

of the most cogent necessities? What gave birth to the union over our border? Was the proposition submitted to the different States in time of peace? Not so. The union, such as it was at first, was cemented only under the pressure of a war with the mother country. If the people of the States had waited for union till that pressure had ceased to exist, they would have been destroyed peace-meal, and would have had no union at all. From 1774 till the time of peace the government had been carried on under a Congress which arose at the promptings of necessity, and assumed a centralized power, but when peace came the centralization ended, the States pulled apart, prejudice and passion denuded them, and it was not until ruin stared them in the face that they were again forced to unite with closer bands and in a more solid union. The same has been the case with the other unions of the world. The merest tyro in history knows that the United Provinces of the Old World combined only under the iron heel of Spanish despotism. It was the hostile legions of Alva that created a union which peace and prosperity would never have produced. All the other unions of independent States, that have had any permanence, are those which have been cemented under the pressure of urgent necessities. The Prov. Sec. has referred to a letter which has recently appeared, and which will have great influence. I will not undertake to say that I consider the picture of our dangers from Fenian invasion rather overdrawn, but this I do say that if I were addressing this house, and desired to make the strongest appeal on behalf of Union, I would have rested it on the very premises which that letter contains. I should have drawn conclusions from it the very opposite of those of the very able and eloquent author. There are certain considerations connected with the dangers so powerfully descanted on in that letter, which should press upon us with great force. Our position is this: We stand alongside a country which has suddenly developed itself into the greatest military power in the world. It contains large numbers of armed and trained men, at this moment hordes of them are threatening an inroad upon our territory. We have opposed to us not merely the irradicable hatred of British power which distinguishes the descendants of Ireland who have emigrated to the United States, and who compose the Fenian element, but we have that hatred sympathized in by the great body of the American people, and no man can tell at what moment our soil may be invaded. Let us, then, look at England, and see how she stands. England fought for seven years to subjugate the rebellious States, and yet with only three millions to fight with, she was obliged to retire unsuccessful. Now thirty millions of people occupy the place of the three. They have been baptized in the blood of civil war, and acquired the skill and the daring which experience alone can give. Then look at the responsibilities which England has now thrown upon her. The entire Colonial Empire at the Revolution consisted of the American and West India Islands. For five years after the peace of 1783 Australia, a continent larger than the United States and now divided into six separate governments with the dimensions and revenues of principalities, remained undiscovered; New Zealand was unknown. The 140 millions of India were governed by native princes, with the exception of a few thousands who owned the sway of a commercial company; Canada East was in the power of the French, Western Canada was a wilderness. Now the myriads of India are direct subjects of the British crown, and on her Majesty's government devolve the responsibility of ruling this enormous population, itself fourfold greater than that of the United States. They have the care and protection of the vast continent of Australia; they have still to defend the Islands of the West and of the East Indies. So long as she retains her ascendancy at sea she can protect these; but contemplating the whole Empire, including over thirty colonies, scattered over all parts of the world, consisting of every people and tongue, and situated in every climate, is it possible to conceive of a power but that of Great Britain that could have so long discharged such immense responsibilities as the possession of this Empire throws upon her, and that too almost within the life-time of a man, necessarily involves. See how different from ours is the position of all these Colonies. Australia is at the antipodes, and is defended by its distance from a foe. India is separated from the only power that is likely to interfere with British rule by impassable mountains and trackless deserts, the islands of the Pacific and Australasia are protected by distance and their remote position; but here, all along the two thousand miles of continuous boundary between us and America, we have in our immediate presence the military power which makes British America the weakest spot in the Empire. No British statesman can fail to see that of all the points at which the Imperial power can be assailed, this presents the elements which make a war most to be dreaded. Do we wonder, then, that despatch after despatch has been sent by the home authorities, requiring us to put ourselves in such a position that England, if called upon to defend us, can do so successfully. Is it any wonder that we find the Colonial Secretary, time after time, almost imploring us, if we have any desire to retain our allegiance to the Crown, to put ourselves in such an attitude that the Crown can protect us? I feel that if there were no commercial advantages to be derived from striking down antagonistic barriers; if our material interests even were not promoted by Union, we could not gracefully resist the expression of such a desire on the part of those to whom we are indebted for protection, and of whom we are even now imploring aid. For they say, "we are ready to place the whole resources of the Empire at your back, we will defend you" as long as you desire to remain with us; but we claim it a right which our position gives us to offer you advice as to the attitude you shall assume, and in which, we think, you can best be defended." Even admitting that there were no commercial advantages in the proposed Union, admitting even that we did not agree that the British government were right in the belief that Union would aid our defence, is there a man in the country who could look a British statesman in the face and say "we will accept your protection, but we decline your advice?" This argument alone, the defence which is due from our position as the protected and defended, to those who protect and defend, I feel to be irresistible. I have never hesitated in this assembly from the first hour when the proposition for Colonial Union was mooted, from giving it my support. Since it assumed a definite shape and I became a party to the Quebec scheme I have felt my conviction of the soundness of the principles upon which that scheme was based, strengthened by reason and reflection. I claim no right to dictate to others their course of action. The gentlemen with whom I have been associated, have a right, if they choose, to change their views, but I do not feel at liberty to do so while I retain

