

(Mr. Townsend) stood up manfully, and said they ought to be ashamed. Under such circumstances it was not strange that a portion of the county of Yarmouth opposed the Union of the Colonies.

Mr. COLIN CAMPBELL said that the hon. member for Yarmouth would know the sentiments of the representatives of the county of Digby at the proper time. They were prepared to assume themselves the responsibility of dealing with the question in that spirit and manner that would best advance the interests of the country.

Mr. KILLAM said that he would deal with the question of Confederation at the proper time. He had not attempted to influence the constituency against Mr. Townsend. He was not aware that any opinions in respect to annexation had been mooted in the meeting referred to.

Mr. PATFIELD regretted that so much time had been wasted that might be more profitably employed.

Mr. McLELAN said that he believed the effect of Confederation would be to annex the Provinces to the United States.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL presented a petition from H. Cameron and others against Confederation. The subject then dropped.

Mr. WHITMAN introduced a bill to legalize as permanent rolls of the county of Annapolis. The house then adjourned.

MONDAY, APRIL 16 UNION OF THE COLONIES.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said: The Provincial Secretary told us, some days ago, that the Government were awaiting the action of New Brunswick on the question of Confederation. I do not think that this Province should place itself in that position. Nova Scotia is the most important of the Maritime Provinces, and I do not see why we should wait for others to lead us on this important question. It is the duty of the Government and of this Legislature to take a leading part in the discussion of this measure. When the question was introduced a year or two ago, much diversity of opinion existed as to the details which had been arranged at Quebec, and matters stood in a different light from that in which they now appear. At that time we looked forward to peace and tranquillity with the United States; we had free trade with that country. But how has the aspect changed since then. We do not stand in the same position as we stood in six months ago. The United States have shown every disposition to annex these Provinces, and have shown a determination to punish us by every means in their power. Besides that, we have been threatened with an invasion, and it becomes our duty to come forward like loyal citizens and to unite ourselves for purposes of defence. There are sentiments in this Assembly favorable to annexation, and if the country were informed of the fact, those sentiments would be hoisted at one end of Nova Scotia to the other. Whatever objections the people entertained to the Quebec scheme twelve months ago matters have entirely changed. There is not a man in my County who is not loyal to the Union, and who would not consent to any scheme that would save us from annexation or from invasion. Mr. Annand told us that two years ago the country was calm,—so it was; the dangers of to-day were then far in the distance and the people felt at liberty to discuss the minor points of the scheme of union, and to thwart the government from motives of self interest, but the aspect has greatly changed. All the trifling disputes which have engaged our attention should be at once buried before the great object of maintaining British connection. The advice of the British Government and press should lead us to look forward to the time when we shall become an ally instead of Colonies of Great Britain,—that is the proud position to which many of us have looked forward ever since we came to the country. Can any one pretend to say that Great Britain would allow us to annex ourselves to the United States when the Government of that country are threatening her in every possible manner? Would the mother country part with all the resources at her command in this Province, and allow them to be handed over to her bitter enemy? The idea is preposterous. Mr. Annand has told us that the railway should precede the union—that might be an advantage, but he knows that though that matter has been agitated for ten or twelve years we have failed in obtaining the road. It is quite evident that we cannot have these advantages without union. He then proposes a delegation from the Maritime Provinces to agree on a platform before submitting the matter to the British Government, but such a course I do not consider wise. I may say that I had objections to the Quebec scheme, but when the great necessities to which I have referred arose these objections vanished like smoke. Before knowing the wish of the British government, I had objections to the details of that scheme, but knowing now the opinions they entertain and the offers held out to us of becoming a nationality as soon as we are able to protect ourselves, these objections have been overcome. How does the matter stand now? To obviate any objections existing it is proposed to submit the whole matter to the mother country to arbitrate between the Provinces and to form a scheme equitable to all parties. The proposition of Mr. Annand seems to me, as I have said, objectionable and would only have the effect of deferring the object in view. The scheme has been before the country for two years, and if we are to come to a decision at all it is time we should do so now. The plan proposed in the resolution appears to me to be objectionable while the Opposition appears in a great strain to make any suggestion, and as a last resort have proposed representation in the Imperial Parliament. The idea of such a representation I consider ridiculous. If it were granted to Nova Scotia it would have to be done to all the other Colonies, and the Crystal Palace would not be large enough to hold the Parliament. That plan was proposed ten years ago by the hon. member's leader, but it fell to the ground without much attention being paid to it looking at the Lower Provinces, it will be seen how subject they are to an attack from the United States; and it has been the policy of that country to thwart the proposed union in order that we may be more willing to annex. It has been proved by history that small countries are always swallowed up by the larger. At this moment it is not improbable that the United States would negotiate with Nova Scotia for admitting fish and coal free, and the good feeling between this Province and Canada would be thereby destroyed and variances in interest and feeling created. One after another of the Colonies

