

Mode is un-British, uncertain, and unreliable, how are we to adopt it? What are we to depend on for the decision? We recently took away from a large portion of the people the electoral franchise, are we to send this question to the electors, or to the whole people, and under what regulations? We have heard a good deal about appeals to the people, and I would like to look back at the history of this country to show, as I believe I can, that such an appeal is not desirable or necessary. What did we do a few years ago? We passed a bill by which the franchise was nearly doubled in the numbers of the persons called on to exercise it; and is not the franchise the source of all right and power? Did the opponents of that measure ask an appeal to the people? Not at all. Afterwards the suffrage was still further extended and made almost universal without a word about appeals to the people. Not long ago, when Mr. Johnston was in power he introduced a bill altering to a large extent, the franchise and re-distributing the seats; did his worst opponent say anything about an appeal to the people? No, the whole matter was discussed without such a question being raised. If, when I quote the acts of the conservative party, I am met with the answer from gentlemen on this side that this is poor authority, I ask did we (the liberal party) not within a short time, feeling that the franchise was too extensive, and that the time had come when the property of the country should be represented by the property holders, pass a bill striking down one-third, if not one-half of the electors. There was no appeal to the people in that case, this house did not ask it, although it was sought by a gentleman in the Upper House. Am I not therefore acting in accordance with the policy of my party, who maintained that the people were here present by their representatives?—Let me come now to another time. In 1864 a resolution brought in to the legislature by the leading minds upon both sides, for the Union of the Maritime Provinces? No, to confederate them, but to unite them under one government and legislature. Was anything said about an appeal to the people then? No; it was said that the delegates should return, in order that we, the legislature, might ratify their arrangements. I ask the house whether or not, if the legislature of the different Colonies had accepted a scheme of legislative union of the Maritime Provinces, there would have been an appeal to the people? We have heard about traitors to the country, and traitors to the party. We are told that the liberal party are opposed to the scheme, and my position is not at all agreeable to my friends who sit beside me, or to myself, in separating from them. I got my liberalism very early; I drew it with my earliest breath, and learned its principles at the feet of such men as Dr. McCulloch and Jotham Blanchard; and I claim to have been as consistent a member of that party as any one in Nova Scotia, here or elsewhere. What was the watchword of that party? They have always claimed as their watchword, Reform and Progress,—and that this movement is a progressive one, I firmly believe. This is a measure of progress, and if opposition was to be expected, we had little reason to look for it among the Liberals of the country. I feel that I have not forsaken Liberal principles, and that it would be as hard to do so for the "Ethiopian to change his skin or the leopard his spots." I feel that I am where I ought to be and where I wish every liberal in the country was, following our principles to their legitimate end, going forward and not adhering to the old fogy and tory principles of keeping every thing in the old position without making an advance, and opposing every change, just because it is change. As I said, I was brought up a liberal, as I advanced in life I surpassed the leaders of the liberal party. When I first came into this house, under a good deal of temptation and trial, I sustained William Young and Joseph Howe in their principles, and if I am now to be told that I am deserting the party now I reply that I do not feel ashamed to follow the liberal *par excellence* of British America, the hon. George Brown and Mr. Tilley of New Brunswick, men who are liberals to the heart's core, men who have long fought for the principles of their party, and under their flag and in their ranks I am not ashamed to stand. Coming home I ask whether when I am in association with the leader of the opposition in this House and in the other, and assisting in carrying forward the question so long and so often proposed by the liberal party of this country, I am not where a liberal should be found. It was not my intention to address the house at length, and I will not continue longer. The principles which I now maintain are those of the party of progress; we have with us the young men of Nova Scotia, who are identified with its future progress—the best and most intelligent men in all the provinces, and all who look forward to being not merely Nova Scotians, Canadians, or New Brunswickers, but citizens of British North America, and all who desire to see our country occupying her true position. With their assistance these objects must be soon attained.

REMARKS OF MR. TOWNSEND.