my present conviction. I have put my hand to public documents which bind me in honor to the same course to which my convictions lead. As I have said my opinion of the Quebec scheme is entirely unchanged. I believe that it guards our interests as far as we had a right to expect them to be guarded in an Intercolonial arrangement; but if larger concessions can be obtained, there is no member of this House or of the Quebec Convention, who would not willingly accept them. The resolution now before us leaves the question open only to a change in our favor—Canada is bound by her Legislature to go to all events as far as the Quebec scheme. The Lower Provinces alone are dissatisfied, and if any alterations are made, they must be in the line of concessions to them. If we can secure guarantees and privileges not embodied in that scheme, it will be in entire accord with the feelings of this House and those members of it that attended the Convention, and as the proposition now before us will secure us at least the benefit of that scheme, and possibly some others, I do not hesitate to give it my support, and have much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Hon. PRO. SECRETARY, in reply to a remark from Mr. ANNAND, said that the passage of the resolution would enable a scheme of union to be given effect to by the Imperial Parliament but that one of the conditions would be that the existing Legislatures would not be interfered with, and would continue to sit for the term of their election.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced a bill to enable the City of Halifax to erect a slaughter house.

THURSDAY, March 12, 1866.

The house met at 3 o'clock.

UNION OF THE COLONIES.

Upon the motion to take up the order of the day, Mr. ANNAND asked that the debate be deferred in consequence of the arrival of the mail steamer from England, which had brought him important correspondence requiring immediate reply.

Hon. PROV. SEC. replied that the Government were desirous of pressing the matter to a conclusion, as the Session had far advanced. It was well known that gentlemen opposite desired delay for the purpose of creating an agitation of the most discreditable kind.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL supported the proposition for an adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MILLER called attention to the fact that the *Morning Chronicle*, in publishing his recent speech on this question, had omitted a considerable portion of it. It was of great importance that this debate should be fairly sent to the country, and he trusted that the paper referred to would receive no portion of the grant for publishing the debates, unless this matter was remedied.

Mr. ANNAND said he was not aware of the circumstance until that moment. He should be ashamed if any one in his employ could be guilty of the act intentionally. He would request that the Committee on Reporting and Printing investigate the matter. He did not see why the debate should be thus forced on. Some time ago he had asked the Government to define their policy on the question, and the answer given was, that they had no policy until after New Brunswick had taken action. It would be impossible for him to remain in the house that afternoon.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said that no one could say that justice had not been done to the hon. gentleman in this debate—as to courtesy, he, Mr. ANNAND, was entitled to note, for he had been representing a majority of the house as corrupt and venal. He, Pro. Secy., was not prepared to accept the statement that private business interfered with Mr. ANNAND's attendance, for that gentleman had spent the morning in the streets, and had made no secret of his intention to postpone the debate.

Mr. ANNAND rose to reply; but upon interruptions coming from the galleries, Mr. S. Campbell said he "saw strangers in the galleries," whereupon they were cleared.