would by that policy be made willing to be annexed on such terms as the United States would dictate. The conduct of some members of the House appears childish in the extreme—one day they advocate sending to Great Britain for ships and men to protect our fisheries, and the next day they oppose with all their might the proposition to pay any regard to the wishes of the Government to which we send for aid. My colleague urged the Government to send vessels to protect the fisheries on the Cape Breton Coast, while at the same time he is a strong opponent of Union. What do we see every day? War ships, guns and ammunition gathered round to protect us without the cost to us of a shilling, and at the same time we presume to set at defiance the demands of that Government, which gives us these means of self-protection, that we should unite for defence. If we are able to defend ourselves without the assistance of Great Britain, let us say so; but if we are not, let us concede what the mother country desires. Going along dock the other day, I looked at our Provincial navy in the whole affair seemed utterly contemptible. There was the *Drift* with a two pounder to protect our harbors and fisheries, and yet we felt quite conceited and clamorous against Confederation. My idea is, that instead of awaiting the action of New Brunswick, we should take the lead. Ours is the most populous Province of the two and should set the example. I think the country should be made aware of the principles of those members who oppose the measure. The hon. gentleman, whose name has been introduced into the discussion, ever since his return has been boldly proclaiming annexation sentiments in the streets and in the lobby of the House. Gentlemen holding such views are getting more and more bold. The history of small countries has been that from animosities they have been set to fight against each other until they have been so weakened as to be unable to present a front to the common enemy. So it will be with us, if we do not take steps to strengthen ourselves and to become one people. As I have already said, I think the Government should take such steps as will show the other Provinces that we are not backward in this matter.

SPEECH OF MR. LOCKE. Mr. LOCKE said:—It was correctly remarked the other day that the opponents of Confederation are in an unfortunate position in having nine lawyers and a doctor worth three more, opposed to us. We cannot be expected to exhibit the same ability that will be displayed upon the other side, but we stand here backed by the strong opinions of our constituents.—Those opinions we believe to be correct and sound, and we feel that the principles which we maintain are correct. This is a question of the deepest moment to the country, we are bartering away our rights and privileges if we hand over this fine Province of ours to Canada, and I feel disposed to say,

“Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own my native land.”

In adopting this scheme we are giving our country to Canada to be swallowed up with grand schemes and projects of aggrandisement, to a colony not only disloyal. Coming as I do from a country whose inhabitants have come from loyal stock, a country settled by men who have sacrificed their best interests for the sake of British connection, I feel at liberty to express my opinion freely and without fear of the charge of disloyalty. The question of Confederation has been before the country now for two years, and its aspect has recently been materially changed. What brought about this change? We saw gentlemen on both sides of the House last Session exceedingly hostile to the scheme, but a change has come over the spirit of their dreams. We had the hon. member for Richmond advocating one side of the question with all the eloquence at his command, we had the member for Inverness, Mr. McDonnell, taking the same side with the same ability, and all at once these gentlemen rise and propose that another scheme be resorted to and state that circumstances lead to the belief that a better scheme can be procured. I ask, then, what has brought about this change? The Prov. Secretary spoke of influences, had we not every reason to suppose that influences were at work? What these influences were it was not our business to enquire, but the suddenness of the change showed that there were such and that they were of a strong kind. Three months ago these gentlemen were denouncing the Quebec scheme, and now they come forward and advocate a new delegation, although we know to a certainty that the new scheme will be the Quebec scheme; there may be slight variations, but in the main and substantial particulars it will be the same. Loyalty to the Crown, it has been said, requires that we should confederate, because the Lieut. Governor has been sent here expressly to carry the measure out. No remarks in reference to that officer will be construed, I suppose, into disloyalty to the Queen, and when the Prov. Secretary spoke about the scheme being urged upon us by such impressiveness as Royal lips alone could evince, and by his mention of the appointment of Sir W. F. Williams to carry it out he invited comment. If it be declared to be disloyal to refer to the action of the Governor I will ask the House to let me refer to 1811 when an election was being run in Victoria County. In the Prov. Secretary's own organ I find this language; and although I quote from a paper that was particularly under his direction, and the very style cannot be mistaken, as he used the same or nearly the same words on the floor of the House:—