Mr. TOWNSEND spoke substantially as follows:—I feel a great deal of reluctance in rising to address the house on the present occasion, when I see all the legal talent arrayed against me on this important question. I feel, however, that I stand here with the great mass of the people at my back. I contend that we have no right to deal with the question; the people did not send us here to deal with it; they do not yet know its merits. I cannot believe that such immense advantages will spring from Union as some gentlemen profess to see ahead. You cannot force trade out of its natural channels. The State of Maine, and not Nova Scotia, is the natural frontage of Canada. The interests of the people do not lie in the direction of connection with Canada. As far as my own people are concerned, I know if you were to ask them if they would prefer Annexation to Confederation, they would answer, yes. Their commercial interests are intimately bound up with those of the United States, and it is not therefore surprising that such a sentiment should prevail.—They say, give us connection with a country that will protect us. Canada cannot take care of us. I do not feel this way myself, but still I know what I state is perfectly correct. I know that, simple man as I am, I cannot change your sentiments on this question. All the leading talent of the house is against us.—We have no leader; I do not acknowledge the hon. member for East Halifax as such. The leader of the Opposition is with the Government on this question; he supports them on the School Bill and Confederation, and I am only surprised that he is not one of their number. I deny that Mr. Annand is my leader. Can I take a man that says a thing on the street, and then comes here to prove it? I have yet to hear the arguments to satisfy me of the necessity for this Confederation. Is it advisable to unite with a country with such large debts and duties? to have to pay for the enlargement of her canals, and extension of her railways? A large proportion of our popula-

tion are fishermen and heavy consumers, and under Confederation when you increase the duties you must increase their expenses. The Intercolonial Railway will only benefit us so far as it connects us with St. John. You cannot carry it in quantity for any great distance over the railways; the barrels are injured; water communication is infinitely preferable. It is only in winter that the road will be found of any particular advantage. What I fear is, that if you pass this measure in the mode proposed you will confuse the country from one end to the other. All we require is to be allowed to manage our own affairs in our own way. I do not think that we can be better off than we are now under any circumstances. Why not then let well enough alone, and cease disturbing the country at what gentlemen say is a critical period of its history? The Quebec scheme is as good a scheme as any you can devise, but I do not want any at all. I know that my constituents are to a man opposed to the proposed Confederation, and I am determined to stand by them. I feel that they will look upon the present action with horror and alarm. My people, I say, would prefer Annexation to Confederation, but only let a thousand Fenians come among them, and the fellows would not be heard of. Let England or Canada be assailed, and two-thirds of our young men will volunteer to take care of the country. But still we do not wish to be hurried into Confederation. We want the people to have a voice in the matter.

SPEECH OF THE HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL.
HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL SAID:—I have been labouring for some days past under a hoarseness, which is not at all pleasant, and I do not feel now in a condition to do justice to the important subject before the House; but as gentlemen appear indisposed to speak on the subject, I shall endeavour, without preparation, to give my thoughts as concisely as is possible. The question is one of such great magnitude that I feel I am hardly doing my duty in addressing the House under the circumstances I have stated. The present question is one which is fraught with most fruitful consequences to the people of this province, as well as of all British North America. We have thrown upon us responsibility by the tide of events which we must assume, unless we are willing to fail in the duty we owe to the people. It will be for gentlemen, looking at the whole position calmly and dispassionately, to deal with the question as subjects of our beloved Queen, anxious to perpetuate the connection with the British Empire. All considerations of party politics should be laid aside, and no influences should prevail, except the desire to arrive at a conclusion that will benefit the people whose interests we have to charge. I contend that, as subjects of the Queen of England, as members of the province of Nova Scotia, we have duties now to discharge of a most onerous character. We have been accustomed from our childhood to take an interest in the great country from which we have sprung. We have drawn from that country the principles that lie at the foundation of all our institutions, not merely in the capacity of provincial representatives, but as subjects of the great empire of Great Britain. I hold this doctrine, and I believe it is a patriotic one, that we should consider in our deliberations, that we are acting not only for the advantage of Nova Scotia but also in the interests of the great empire of which the sun is said never to set. I have listened with some interest to the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Townsend), and although I must condemn his disloyal sentiments, yet I feel he is at all events entitled to some credit for the candor with which he stated them. I can understand that hon. member coming forward and proclaiming to the House and country that the people of Yarmouth have no loyalty except what puts money into their pockets. We can understand that argument against the union of the Provinces, and need not therefore be surprised that nine-tenths of the people of that section are opposed to Confederation.—We therefore see plainly why the hon. gentleman is opposed to a union of British North America. We can understand gentlemen who argue this way, who prefer annexation with the "Stars and Stripes" to England's "Meteor flag," but what are we to think of gentlemen who come forward and say that they are actuated by very different motives—that they wish to keep up the connection with the British Crown; they say they are loyal, but that if we confederate, we must be eventually annexed to the United States. That is an argument which requires some explanation before it can satisfy those who have studied the question of union and have come to the conclusion that a union of the Provinces is necessary to the continuance of their connection with Great Britain, and their only safety against annexation.