FRIDAY, April 13.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Mr. ANNAND said:—In rising to address the House on a question far transcending in magnitude any measure ever submitted for our consideration I feel I am under no ordinary responsibility. On this occasion we have arrayed against us a large amount of ability from, we suppose, all the talents of the government combined with that of the leader of the opposition. Although I desire that some one more able than myself was here to put to the members of the House and to the people of this country the important bearings of the question, yet I feel that if the gentlemen who surround me "speak the truth and feel it," it will send an echo through the Province, and if there should be a majority in the House in favor of a transfer of our privileges to a government to be organized six or eight hundred miles off, yet the gentlemen who oppose the bargain will go down honored to posterity. I feel on this occasion the necessity for more than ordinary calmness—I feel it would ill become me to imitate the precarious example set on more than one occasion by the leader of the government. Have we not seen that gentleman approaching a question which involves the dearest rights of the people, which involves the rights of members who sit here, have we not seen him rising to move a resolution which will sweep away our constitution, not in the spirit of a statesman dealing with a large public question, but in the tone and spirit of an angry, an excited, and when this debate concludes, it may be found a disappointed partizan? I do not intend to approach the question in that frame of mind, or to follow him in the intemperate abuse of gentlemen not here to defend themselves. The mover of the resolution spent an hour and a half in assailing the Press of the country and those who contribute to and conduct it. Transferring our thoughts to a wider arena, can we imagine Mr. Gladstone coming to the House of Commons and prefacing his Reform Bill by a tirade against one of the organs of public opinion? Could that statesman condescend to such a course, he would be hissed out of the House of Commons. And yet that is the way in which this question has been approached; the Provincial Secretary. Let me at the outset invite the attention of the House to the state of this country two years ago. There had been discussions in past years in reference to Union, and there had been diversities of opinion, some being in favor of a Legislative and some in favor of a Federal Union; but I challenge any gentleman to show me that beyond the mere expression of abstract opinion in favor of Union, any reso-