“Taking into account the position of the Government and the unscrupulous means resorted to by them we can scarcely imagine the possibility of Mr. Campbell being elected. It is now understood that Lord Mulgrave made it an express condition with the usurpers that Mr. Campbell must be unseated and Victoria carried or he would be compelled in his own defence to dissolve the Assembly.” And further on he says: “Mr. Hugh Manroe was allowed by Lord Mulgrave to abandon the important duties of his office as Chairman of the Board of Works and head of the Lunatic Asylum, in order to take part in an election struggle, contrary to the spirit of the law and policy of the legislature who had removed that officer from politics. The Governor and Government having thus combined against the liberties of the people and determined to obtain a supporter from Victoria, it is not to be supposed that any means would be left untried.” He ends by saying: “If there be any man in Nova Scotia who doubts the completely partisan character of the Lieut. Governor let him ponder upon these two recent outrages for which Lord Mulgrave is directly responsible. Sending the Chairman of the Board of Works and the Sheriffs of other Counties to aid the Government in the Victoria Election.” In another issue of the paper he says: “That the Chairman of the Board of Works, who could not leave the important duties of his office without the leave of Lord Mulgrave, was immediately despatched with £400 a year of the people's money in his pocket to aid the Queen's Printer who

carried the bag in the Cumberland Election in corrupting and intimidating the Electors of Victoria. We venture to assert that the history of the Colonies will be perused in vain to discover such daring innovations of the liberties of the people by any Governor. Does Lord Mulgrave think the free spirit of Nova Scotia is to be trampled out by means so flagitious and corrupt?”

If that is not treasonable language to be used towards a Governor, then nothing that has been said in this debate can be considered so. Mr. Cardwell has taken strong ground, as we believe against the interests of this country, and in delegating a Governor expressly to carry out the scheme of Confederation, we have every right to believe that Her Majesty's Government are working against our interests. There is nothing disloyal in that statement, because it is well understood the Queen can do no wrong, her Ministers being responsible. I may say that it is because I believe that this scheme of annexation to Canada will drive us into annexation to the United States that I oppose it. What are the antecedents of Canada? One of the gentlemen taking a leading part in the movement, one who has lectured in various places on the subject of union, is well known to have been an Irish rebel. Many of the leading men of Canada have stood in the same position, in their conduct during the Canadian rebellion. These are the people with whom we are asked to confederate. If we yield, their Orange and Ribbon Societies and other such principles will circulate amongst us, and we would become equally disloyal. If, then, annexation is to be brought about, would it not be better to go in at once to the American Union? Because we would thus obtain all the advantages of a separate State, while if confederation goes on probably in a few years more we will have to go in as a mere County of Canada. It is said that trade relations are an inducement, but why cannot we obtain them without a political union? The moment Canada finds it necessary to have free trade with this Colony, she will consent to the arrangements being made, it being a sound principle that trade regulates itself. What will the position of our credit be if we unite? At this day our bonds stand higher in the market than those of Canada. Confederating with Canada, and letting her carry on her canal and other works, and through the means of her large debt and great expenditures her bonds will go down and ours with them, we being a part and portion of her country. By a political union we must be absorbed and swallowed up. We will lose our identity and be subject to their will. It is well known that Nova Scotia stood by the Crown during the American rebellion. Nova Scotia was loyal then and is now, and by uniting herself to such a country as Canada she will gain nothing. We have enjoyed a Parliament of our own for a hundred years, with all the privileges that a free people could ask; we have gone on progressing and after obtaining responsible Government we have become so free that we require nothing more in the way of independence. What will the people say to this Parliament being taken from them? We may be told that the local legislatures will remain but who can tell us anything of their formation? I presume that nothing that we can urge will prevent the adoption of the scheme but I contend that it would be unfair for the British government to adopt such a measure without the sanction of our people. In connection with this subject I will quote from the London Review of March 17th:—