When the resolution was passed in this House, providing for a Conference to consider the question of a union of the Maritime Provinces, we all believed that a union with Canada was impracticable at that time—that she would not be moved by an appeal from these colonies—that any movement on our part would not influence her. That was the sole reason why Canada is not included in the resolution in question. We believed that union of the Maritime Provinces was alone practicable, and that it would lead to the larger Union. A delegation was sent to Charlottetown, but before it took place that was announced in all the newspapers? What was everywhere known and understood? What was the understanding of every man that went on that delegation? Why, that the delegates of the Maritime Provinces were to meet a delegation from Canada at Charlottetown in reference to a Union of British North America. Gentlemen, now busily occupied in opposing union, were aware what was to take place at that convention. I have no hesitation in saying that the fact was known to Mr. Howe, and publicly stated in his presence at the dinner given to the Canadian gentlemen, but who, in a number of articles, has been obstructing union for the last eighteen months—who has called those connected with the Quebec scheme "traitors"; thereby stigmatizing his own political friends and allies as well as those who have been opposed to him in public life. He has charged them with having sold and bartered away the rights of the people of the country, and when a gentleman under his own hand, makes such charges against others, he need not be surprised that they are thrown back against the individual who made them. That gentleman knew that the Delegates were to meet for the purpose stated. He did not wait to be asked to join that delegation, but personally solicited the appointment. When he was appointed and found that a man-of-war was ready to take him to Newfoundland, and that he could not go to Prince Edward Island, he expressed his deep regret that he could not join us. Believing and expecting that something would grow out of that meeting, he wrote to the Government expressing regret that he could not join the delegation, but that when he returned in October he would be happy to aid them in any scheme that might be ar-

anged. It is not necessary for me to go over the evidence that he was always in favor of a union of the Provinces. Whilst conducting a leading public journal he advocated it for years; within these walls he repeatedly referred to the subject in a manner that was calculated to bring conviction to the people of this country. Who does not remember the story he told so often that when he arrived in Liverpool a consul from the United States, the bearer of important despatches, was allowed to go ashore, whilst he had to remain in the ship. Should a Colonist, he said, be considered so little entitled to consideration? Should not the Colonies assume a position that would entitle them to more respect among the nations of the world?

