

ference being, that while in Nova Scotia newspapers pass free, in Canada there is a tax which impedes circulation. The question of the usury laws has been brought here for discussion, but I would suggest that if we are to have Confederation we need not discuss the subject,—in Canada the rate of interest is much higher than with us per cent. Then there is the question of the tariff; there may be no great difficulty on this subject if Canada is willing to suffer such a loss of revenue as would arise from striking off her twenty per cent duties.—In that case there could be no difficulty in assimilating our tariffs, and this it will be remembered was one of the conditions in the arrangements of 1862. Much has been said about the Intercolonial Railway,—this has been the grand lever used to operate on the people. We are told that we can have no railway unless we confederate, but looking at the necessities of Canada,—at the position she would be in if difficulties arose, ice-locked for six months in the year, we find how essential it is to her independence. While these are the facts so little loyal sentiment is there among the public men of Canada that they will not make the effort to secure that road, but will run the risk of severance from the British Empire while using it as a lever to bring about Confederation. Then comes the question of defence,—we are told we cannot defend ourselves unless Confederated. I admit the potency of the argument in reference to the Intercolonial Railway as a means of defence, and I believe that that road will be exceedingly useful in time of war, but it might be cut in two or three places in the event of hostilities. Any one reading the history of Sherman's campaign knows how easy it is to cut a railway, and how easily these Provinces could be separated.

The Pro. Sec. read a speech delivered by me on a former occasion in reference to the question of defence and I am prepared to reiterate the same sentiments to-day. My mode would be this: I would have the people contribute liberally pound for pound with Canada, or any other portion of the Empire, for the protection of our homes, I would pay that amount into the Imperial treasury and would charge the Imperial government with the defence. I would be willing to have this levied as a tax per head or a percentage on our revenue. If it be true, and I believe it is, that the British government intend to throw upon Canada the expense of her fortifications and of her gunboats for the lakes, here will be an enormous amount that we must pay into the Canadian exchanges, not for our defence but for theirs. The Pro. Sec. referred on a previous day to my friend Mr. Howe, and to the opinions that he uttered in England in advocating the Intercolonial Railway,—that gentleman did express strong opinions, but they were not so much on the subject of the union of the Colonies as in connection with that railway. Taking advantage of the apprehension existing in connection with the Trent affair, Messrs. Howe and Tilley used every argument they could urge. I do not hold myself responsible for every opinion expressed upon these matters and I may perhaps admit that Mr. Howe has committed mistakes almost as grave as those of the Provincial Secretary himself. In reference to the contribution from the treasury for defence, do not let me be misunderstood as to the mode in which the tax should be levied. By the consent of our own Parliament, responsible to our own people, we should contribute such an amount as the country could afford. What do we require for defence? It is said that as we are now situated we cannot march a militia from one Province to another. Then all that is required in case of an attack is an authority by which we can aid each other. Do we not now see all British America armed to the teeth and prepared for the conflict without Confederation? Then there is this difficulty in the way. When we are confederated the Commander-in-Chief would have his headquarters at Ottawa; and we will find that if Canada is attacked and these Provinces threatened, the Executive Government at Ottawa will naturally prefer the protection of their own homesteads to our security, and will withdraw our men for their defence. What did we hear some of the Canadian statesmen say some time ago? One of them said, "Look down at the Maritime Provinces; they have 30,000 sailors to man our gunboats." Another repeated the remark; but it never occurred to them that we might also be threatened with attack, and that it might become necessary to send down some of the yeomanry of the West in exchange for our seamen. Their idea seemed selfish and narrow and limited only to the defence of their own country at our expense. It is said that Confederation will make us much more powerful for defence. But Confederation does not give us a man more or a pound more; it adds neither to the material nor the sinews of war. If I need refer to any authority—an authority which I have under my hand—an authority which even the Provincial Secretary and the Attorney General will admit to be conclusive. I read an extract from a leading paper in Canada, the Toronto Globe, in answer to a correspondent who urged the objection "that Canada, under Confederation, would be compelled to furnish a quota for the defence of the Lower Provinces, whereas we should be relatively weakened." The Globe, in reply, said:—"It so happens, however, that for purposes of defence we are already Confederated, the Imperial Government being the central power. It is quite true that we could not in the present state of things be compelled, without the consent of our Legislature, to send troops to serve in Nova Scotia; but the home authorities have a most powerful means of coercion in their hands. They would tell us at once that, if we selfishly refused to aid them in the concentration of troops at the point where the Commander-in-Chief judged such concentration to be most needed for the preservation of the whole of British North America, they would leave us to our fate."