THE RECALL OF SIR CHARLES DARLING.—Mr. Cardwell has found it necessary to recall Sir Charles Darling, the Governor of the colony of Victoria, and we think it will be generally admitted that he has not taken this step on insufficient grounds. It will be in the recollection of our readers that the two branches of the Legislature of the colony came into conflict upon the financial schemes of the Government for the time being. The Lower House passed, the Upper House it was known would reject, the Budget. In order to surmount this difficulty, the Appropriation Bill was tacked to the Bill imposing new Customs duties. The Legislative Council was thus presented with the alternative of submitting to the dictation of the House of Assembly, or of leaving the Government without any legal power to levy taxes or to defray expenses; but, eventually, they chose the latter course, as they had a perfect right to do. Pressed by the difficulties of their situation, the Colonial Ministry, thereupon, resorted to more than one irregular and illegal means of raising the wind. It was clearly the duty of Sir Charles Darling, as the representative of the Queen, to refuse his sanction to acts of such a character. But he not only gave his cordial and earnest support to the politicians who were violating the Constitution, he did something even still more objectionable. Commenting on a despatch to the Colonial Secretary upon an address from the Legislative Council, he took it upon himself to express a hope that the gentlemen who had signed it would never be designated for the position of confidential advisers to the Crown, because it is “impossible that their advice could be received with any other feelings than those of doubt and distrust.” When a Governor thus converts himself into a partisan, and descends from his constitutional eminence as the representative of the Crown, to participate in the party conflicts of the colony placed under his rule, it is clear that he can no longer discharge his delicate and dignified duties with success. His usefulness is at an end, and nothing remains but to replace him by some one who can maintain with greater firmness a position of impartiality, and can hold himself aloof with greater self-command from the excited passions which it is his duty to moderate. In a despatch of stinging but well merited rebuke, Mr. Cardwell has insisted upon these obvious considerations, and has relieved Sir Charles Darling from the further exercise of functions which he has so grievously abused.—London Review, March 17.

The cases it may be said are not exactly similar because that governor went into opposition to the legislature of the Colony but our Lieut. Governor knows from the petitions that have been presented that the feeling of the country is against the scheme, and that if members would but rise and express the views of their constituents they would be found in opposition to the measure. Mr. Cardwell should surely stay his hand before giving his assistance to the completion of the union under these circumstances. I will now read from the New York Advertiser a paper well known to be thoroughly loyal though published on this side of the Atlantic:—

REMOVAL OF A COLONIAL GOVERNOR.—Careless observers of the working of British institutions have been in the habit of assuming that the Imperial Government desired above all things to maintain its own supremacy in remote settlements, and that it is always disposed to back up its own local representative. These erroneous impressions may perhaps have been partially disturbed by the strange spectacle lately patent in Jamaica; and they will receive another rude shock in the news

that has just reached us from Downing Street. Mr. Cardwell, the Colonial Secretary, has advised the Queen to recall Sir Charles Darling, some time Governor of the Colony of Victoria. The circumstances of the quarrel that arose between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, in which quarrel Sir Charles interfered injudiciously, or illegally, or both, are detailed in extracts from London papers cited above. We have only to add that Mr. Cardwell's despatch, displacing the Governor, most emphatically insists upon the determination of the Colonial Office at home to leave the Colonists to manage their own affairs, and points out most cogently the great blunder of the Governor in identifying himself irremediably with any political parties. The despatch we doubt not will cause a flutter among the occupants of high places. For us, it has but a partial interest; because we knew well beforehand that British statesmen, one and all, have long since abandoned the idea of ruling free men by edicts from home. If Jamaica be under the present melancholy state of things an exception to this rule, it is because the free Blacks have shown themselves unworthy of free Government.