I am not going to recapitulate what occurred at Charlottetown, or enter into any elaborate exposition of the necessity and advantages of union; it has been thoroughly discussed in the press and on the platform, and on this debate, in this house. I have yet to hear, in the future, anything on the subject that has not been often said before. It is complained that there are eleven lawyers in this House in favor of the scheme, but are not the best minds in the country also supporting it? I need not tell gentlemen who are opposing this great measure of intercolonial progress, and who the "head centre" is. He is well known in this House and country; he has been receiving pay from the Imperial Government for the past two years, but, opposed to the views of that Government, has been secretly using every means to thwart them, and at the same time tried to delude the people by a letter that he was not opposing the measure in any shape. Now that his pay has ceased, the mask is thrown off, and we find him openly in antagonism to the measure which he pretended he had not endeavored to thwart. He, a servant of the British Government, has been for months past insidiously laboring to destroy a scheme that he knew had secured the approval of that Government, of the British Parliament and people, and the best minds in British North America. This is a free country, and every man is at liberty to write what he wishes; but there are responsibilities thrown upon some persons in reference to many public measures that should induce them to act with great discretion. That discretion has not been observed by Mr. Howe. He has forgotten the responsibility that he owes to the people of this country. He was not called upon as a public man, for he occupied no position in this country that required his action, but he has gone out of his way to oppose this measure, and to slander and vilify members of this House, on both sides. We are told that this is the patriot of Nova Scotia, and that therefore he is entitled to consideration. Let us see the position that the hon. gentleman occupies before the people of Nova Scotia, and scrutinize his claims to the confidence of the country. He went to England on a railway mission, three or four years ago, and entered into an arrangement by which the people of this province would have to pay three and a half twelfths of the entire cost of the intercolonial Railway, and then came back, and by the power of a small majority, whilst an employee of the British Government, passed an act to carry it out. Now, when the road is to be built on most advantageous terms, he is found opposing a scheme of union without which its construction must be delayed for years. He went to the county of Lunenburg at the general election in 1863, and the people rejected him by an overwhelming majority. He has since then been in the pay of the British Government, but during that time what evidence did he give of his patriotism? Did he serve the interests of the people on any single occasion? No; his patriotism was subdued by his salary.

This gentleman, whose ability is undoubted, whose speeches I have listened to on the floor of this House with the greatest interest, assumes to be the guide of the people. Let us see what claims he has to that position. We all know that the Reciprocity Treaty was entered into in 1854. It came to be ratified in this House, and where do we find that hon. member? We found him endeavoring to defeat that measure, and dividing the House on the question. If the hon. member had been successful, we would never have had any Reciprocity Treaty, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, and the advantages of that measure and the favorable position it now so strongly enables us to take in dealing with that question, would have been wholly lost. Again, the question of the settlement of the Mines and Minerals came up for consideration in 1858. It was arranged by a gentleman taken from each side of the House—the present Judge in Equity and the hon. leader of the Opposition. Mr. Howe led upon opposition to the measure, and did all in his power to frustrate the arrangements that the delegates had made in London. These were two important questions which have proved most advantageous to the people, and yet Mr. Howe, the patriot, was found throwing obstacles in their way. Again, the hon. gentleman became a railway commissioner, and I need not remind the House that, in 1856, he was constantly found button-holing members, and endeavoring to upset the Government of his own party, whose subordinate officer he was. If that Government, which he represented as resting over a volcano, was not immediately broken up, it was not his fault. Things went on this way until 1857, when the Gourlay shanty riots occurred. We all remember the religious animosities that were excited. Who was the origin? This same gentleman. He destroyed his own political friends by forcing measures upon them which they could not with safety adopt, and which divided, as he knew it would, his own party. He raised religious strife in this country for his own personal objects, and excited neighbor against neighbor who had lived for years in peace and quietude. He managed by this means to get into power in 1859, but for years he endeavored to preserve consistency of action? Nothing of the kind. After his success, by a small majority, which was subsequently melting away, and feeling the power unrighteously obtained fast slipping away, and in order to avert it, he did not hesitate to seek aid from the very men he had proscribed, and to assert that his professions to others were false, and that he had only wanted a little capital by which to get back into power.

This is the gentleman who now attempts to deal with the people of Nova Scotia, and tell them that they should follow his advice. He has been opposed to the continuance in office of the present Government, and he made overtures to Opposition gentlemen, asking them to support the Confederation scheme, asking them not to allow the present Government to carry it, that if they would only help him to overthrow the present Administration he and they might, if necessary, pass the measure when they got into power. I am not making this statement rashly. I can prove it by what has passed between them within and without the walls of this building. His opposition is, I am satisfied, not so much to Union as that the men in power should carry the measure. That is the patriotism that influences the hon. member.