"In fact, we regard the addition of their population as a clear gain to Canada. New Brunswick might demand their assistance and ours too—for next to our own Province she is most open to attack but when the danger had passed her strength would be thrown in wherever needed. Moreover, the Maritime Provinces, in consequence of the large proportion they have of a seafaring population, furnish a most valuable element of defence which we do not possess." The Pro. Sec. said "if you would only unite you would be defended by the entire forces of the Empire." Will he undertake to say that if we decline to unite we will not be defended by Her Majesty's army and navy? Will he hazard that opinion? No, because he had to admit that come what would Her Majesty's government could not afford to lose these Provinces. Then away goes the story about casting us off, and even the leader of the Opposition said that England was bound to uphold the Colonies.

There is another view of the question and it is not the least interesting,—in connection with finances under confederation as compared with the present position. I have in my hand a calculation made from our public documents—from the estimate laid on the table of this House at this Session, and I will be prepared to show the House, and through the press to the people, the enormous sum we would sacrifice by Confederation. In the event of union the taxes known as Customs

duties would be collected and paid into Ottawa treasury, so with the light duties, our Railroads would become the property of the General Government, and our revenues would be derived from the following sources:—

Table with 2 columns: Item and Amount. Includes Casual revenue, Crown lands, Gold mines, Hospital Income, Local Expenditure—Estimate, 1868, Agriculture, Board statistics, Criminal prosecutions, etc.

The total cost of these services will be \$487,518, and I put it to the house can you afford to reduce any of them? And if so, where are you to begin? Then there is another species of expenditure which refers to the altered condition of affairs under Confederation; we have not yet been informed as to the sort of local government that we are to have,—we know not whether there will be one or two branches of the Legislature, or how many members each will have; but I assume that our Legislative expenses will be \$200,000 instead of nearly \$300,000 as at present. We will require a Prov. Secretary, he may not be a gentleman of such distinguished talents as the gentleman before me, because he may be called to a mere exalted sphere—he may aspire to be Prov. Secretary of the Confederated Provinces, he may be one of those governors who will be sent down to administer our affairs, certain it is that all those gentlemen who have acted as delegates will be spirited away from us. The expenses of the Prov. Secretary's office I have put down at \$4,000, and I have included in this the cost of the Financial Secretary's department. For our Treasurer I have put down \$3,100. We will require a Crown Officer to act as Atty. General, though I presume we can dispense with the Solicitor General, and for that officer I have put down \$1,600. Miscellaneous services last year amounted to \$35,044, but I have stated them at 10,000. Navigation Securities, I have reduced from \$80,000 to \$26,000,—I may be told that this last will be a charge upon the general government, but many of our small services will be entirely lost sight of by that great government in the extension of her canals, and in attending to the wants of the North West territory. For Public works, in reference to the extension, I have allowed nothing, although we need extension of the Lunatic Asylum,—Public works, including Board, maintenance, Hospital for Insane, Penitentiary, &c., I put down at \$50,000; Printing, \$5,000; Packets and Ferries, throwing out of consideration the steamboat service, \$11,070. Altogether we have for Confederation under these services, \$131,420.

Table with 2 columns: Item and Amount. Includes Legislative expenses, Provincial Secretary's Office, Receiver General, Attorney General, Miscellaneous, Navigation Securities, Public Works, Printing, Packets and Ferries.

tember, 1862. The chief mission of the Delegates was in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Union was mentioned at the Convention, but only incidentally discussed, no resolution being moved, and no record of the proceedings being kept. So that it merely amounts to this:—we pass a resolution stating that there is a diversity of opinion on the subject of Colonial union, which should be considered and set at rest; but no man in the House has been committed to any scheme of union, much less to the Quebec scheme. I am not therefore inconsistent in taking my present course, nor is any member who was then in the legislature, and I could feel myself at liberty to vote against any scheme that did not commend itself to my judgment. But of all the members of the House, the Pro. Sec'y is the last who should dare to talk about inconsistency. His whole life has been a life of inconsistency, from the first time he took a seat here. We know how he acted in reference to the construction of railways. What is his policy on that subject now? It is the policy of the gentlemen who preceded him. He held a policy in reference to retrenchment, by which \$75,000 a year was to be saved; he went to the country with the cry, and that is the last we have heard of it, while nearly every public service has been largely increased under his administration. The Pro. Sec. seems exceedingly sensitive just now; he declares that by those shocking appeals from the press we are disturbing the public mind; why could we not have been quiet until the gentlemen accomplishing this measure had been spirited away to another country. He said, in reference to some remarks which have appeared, that he would be justified in dealing with me as if I were a traitor. I understand him to mean, by that, that he could have brought me to the bar of the House for these remarks. I challenge him to show me his right to do so, even if I wrote the article alluded to; and I challenge him to show anything in the article to warrant the language he has used. Then we are told that the press has had the audacity to charge members of this House with being traitors. Unquestionably the press did so, but did he ever turn a traitor in one's life? Webster says a traitor is one who deceives, who betrays his country; and I say, taking that sense, there are men here who deserve the appellation.

