call your attention to this charge of bribery. No one will deny the truth of the principle that it is only when you find a man lend himself to a dishonourable deed, that you have a foundation to impute a base motive. In what position are the promoters of the Quebec scheme? Were we in the position of having denounced a Union of British North America, and then, without anything to change their attitude, having suddenly assumed a position entirely antagonistic and at variance with that which we had previously taken? If it were so, then the hon. member might have something on which to base a suspicion. Before the question was mooted in this Legislature I was called to address a meeting in the city of St. John, in the neighbouring Province, and chose for my subject the Union of British North America. From that day to this I have been found the consistent supporter of Union. When the late government brought down the question of Union I adhered to the principles on the platform and in the press, and gave them my cordial and enthusiastic support. So down to the present day I stand before the people of this country as a man who, in every position, has used every influence he possessed to promote and carry forward that on which he believed the prosperity and security of the country depended. Can the hon. member find any foundation there for the imputation of base and corrupt motives? Again, if the promoters of Union are influenced by motives that are dishonourable to themselves and the Legislature, in what position is Her Majesty the Queen? When he sees the Queen, session after session, at the close and opening of Parliament, coming down and urging in the most emphatic terms that the Royal lips can use, this question of Confederation upon the people of British North America, does he mean to say that she, too, is corrupted by base bribes? Coming down to Her Majesty's Ministers—the men who stand before the world as exemplars of the most distinguished patriotism, the most profound statesmanship—are they too corrupted by base means when they declare that the advancement of British North America is to be secured by carrying through this great question of a Colonial Union? What does he think influences Lord Derby, and the statesmen opposed to Her Majesty's Ministers who, on every occasion, have stood forward and strengthened the hands of the government of England in carrying forward this great question of Colonial Union? What has influenced the press and people, as well as the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, when, with a unanimity which has never been exhibited on any other public question, they stand forward as the avowed supporters and advocates of this great measure? Is it at a crisis like this—when day by day these patriotic influences that are calculated to operate upon men's minds do operate—that a member of this deliberative assembly should dare to dishonour this House by imputations of being influenced by base and unworthy motives? Go to Canada and you find in that great country an overwhelming majority of both branches of the Legislature in favour of this great measure; and you find Her Majesty's Representative therein using his legitimate influence to press it forward. Go to New Brunswick and you see Her Majesty's Representative heartily promoting the scheme though he was at the outset hostile to it; but when he has had an opportunity of examining it in all its details he gives it his support and confidence. If you look at the Legislature of that province you find that, although upon an appeal to the people by a combination between the opponents of Confederation and the opponents of the government, a large majority was returned to oppose the Quebec scheme, yet now day by day the conclusion of public affairs is operating to such an extent upon both branches that a few days since the following resolution was passed by the Legislative Council, by a majority of 14 to 5:—

Resolved, as in the opinion of this Committee,—That a Union of all the British North American Provinces, based on the resolutions adopted at the Conference of Delegates from the several Provinces, held at Quebec on the 10th of October, 1864, is an object highly to be desired—essential to their future prosperity and influence, and calculated, alike to strengthen and perpetuate the ties which bind them to the Mother Country;

Resolved, as in the opinion of this Committee,—That the Legislative Council should concur in any measure which may be necessary to carry such a union into effect."

I ask what is it that has corrupted the Legislative Council of New Brunswick so as to induce this overwhelming change in their minds. Is the hon. member prepared to charge them with base, dishonourable, and corrupt motives? Does he not know that sitting in that branch of the Legislature are men whose wealth and standing in the country are sufficient protection against the base insinuations with which he fills the disreputable journal which is under his control? In the presence of this crisis in the history of British North America the Legislative Council, like Her Majesty's Representative, stand forward and declare by an overwhelming majority that they are prepared to uphold the great scheme of Intercolonial union as the great means of advancing the best interests of the country. Look at the lower house, and you will find the leader of the Government—who has been bespattered for the past twelve months by this same press, and held up as an incorruptible patriot,—declaring by the speech at the opening of the Legislature, and showing by his own admissions on the floor of Parliament, that his views have undergone a great change in relation to the question of a union of the colonies. Looking at the events that are transpiring in this province no one can doubt the result. Then, I say, is it Canada's gold that is corrupting the Province and influencing it to assume an attitude so very different from what it assumed a year ago? Coming to our own Province what do I find? I am not going to speak of the Lieutenant Governor (Mr. Annand—bear hear), but the Government know that the "Hero of Kara," in his capacity of Commander-in-Chief of British North America, used all the ability and talent at his command, by public speeches and written communications, in favor of a union of British North America, as one of the most distinguished soldiers of the empire he felt that the salvation and security of British North America depended upon the proposed union being carried into effect. What has corrupted that high-minded soldier, statesman and patriot? Is it Canadian gold? If the features of the scheme are such as to bring to its advocacy a man so distinguished, why is it that this deliberate Assembly is so ready to see that Canadian gold is the only means of inducing man to come in carrying forward? In what position is the brave and