There is another gentleman opposite who opposes this measure, and that is the hon. member for East Halifax. I regret to say anything severe about that gentleman, for he has passed

through an ordeal in this house which entitles him to commiseration. He endeavored to blacken the character of men connected with the Quebec scheme. We all know the statement made concerning Hon. George Brown, and the refutation it has met, even from his attempt at escape by denying his own words, uttered in our presence. I ask the hon. member to consider the position he occupies on this question. I am prepared to prove by the most conclusive evidence that the hon. member, within the last two or three weeks, would have been willing to go for this very resolution, without any stipulations as to an appeal to the people. What has changed the hon. member since? Have there been any new arrivals in this country since he formed and uttered this intention? Has there been any influence brought to bear upon him? A gentleman, has written article after article on the subject, who has stated deliberately that he would be willing to support this scheme, now comes here and tells us that he has yet to hear "the first argument in favor of union with Canada." He attempted to define his position the other day, but I am quite sure that when he was done, nobody knew where to find him.

On the several occasions that this question has been before the House, I have not said a single word on the subject. It was one of those questions that I did not wish to deal hastily with; I was anxious to ascertain how it could be carried out in accordance with the public interests, and how far the measure could be practically dealt with. We went to Quebec, and I listened attentively to the arguments in connection with the subject of Union. When I saw that a practicable scheme could be matured, and believing it was necessary for the welfare and prosperity of the people of British North America, then alone did I consent to be a party to it. As respects the Quebec Scheme, I may state that I had my doubts as to the correctness of some of its features, and divided the convention on them. I objected to the pardoning power given to the local governors, who are simply delegates from the General Government, believing that feature would be regarded by the British Government as against principle. I objected again to that portion of the scheme by which the number of the Legislative Council is stereotyped; I held that it was preferable to continue the principle of the British Constitution, which allowed the Crown to add to the number of the Upper House, but I was overruled by the all-gation of the difficulty of arranging the numbers which might be added so as not to alter the relative numbers from all the Provinces. I felt, however, although opposed to some of the details, that it would be for the interest of the Provinces to adopt it as a whole. I felt that whilst they remain isolated, instead of becoming more intimately connected and better acquainted, they were likely to become more and more antagonistic to each other. I had before me the position of two Australian Colonies which came nearly to war in consequence of some financial dispute between them. Some goods were seized by the one, and attempted to be rescued by the other, and they were only restrained from the adoption of extreme measures by being Colonies instead of independent countries. We have trade relations between the Provinces that are injurious to all of them.

The hon. member for East Halifax says that we can have changes, and those relations improved without union. Well, the hon. gentleman tried that on one occasion, and found that the difficulties that met him were of a most insurmountable character. We are told that the currency could be assimilated, but the hon. member must have changed his opinions on this subject very recently, or he would not now desire to alter or assimilate the currency. A few years ago I introduced a bill for the purpose of giving the country a decimal currency, founded on the basis of the American, Canadian and New Brunswick currency; but he voted against it, and he and his party did all they could to prevent us assimilating our currency to that of the neighboring States and Provinces. The hon. member denies that Union can increase our capacity for defence, but no one is likely to believe that his opinions are entitled to greater weight than the eminent statesmen and generals who have given their views on the subject. At present each of the provinces looks to its own safety, and does not trouble itself much about its neighbor. We can hear with comparative quietude that the Fenians are about to land in New Brunswick, but if we hear that Nova Scotia is endangered and its soil invaded, our blood is excited, and we feel we must rise and defend our hearths and homes. If we were all united in one, if the Canadian felt that the soil of Nova Scotia is as dear to him as that of Canada—if Nova Scotia felt that Canada is a part of itself—we would all have a greater guarantee of security. We are told that disunion we can as effectually defend ourselves. I would call attention to the position of Wellington in Spain. Whilst trammelled by the orders of the British Government, Spanish Junta, etc., he was powerless, but the moment he determined to act on his own responsibility, success crowned his arms. Everybody must see the great advantage that is derived from the concentration of authority in one hand. The most powerful government for speedy action is that which is despotic. If we have one concentrated authority in the country—one general command—our strength will be vastly increased, by the ability to concentrate force when necessary at any important point. The hon. member for East Halifax would have the people of the province pay pound for pound with those of Liverpool, Manchester and London, and leave the expenditure to the British Government irresponsible of any power. We would then have no control over the expenditure, and could not supervise those who would expend the moneys thus raised. If we were united under one Government, and had one central Legislature, then the money would be under its control; and our own representatives would see that it was judiciously expended.