Hon. PROV. SEC.—I think the hon member is safe in making that assertion. Mr. ANNAND continued—I hurl back the charge upon the Pro. Sec., because he is bartering the liberties of the country. I charge upon him that he is a deceiver, a betrayer of his country—that he is a traitor. There are men in this House who, within the last fortnight, have corresponded with their constituents, sending them down sheaves of petitions against Confederation, by which the people implored the House not to pass any measure on the subject until it had been referred to them. There are men in this House who occupied that position a few days ago, and who to-day are found in the ranks of those who will pass the scheme and prevent the people from expressing their opinion. These men are betraying the people, and are acting in diametrical opposition to their well known sentiments. The Provincial Secretary intimated that there is one gentleman here who deserves the name of traitor; he referred on one occasion to the apology which I made for using language that I was sorry for. Any gentleman who has been betrayed into heated and improper language is acting an honest and honorable part in acknowledging his error. I did that without hesitation, although the Provincial Secretary did not state the words to which he alluded; but what did I find in the press? In a portion of the press reflecting the views of that gentleman I saw a most extravagant and distorted account—a most unwarranted and untruthful version of what occurred. To put myself right I wrote to the gentleman to whom the words were used, and I will let my justification go forth with the misrepresentation that has been circulated.

(Mr. Annand here read copies of letters from Mr. B. Wier and Mr. E. M. McDonald, stating that Mr. A.'s remark in reference to a Fenian attack upon Canada was in reply to an exclamation of Mr. Wier.) These, said Mr. A., are the naked facts of the case. I met a worthy friend who is perhaps a little excitable, and he used exceedingly strong language to me. I used very strong language to him in return, but I remember we left laughing at the extravagant expressions on both sides. Gentlemen opposite are very sensitive about remarks made in the press, and if they could, would probably stifle the press and muzzle our conversations out of doors, but I hold in my hand the record of language scarcely less forcible than mine, but with this distinction, that instead of being uttered in a moment of excitement in a public street these words were demurely placed upon the Journals of the country. I find here a resolution moved by Mr. Johnson the leader of the opposition in this house at a time when excitement ran high in consequence of the removal of certain magistrates; an extract from which reads as follows:—"And this House is of opinion that if such an exercise of executive administration should be vindicated the most sacred interests of society would be placed in the power of every corrupt and unscrupulous Government that could command a subservient majority in the Legislature, and the people of Nova Scotia being driven to desire some constitution better balanced and protected the connection between the Colony and the Parent State would be weakened and endangered."

I can say more: I recollect, in 1849 when Canada was in rebellion when the Parliament buildings were burnt through the streets, there was a Journal in this town in the interest of gentlemen opposite that was so outspoken as to justify fully the persons who committed these deeds, and yet I never heard of any of them being arraigned here for using disloyal expressions. We have heard much about loyalty,—what makes loyalty? Is it not the institutions of a country? Deprive a people of that which they cherish and every freeman among them will desert those who do the deed. The Pro. Sec. made a great complaint about the resolution on Canadian gold and talked about bringing a member to the bar for having published a paragraph. He also more than intimated that my friend Mr. Howe had been corrupted by American gold, and by implication myself also who he said was the mouth-piece of that gentleman in this house. This is the paragraph referred to by the Pro. Secretary.

"In the course of the Confederate 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 State of the Maritime Provinces, would be a profitable Canadian investment. Mr. Brown's hint, we have reason to believe, has not been lost sight of by the Confederates. Canadian gold, it is said, is here, and in sufficient abundance to overcome the scruples of certain representatives

of the people. The country has a sharp eye on the House just now, and will duly appreciate the sudden conversion of members, should any unhappily be found willing to accept the base bribe." I hold under my hand the language of hon. George Brown to which that paragraph refers and he says:—"He could not understand why we should hesitate about bringing in a million of people with a great country and great resources; we might as well hesitate about some petty allowance of money. There was no such instance in history he believed; other nations paid large sums for territory. Louisiana was bought for twenty millions of dollars. What would we not give for Maine or Michigan or Minnesota, which it was possible to pay. Others pay large sums to secure emigrants. We spent some \$25,000 per annum yet we heard peddling objections raised now in a union, to give us nearly a million of people and vast and rich territories; a few dollars for a few years ought not to stand in the way."