lution was ever proposed. The country was then peaceful, contented and prosperous; no one here thought of changing our constitution for the sake of connection with Canada. Some of us entertained views favorable to a union of the Maritime Provinces, but no one dreamed of giving up our present institutions and accepting a subordinate status in another country. I then ask, How does this question of Confederation arise? By what necessity has it been produced? Does it arise from the necessities of the people or Legislature of Nova Scotia? Why, sir, we all know that but for the necessities of Canada, as admitted by the Provincial Secretary himself, and by his colleague in the delegation, that question would never have been pressed upon our attention. Am I to understand, as was said elsewhere, that owing to the Canadian necessities—owing to the fact that the Government of Canada had come to a dead lock, there being three changes of administration in three years, and Parliamentary Government having become impossible, therefore it was that the people of Canada to rid themselves of their difficulties, financial and political, cast their eyes upon these Provinces as affording a means of escape? We all know what took place in 1864. A resolution passed authorizing the appointment of delegates to confer on the question of a Maritime Union; those delegates proceeded to their little town, and there they were met by Canadian speculators in politics, by whom they were spirited away to Quebec, and were seduced from their allegiance to this country and from the mission with which we charged them. In October, after a fortnight's debate at Quebec, and amidst exhaustive festivities, they passed resolutions favorable to a union of the Provinces of British America. These gentlemen have said that this delegation was authorized by the ministers of the Crown and by the Governor General, but it had no authority from us. The debate at Quebec was conducted in secret, all its deliberations were carried on with closed doors, and there is good reason to believe that but for the accidental publication of those resolutions the scheme might have been passed at last Session. I was in England when these negotiations were going on, and did not return until a few days before the resolutions were received. My opinion as to the scheme was asked, my answer was "I have not yet made up my mind, but will take time to consider." I did take time, and having occasion to make a journey of some 200 miles I put the papers in my pocket, read them, and when I returned I had come to the conclusion that the scheme was unjust to this Province, politically and financially, and that I would be recreant to my responsibility to the country if I gave it my support. We may be told that the proposition for union was received with acclamation by the people of England,—let any man go to England today, and although the allusion is somewhat dispelled we hear it said: "the Colonies should unite because the time has come when you should assume the burden of your own defence." That sentiment will be found in the despatches from beginning to end, it was the burden of Mr. Cardwell's recent speech at Oxford. With reference to the opinion of the Colonial Secretary of State I would say—when the scheme of union was sent home for approval it was at once indorsed, in 1864 the Imperial Government had no policy on the subject, no desire that we should be confederated, but on the contrary, the Lieutenant Governors were restricted to the consideration of a Maritime Union. I will be told that after the receipt of despatches from this side of the water the Colonial Secretary consented to delegates proceeding to Quebec—my argument is that Her Majesty's Government, until these representations were sent to the Colonial Office, had no policy in reference to union. What followed? In consequence of strong despatches from the Governor General representing that union was popular in all the Provinces, under this inspiration and believing that the thirty-three delegates truly represented the sentiments of the people Her Majesty's Ministers committed themselves to the policy of union. I do not hesitate to say, and in saying it I reveal no confidential communication, that I had an interview with Mr. Cardwell, in which I gave him the independent view taken by these Provinces,—for the first time that gentleman obtained the opinions held by the opposition in this House, and the views I gathered from that interview were of this effect: "Her Majesty's Government have committed themselves to the scheme and are therefore bound, if possible, to carry it out."—That is the true position of the question at the Colonial Office. Mr. Cardwell committed a grave error which no British statesman in the Colonial Office ever committed before in expressing his approval of a scheme which had never been submitted to the ratification of the representatives of the people. We have been told that the public opinion in England is in favor of union. Not one in ten of the people of England know that there are such places as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and few have heard even of Canada. The first idea arising in their minds is that the union will be a good thing because the union of the three kingdoms was good; but I met only two men during my visit to the Mother Country who did not believe that the scheme before us was a Legislative union; and when I mentioned what it really was—that we were to have a general government and then five local Governments, there was not an intelligent man with whom I met that did not treat it with contempt. The leading and animating opinion of the people of England was that the Union scheme was to take from the Mother Country a large portion of the burthen with which she has been charged in reference to our defence. Among others whom I met, was a very worthy gentleman who was Warden of Fishmonger's Hall; and some will hardly credit me when I say that this is one of the wealthiest organizations in London. That gentleman was the Warden when the Prince of Wales dined there, and it was in that Hall that Messrs. Galt and Carrier received their first public dinner in England. The first observation of my friend the Warden was, "Mr. ANNAND, I hope you are in favor of Confederation." I said that I was not. "What?" said he, "not in favor of Confederation, I imagined that all your people were so." I then explained the reasons of my opposition, stating that the Provinces were not connected, that there were four or five hundred miles of wilderness without there being any means of communication. His reply was that he had seen some observation in a newspaper and that his opinion was that the Railway ought to precede the union, and when I mentioned the many prejudices that existed he said: "this is not a thing to be hurried, satisfy yourselves that Confederation is right and build your Railroad." That was the opinion of this gentleman and I

think it is the real opinion of the people of England. But we are told also that the Queen, (God bless Her Majesty) is in favor of the scheme—Under our constitution the Queen can do no wrong, she is not responsible for a word contained in the speech with which Parliament is opened; but her ministers are charged with that responsibility. The Queen we may imagine, has something else to think about than the affairs of British North America in her household and the exercises of domestic virtues. I attach no importance therefore to that argument and gentlemen opposing must be weak indeed for argument when they bring Her Majesty's name into the debate. Her name should not be mentioned here. Then it is said that the British Government are in favor of Union—I have given some of the reasons as stated by the Colonial Secretary. There are fifty or sixty Colonies to be managed and if five or six of those in British America could be knocked into one the labours and responsibilities of the Colonial office would be lightened. We have also been told that the British press are in favor of it,—the press are probably animated by the feelings of the Colonial Secretary, and imagine that the change instead of being forced upon us in defiance of our wishes, was desired on our part, but tell intelligent Englishmen that the attempt to unite us will be contrary to the wishes of nine-tenths of our people and the knowledge of this fact would smash the strongest government in England that attempted to carry the measure. The press believe we desire the change, that the scheme was fair and just, and above all, they believe the scheme will lead us to assume a great portion of that burthen with which the mother country has been charged in connection with our defence. We are told that the Governor, the Hero of Kara, is in favor of it, I do not desire to say anything disrespectful of that highly respectable and able General, I respect him as a warrior who stood true to the colors of his country and faithfully served his Sovereign, I would undertake to find in the backwood of Musquodoboit men who understand the bearings of the questions, and the necessities of the Province as well as he.