The hon. member for East Halifax told us that the necessities of Canada forced them to unite with us. I tell the hon. gentleman Union was poked off, and introduced by the gentleman whose mouth-piece he is, long before it was thought of seriously in Canada. They had no necessities that forced them to a union with the Maritime Provinces. All that they had to do was to agree to the principle that is introduced into the Quebec scheme, Representation by population; and I believe they will be found ready to adopt that principle in their own local affairs if this scheme fails. When this question is settled, they have no important difficulties to disturb them. If the question of Union has attained its present position rapidly, it has been aided by the resolution that his own government introduced, and carried in this House some years ago, without a division. When Canada found that the Fenian Provinces were taking measures for union among themselves, her public men asked if we could not unite in a Confederation of all the Provinces. When we went to Charlottetown, we found that, owing to the opposition both of New Brunswick and P. E. Island, the smaller Union

was impracticable. Not a word was said about union with Canada until it was found that the union of the Maritime Provinces could not be brought about. I may add, that the question of a Legislative union of the Maritime Provinces was again brought up at the Quebec Convention. Canada and Nova Scotia argued that union, but gentlemen representing the two provinces named would not consent to that union. If, therefore, the Maritime union has not been carried, it is not the fault of Nova Scotia or Canada.

Reference has been made to the financial necessities of Canada. We know from our own experience that the revenue will fall off considerably during some years; one year Nova Scotia had a deficiency of £390,000. Three or four years in succession of failure of crops affected the importations into Canada, and consequently caused a deficiency in the revenue. Now I can assure gentlemen that Canada is not now in any position to require assistance. Yet gentlemen who would object to Confederation with Canada for fear of extra taxation, would have no unwillingness to annex us to the United States, with its immense war debt and exhausting taxation. Canada now is as prosperous as any portion of the globe.

The hon. member told us that the Imperial Government had no policy until after the report of the delegates. In this he may be correct. The British government, looking at the fact that leading men representing both political parties in the provinces were in favour of union, and had adopted a measure for their confederation, had every reason to suppose that they represented the feelings and wishes of the country. When the British public saw that the Colonies were entertaining the scheme for Union, that the leading men had concurred in its details, they felt that this was a measure that invited their serious consideration and approval. I tell the hon. member for Shelburne that it is not only Mr. Cardwell who has spoken strongly on this question; if he did not support it, I believe he could not remain in his present position. No government could be formed in England unless it encouraged and stimulated this union, for public opinion in that country is almost unanimously in favor of that scheme. I know "his" from leading supporters as well as opponents of that government.

I have already pointed to some of the parties who are opposing the Union of the British North American Provinces. I have shown you that some of these gentlemen profess to be Annexationists to the American Republic. But we had on the promulgation of the Quebec scheme opposition from another quarter.—It will be remembered that there was a paper published in Halifax under the not very euphonious title of the *Bullfrog*, patronised and encouraged very largely by gentlemen in the Anti-Confederate interest. This paper was edited principally by gentlemen in the Royal Artillery in this garrison, who have since published a work on Confederation, which I find reviewed in an English paper. I must say that, if the Review expresses their views, these gentlemen have been guilty of the grossest libel upon the loyal people of Nova Scotia that was ever penned. When we look at a man's conduct in all its relations, then only can we form a just conclusion as to the motives that actuate him. I will now read to you from a review of the work in question:—