Does any one need to be told that the meaning of this is that the secret service money of Canada, if required might be had? (Cries of Oh! oh!) from government side of house.) Gentlemen need not be so excited, for I tell them that I had a conversation with Mr. Brown not very long ago, in which I was led to believe that if I would join the Confederates I might have had money, and place, and preferment in Canada as inducements to my supporting Confederation.

Hon. PROV. SEC. asked that Mr. Annand's words be taken down as he intended to test their accuracy by telegraphing to Mr. Brown immediately. The SPEAKER said he could take down no words which were not unparliamentary. Hon. PROV. SEC. said that he merely desired that no injustice be done to the hon. gentleman in the representation of his remarks.

Mr. ANNAND continued.—My remarks I presume have been already taken down by the proper officer and it will be unnecessary for me to repeat them. The Pro. Sec. has referred to the action of Canada, but I do not wonder that the scheme was adopted by a two third vote in the Parliament of that Colony. We have been told that he extolled Mr. Smith as "an incorruptible patriot." Whatever Mr. Smith's claims may be on the people of New Brunswick they appreciate them, and without wishing to say a word derogatory to the credit of the members of the learned profession here, I doubt that there is one of them who, when the office of Chief Justice was vacant, and when he was pressed by friends and foes to take the position, would pass it by rather than leave the Legislature when the county needed his services. Few men would have made such a sacrifice as that at which the Provincial Secretary sneers. We have been asked "what corrupted the Admiral and the General or the city of Halifax?" I made no such charge against any of them. This city is largely in favour of Confederation, because they believe that they cannot get the railway without it. Then we have been told that we cannot get an expression of opinion from the country. Sir, I ask you not? It has been said that the question will be largely mixed up with others,—with the question of education, the railway, retrenchment, and other subjects, but I maintain that there is a mode of getting the opinion of the people—the way in which their opinion was obtained upon the Municipal Corporation bill. In that case the vote was taken upon the measure alone, and such a vote would settle this question in a single day. It has been said also that our only object is to upset the Government, but I ask is it not patent to every man that if this agitation ceased tomorrow gentlemen opposite would not have the ghost of a chance of occupying their positions again. Let them open a single constituency and obtain a decision either on this question or on the general policy of the government, and that decision will be conclusive. These gentlemen know that their fate is sealed, and they are afraid to meet it—for this reason, as much as for any other has this matter been urged on us this session. The Pro. Sec. took great liberties with a friend of mine and with me, for he coupled my name with his as that gentleman's mouthpiece, in attributing base motives to him. It is said that when Mr. Howe's salary ceased he became an agitator from personal motives, but I happen to know that in taking this step he is incurring risks which few would run.—He holds letters from leading men in England recognizing his claims upon the consideration of the Imperial Government, and by the patriotic course he has taken he may have forfeited that consideration. I throw back then the foul insinuation that Mr. Howe has thrown himself into the scale because the inducements of salary have ceased. The Pro. Sec. spoke about "button holding" and "sapping loyalty" in the same connection and this leads me to imagine another scene: I imagine a member of the House being sent for by a distinguished individual and addressed in this language:—"my dear sir if you will only move a resolution in the Assembly asking the House to affirm the policy of union and leaving the details to be settled at the Colonial Office your services will be appreciated and recognized by Her Majesty's Government." I can imagine such an occurrence and I can imagine the person thus addressed though a poor man, with a respect of his fortune being thus made, rejecting the proposal. Yet we are told that we must not speak of corrupt influences. The Pro. Sec. gave us an argument the other day on the subject of an appeal to the people, he said it was our constitutional right to deal with the question. We may have the abstract right to do so but I put it to them one and all when we were elected three years ago if members had told their constituents that they would if elected destroy the constitution of the country, how many of them would have been here? The trust reposed in them was for a very different purpose, it was that they should transact the public business according to the well understood wishes of their constituents. The opinions of Messrs. Howe, Young and Johnston have been mentioned in this connection,—these gentlemen said that the proposition must be ratified by the legislature as of course it must, but will any man undertake to say that either of them dreamed of such a change being effected without an appeal to the people? I have too much confidence in the patriotism of one and all of them to believe that they ever entertained such an opinion. We have however pretty good authority for saying that the constitution should not be changed without submitting the scheme to the people. Mr. Archibald in course of his speech at Temperance Hall last winter said:—"It is for the people of Nova Scotia to ratify or reject what we have done. It will not promote their interests—if they believe the result will be injurious and not beneficial, let them reject it; but if they feel as we have felt that their future prosperity and happiness are identified with, and inseparable from, Union—if the time is now come for it—let them be equal to the emergency; let them accept the position