(Upon interruptions being caused by disturbance in the galleries they were cleared at the instance of Mr. S. Campbell, but were subsequently re-opened.)

Mr. ANNAND continued:—While, as I have said, I have the greatest possible respect for the abilities of the officer presiding over the government of the country, in his military capacity, on questions of local politics, and relating to the formation of a new constitution for these Colonies, these are not the men to whom I would look for instruction. The name of the General and of the Admiral have also been improperly introduced into the debate to give weight and authority to the scheme of Confederation—these are the proper judges in time of war, we are ready to follow them in the field and to fight under their flag upon the sea, but it is highly indecorous to bring the names of these functionaries here and least of all, should the clergy be so prominently referred to within these walls, we respect them, in the discharge of their duties in connection with their flocks, but a clergyman is out of place when mixed up with the excitement incident to politics and party strife. Then we have been told "you have all the religious press of the country against you." Now, do we go for our political opinions to such newspapers as these? These are authorities while they confine themselves to the tenets of the doctrines which they uphold, but no longer, and I am authorized here to state, on behalf of many Presbyterians, clergymen and of many leading Wesleyans and Baptists, that they repudiate the opinions of these journals. But if it be true, as has been represented, that all this combination is on the side of the Government, I ask how is it that the great body of the people are arrayed against them. The reference to these religious bodies challenges this reply. The Provincial Secretary may quote these distinguished names and refer to these organs of popular opinion, but how is it that he dare not at this moment open a simple constituency in the country? There have been three elections since the scheme was proposed, and at every one of these the Government has been "routed horse, foot and artillery." What do I care for the opinions to which he has referred, when I know he dare not open a single constituency, and that the greatest misfortune that could befall him would be a vacancy in any of the seats? I therefore hurl back the allusion he has made. My mind can carry me back to the time when we were struggling for responsible government, we asked Her Majesty's Ministers for the concession, and we had them against us, we had against us the press of England, Her Majesty's Representative, and the General here, but we were right, we pressed for the rights and privileges of a free people, and achieved the system that we now enjoy. Therefore away with the arguments drawn from the opinions of the Admiral, and General, and Governor,—their feeling is to obey the Imperial authorities, and their opinions may be expected to be moulded by their government. We have been referred to the despatch of the 24th June 1865, in which it is said:—

"Such a union secures to Her Majesty's Government to recommend itself to the Provinces on many grounds of moral and material advantages,—as giving a well founded prospect of improved administration and increased prosperity."

What are the matters tending to the prosperity of this country? The improvement of our trade and commerce, a large market for the produce of the country. And can it be said that Confederation will increase our market? Will anyone say that we will buy a barrel of flour more from Canada unless a discriminatory duty is imposed? Will Canada buy any more fish or coal under Confederation? Can it be said that our productions will be allowed to enter Canada upon terms more favorable than those imposed on American articles? I do not give the Canadians credit for so much love for us. We may have free trade between the Provinces without a political union. It can be effected through our various governments. Would any one hazard a statement to the reverse in the face of the evidence upon our journals? I have entertained some doubts as to whether free trade in manufactures is as present desirable. There are manufactures growing up here which are now so weak as to require legislative aid; and to bring them into competition with the more advanced manufactures of Canada would be to ruin those who have embarked their capital in such enterprises among us; but if it should prove desirable I would throw no obstacle in the way. Then, is it necessary to have the Union to assimilate our currencies? No one will hazard such a statement. The effort has never been made; and until it falls, I will not admit the argument drawn in favor of a political union. It would be impossible to assimilate our currencies with that of the United States, and with the States we have a hundred commercial transactions for one with Canada.—Then comes the question of postage. Our postal system is now nearly the same, the only dif-