The Confederation of British North America. By E. C. BOLTON and H. H. WEBBER, Royal Artillery.—London: Chapman and Hall.
The authors of this volume go dead against a scheme which was received with much approval in this country, and was believed to have been also, on the whole, favourably looked upon in the colonies.—We mean, of course, the proposal for the Confederation of the British North American Provinces. It seems, however, according to the authors of the work before us, that we were all wrong on the subject.—Confederation, they declare, is neither possible nor desirable—indeed, is not desired, in the wide sense of the word, at all. The maritime provinces, while they are favorable to a federation among themselves, are bitterly inimical to a union with Canada; while all the Colonies—Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and the loyalists—are bent on annexation to the United States. The confederation proposed, and only value British connections for the sake of Imperial expenditure among them. The Confederation scheme the authors pronounce to be a farce; and, if carried out, a ruinous farce. The colonies wish to do nothing, and will do nothing, to promote a union with themselves. The mother country, they think, cannot do without them.—In fact, would sink into the position of a third-rate power, were her American colonies severed from her, while they would still retain their trade with the United States, with England and with the rest of the world. The people of all the Provinces are, we are told far more loyal to their British connection, and their loyalty to the Crown, of which we hear so much, is to be trusted Messrs. Bolton and Webber, only a mere lip service, put on to keep up appearances, and induce a continuance of grants for public works, for fortifications, and for the maintenance of troops in the provinces and on the navy on the station.

Here you see the supporters of the Anti-Confederation doctrine perpetrating this disgraceful libel upon the people of Nova Scotia. I hold that these gentlemen are no worse, however, than those who here advocate annexation. We are told that our loyalty is only a mere lip service, that we value British connection only for the advantages it brings with it—naval and military expenditures. I ask the hon. member for East Halifax, and those who are associating with him, ought they not to be proud of their connection with these gentlemen who "hus libel our country?"

We are told that we should not go into this Union—that Nova Scotia is now happy and prosperous, and does not require union to make her more so. Let me ask how we are going to provide for the continuance of that prosperity? Who of all the Anti-confederates can show us where, without union, we will be in two years?—who can guarantee us our position for that period or less time? We only jeopardize it whilst we remain isolated as at present. Look at the geographical position of Nova Scotia; at her great resources, and ask it she should not wish to be even more prosperous than she actually is, or without union can ever expect to be. What is it that placed England in her present exalted position among the nations of the world? What is it that has given her continued supremacy on the sea, and as a manufacturing country? Her mines of coal and iron. What have we in Nova Scotia?—She is partly a fishing and partly an agricultural country, but she has also most valuable mineral resources only in the infancy of their development. If you consider her water power, and mines of coal and iron, and her geographical situation, you see all the elements of a great manufacturing country on this side of the country. Whilst we have no market we cannot expect to see our manufacturing system develop itself, but if we had a market of four millions of consumers, then we might expect, in a fair competition, to see them progress. Give her the population, and I am confident that she will take a position in the manufacturing world that no country of the same size can far surpass. We are told that we can have free trade without union, but that cannot be proved; we are told it, I repeat, but not the slightest evidence is adduced to show how we can obtain

it. There are things that are applicable to Nova Scotia that have followed this principle that they have a right to a greater benefit than are on the part of all seasons mineral and the entrepote of the West Indies. The West Indies are only ready to become a degraded employment at I will not say a pig and a man. But, since union with Nova Scotia?—Let this continue danger imminent present. It get by the force and industry by perpetrating the Empire of the world, and not by the section by against the protection of us.

We are told that Halifax, England, and the rest of the world, are in honor, gentle opinion, and that he did not support it, I believe he could not remain in his present position. No government could be formed in England unless it encouraged and stimulated this union, for public opinion in that country is almost unanimously in favor of that scheme. I know "his" from leading supporters as well as opponents of that government. I have already pointed to some of the parties who are opposing the Union of the British North American Provinces. I have shown you that some of these gentlemen profess to be Annexationists to the American Republic. But we had on the promulgation of the Quebec scheme opposition from another quarter.—It will be remembered that there was a paper published in Halifax under the not very euphonious title of the *Bullfrog*, patronised and encouraged very largely by gentlemen in the Anti-Confederate interest. This paper was edited principally by gentlemen in the Royal Artillery in this garrison, who have since published a work on Confederation, which I find reviewed in an English paper. I must say that, if the Review expresses their views, these gentlemen have been guilty of the grossest libel upon the loyal people of Nova Scotia that was ever penned. When we look at a man's conduct in all its relations, then only can we form a just conclusion as to the motives that actuate him. I will now read to you from a review of the work in question:—