When the Lieut. Governor ventures to carry out any scheme of union in opposition to the wishes of the people he identifies himself improperly with a party. This House is elected to legislate according to the well understood wishes of the people, and this particular scheme, changing the constitution, it was never empowered to carry out. In adopting the scheme we do not carry out those wishes, and if the people had the opportunity of expressing their views they would return such a majority that twelve members would not be found to support the scheme. The Prov. Sec. said that it had been used as an argument on our side, in other places, that if this scheme were carried out not one of its supporters would get a seat at Ottawa. This I think very probable, but it makes our prospects still more unfavorable. We have in this House supporting Confederation a set of trained politicians. If these gentlemen went to the hustings, in all probability they would be rejected, and this would be a positive loss to the country. You would then have a new set of men meeting more astute statesmen, and the interests of the country would be insecure. I assure the Prov. Secretary of these facts for his own interest; and while I might consider that he would be no loss to us, we have men who have heretofore acted with and led us to care for the true interests of the country, who would be. Taking the first view of the question which I took—that annexation to the United States will follow annexation to Canada, it will be seen that we are doing a positive injury to Great Britain by confederating, because the moment she loses her Colonies England must become a second or third rate power. It will be recollected that the celebrated “Junius” said in one of his letters, “The feathers which adorn the royal bird support its flight; strip it of its plumage and you fix it to the earth.” The moment you take away the Colonies from Great Britain the feathers which support her flight are taken away, and she ceases to be a first rate power. As loyal men, we should stand by our country in this emergency. It is not certain that New Brunswick will fall in with the scheme. A telegram informs us that a majority of the Assembly will move for the recall of the Governor, and that will postpone Confederation for some time. It seems to me that the Government are too hot and too hasty in this matter. Give us time to consider the question. I do not ask them to dissolve and go to the country, but I think we should have the chances of one year more to see if the people will be indoctrinated into favouring the measure, not that I expect them to willingly favor such a union, for I want none, we are prosperous and happy as we are. I ask the House not to agree to the proposed delegation for we very well know that the delegates will come back with the Quebec scheme. Mr. Cardwell having taken a decided stand in its favor, I, therefore, call upon the government to stay their hand and to give the country time to consider what is the best course to pursue. But if this new scheme to send a delegation to England to settle terms of union there, should be carried in this House, I would demand as a right of the people of this Province, that after terms being agreed upon by the British Government and the delegates, that it should be referred back to this people for their sanction. If any other course be pursued, you trifle with the liberties and privileges of a free people in bartering them away without giving them a voice in the matter, and the consequences, be what they may, will rest upon the men who have so acted.

SPEECH OF MR. BLANCHARD. Mr. BLANCHARD said:—The hon. member who has just set down has very forcibly expressed the opinion that this is one of the greatest questions ever presented for our consideration; and I feel that I approach it under no ordinary responsibilities, and with the conviction that I am dealing with the great interests of the Province of Nova Scotia. We have been told by that hon. gentleman that in favor of Confederation are arrayed the chief legal talent and nearly all the trained politicians of the country. I consider this a strong argument in favor of Confederation that the trained politicians of all the Provinces—the men who are accustomed to look at great questions, and to judge of them, have deliberately made up their minds that the scheme of Union is favorable to the interests of the Province, and to our connection with the British Crown. Let us look at any of the deliberative assemblies, and will we not find that when the leading men adopt any particular view of a question, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand they are right. I might refer to a great variety of instances in support of this position. In the history of Pitt it is seen that in some cases Fox, Burke, and Sheridan, his greatest adversaries, were found coinciding with him, and history proves that in all such cases they were right. I do not think the hon. member did justice to himself in saying that the trained politicians were all on one side, for his speech showed an amount of eloquence and research seldom exhibited on such occasions. That we have nine lawyers upon this side of the question is true; but I claim that we occupy the right position, and one which many of the lay members of the house will willingly endorse.—The hon. member for Shelburne also told us that he represented a people truly loyal, the descendants of those who sacrificed much for their principles and for their attachment to the mother country. Sir, I yield to no man in the loyalty of myself or of my constituents; I too am a descendant of a loyalist who sacrificed as much for his loyalty as any of the men who came to Shelburne at that time; nineteen-twentieths of those whom I represent are Scotchmen, and what race have done and suffered so much for their country, and where do you find patriotism if not among them? It has been said that there are influences at work in reference to this question. Sir they have no effect upon me. My friend can say nothing to me upon that score. My position has all along been different from that of those

who actively opposed the measure and who I presume are prepared to give good reasons for their change of mind. I feel that I am not called on, nor would it be advisable that I should go into a discussion of the merits of the scheme recently submitted to the country or of its details. That there has been exhaustion, and here will be little effort on my part to crush down the opposition to confederation. I do not therefore intend to discuss the details of the question, but to explain the position which I occupy, which is very different from that of many gentlemen around me. I have felt that the question should be approached with great care. I have felt it my duty as a representative of the people seriously to weigh it before coming to a conclusion, and no man can say that, up to this time, I am in any way pledged or promises to take any particular position. We have heard about “traitors” and “treachery,” and “Canadian gold.” I feel it is hardly worth while for me to contradict the statements upon these subjects as far as I am concerned. I have not come from a school of traitors, and the reproach cannot fall upon me. I regret that I am called upon in connection with this subject, to differ from some of my friends, and I regret that personal recriminations, private conversations, have been introduced into this discussion. This is a matter which ought to be discussed calmly, and without temper. We live in an age in which progress is not to be measured as it once was, it is exceedingly rapid at the present day, and men live more in one year now than they formerly lived in twenty. Changes are rapidly approaching, and it is now our duty to look them fairly in the face, and honestly to consider the probable future. The question before the house is, in my opinion, whether we shall unite with the adjoining colonies or remain disunited, and isolated with the chances of annexation. Mr. Locke has said that Confederation will lead to the latter—if he could convince me of that he would find an opponent of the measure as determined as any man in this country, but I support it because I feel and believe, and am convinced in my heart and conscience that if we remain as we are the time will soon come when we will be absorbed into the American Republic. My hon. friend from Halifax, who is leading the present opposition, published that which met my approbation a short time ago, when he declared that a change was approaching, that something must be done, that this country could not remain as it was, and that our future must be looked in the face. I felt and still feel that these were the words of truth and soberness, and I believe that unless these Colonies proceed to confederate we cannot long continue dependencies of the British Crown. What has occurred since last session? When the friends of the measure stated last year that they believed that the Reciprocity Treaty was about to be abrogated we were told that this was nonsense, that American interests were too deeply concerned, and that they valued reciprocity as much as we—yet have we not seen it come to pass in the teeth of offers, on the part of our government, such as none of us would have thought of making a few years ago, and such as few men in this country would be disposed to concur in. So determined were the Americans to abolish that treaty that not only were the arguments of our delegates treated with disdain, but afterwards, when a bill was brought into Senate in connection with the subject, containing propositions that would be indignantly refused here, they refused to receive it. Why did they refuse such a measure introduced by their leading minds, and approved by Mr. Morrill? What answer do their leading organs give to the question? They tell us that it was because they expect soon to be able to annex these Colonies,—that without free trade with them we cannot exist, and that we will soon be glad to seek for admission to the Union. The paid officer of the American Government in reporting on this question broadly put to the government and Senate that the only alternatives were reciprocity or absorption, and while declaring that reciprocity was beneficial to them,—yet advised its refusal as favourable to Annexation. They have refused to renew that treaty influenced by these motives. It has been said that the United States have no desire to annex these Colonies. Can we believe such a statement? Look at our fisheries at our mineral resources, at the extent of our wood lands and can we imagine that they are not most anxious to possess these Provinces, and especially Nova Scotia. I feel, therefore, in looking at the question, and for other reasons not necessary to mention, that without confederation annexation is before us. The abrogation of the treaty owes its origin to the desire of the American people to bring us within their borders, and I am firmly and honestly convinced that it is my duty to say to my constituents and to the people of Nova Scotia that I am willing to do anything—to resort to almost any measure rather than run the risk of such a consequence as that. I do not mean to say by this that the scheme before us will not be very beneficial to the people of this country. My own opinions have undergone no change on this subject, but I have resolved to take this bold and straightforward stand—to declare that we should confederate, and that we should do it now because I feel that the step is demanded by the exigencies which surround us. I trust in God that I may never live to see the Stars and Stripes floating over Citadel Hill,—I trust that before we are annexed I and my children shall have gone to the land of the shades, and that not one of us may be left to see our country in such a position. We have been told by the gentleman who preceded me that Confederation would weaken the ties that bind us to the parent state,—but have we not subordinate officers, and the press of that not the government of Great Britain and all country, and among ourselves our best minds, lay and clerical, urging it on us. Do they look favourably on the scheme because they believe it will weaken the ties that bind us to them? I was sorry to hear one member say that the English people would be glad to be rid of us; I do not believe that such a feeling exists in Great Britain, nor that with few exceptions there are any men in Great Britain willing or anxious to part with us. The only real question remaining in my mind is whether an appeal to the people should not have been had. It was suggested by Mr. Annand that the people be called on to vote on the question of Confederation alone, but I cannot think that he seriously proposed that we should do what no British country ever did before—resort to a plebiscite on this question.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL.—It has been done in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLANCHARD continued:—This reference is to the vote taken upon the Municipal Corporations' bill, but this was simply as to the adoption in each county of a purely local measure; but did any one ever hear of a question of Colonial policy being so submitted? That precedent is no parallel to this case, and I challenge gentlemen who take that side of the question to lay their hands upon any case in which a question of this kind was sent in that way to the people. If a vote