

There are intercolonial commercial rivalries that prevent that object being attained as applicable to manufactures. Wherever an attempt has been made in this direction, failure has followed, and will follow hereafter. Nothing is more certain than the truth of the principle that when you attach a small country having all the elements of manufacturing, to a greater one with a large population, you benefit that smaller country. Situated as we are on the broad Atlantic, with our ports open at all seasons of the year, with our fisheries, mineral and other resources, we may become the entrepot for a large extra trade between the other British North American colonies and the West Indies and other parts of the world, and only require a union with a larger country to become great and prosperous to an unlimited degree. A trade will arise that will give employment to our shipping, and we may as I will, no doubt, add largely to that shipping and the amount of our carrying trade. But, sir, if no increased prosperity will result from union, I again ask you can guarantee to Nova Scotia the position she now occupies? Look at the state of things on this continent, and ask yourselves is not the danger imminent if we remain isolated as at present. If, on the other hand, we are able to get by the union a guarantee of the continuance and increase of this prosperity—if we can by it perpetuate the connection with the great Empire of which we form a part, is it not our duty as well as interest to do so without delay, and not risk the continuance of that connection by a selfish and exclusive policy against the unanimous wish of the people who protect us.

We are told by the hon. member for East Halifax that there is a sentiment prevalent in England in favor of getting rid of these Colonies. I had a better opportunity than the hon. gentleman of judging the state of public opinion, and I travelled over the country more than he did. I can unhesitatingly state that in no part of the mother country did I discover any such sentiment as he speaks of. We have heard of the Manchester school of politicians who are said to be unfavorably disposed towards these Colonies of the Crown; and desirous for their separation. That party is small, if it is all, which I very much doubt; and it certainly does not represent the sentiment of the people. I had the honour on one occasion, during my late visit to England, of sitting down to a luncheon, at Rochdale, a little out of Manchester, with some one hundred gentlemen of standing and influence. I was presenting to them during the entertainment as having been one of the delegates who went from Nova Scotia to the Quebec Conference, to frame the scheme of the Union of the Provinces. I can only say that the statement was received with universal applause, and was called upon to respond to the toast. I never felt prouder in my life than to hear in that very heart of the Manchester district the cheers that rang from one end of the building to the other, when I promulgated the opinion that it would not be long before the Colonies were united. A few politicians representing that part of the country may spout such ideas, but I am certain the hearts of the people are not with them. I believe that a similar feeling prevails among all classes of the people of Great Britain. If any such sentiment is entertained by parties in England, as the hon. member says, it is perhaps not difficult to account for it. Persons there may be deluded into the idea that the Maritime Colonies are opposed to Confederation, thanks to the hon. member and his associates. But if the hon. member is correct, and England does wish to throw us off, what, then, is to be our fate? Where are we? What country do we belong to? What must be the fate of 350,000 people left isolated and alone? Annexation must inevitably follow. Therefore admitting that such a feeling does exist in the mother country, we have an additional argument in favor of the necessity of Confederation—of a union that will give unity and solidity; a population of four millions of souls bound together by the closest ties, determined to aid and strengthen one another, and perpetuate the hallowed connection with our honored parent. If the mother country receives from us a pledge of earnestness in this matter, and believes that our great object is to keep up the connection with her, she will feel doubly bound to give renewed assurances for the continuance of that connection, and to sustain and protect us in the hour of need. She will feel that the colonies united in one great country will be a source of strength instead of weakness. If the colonies are consolidated—if they present a united population of millions of loyal subjects, England will feel a greater degree of security than she can possibly do while they remain mere isolated communities without unity of purpose or design.

We are told that it is unconstitutional to pass the Resolution before the house—that the question should be referred to the people as the polls, but where is the argument that has been adduced in support of this proposition? We are told that it is a terrible thing to take away the rights of the people. Do these gentlemen correctly estimate the position we occupy? Do they forget that we have certain responsibilities as forming a portion of the Empire of Great Britain? We have a constitution of our own to admit, and have the right to manage our own local affairs. We have conceded to us years ago the principle of Responsible Government; but did we also obtain the right of exercising it against the rest of the Empire on a question involving Imperial as well as inter-colonial interests? Are we to use it to the detriment of the mother-country and the sister-colonies? When Responsible Government was conceded to us, the principle of total independence did not accompany it. We may pass an act here, but it must be ratified by the home government. We are dependent, and should where necessary, modify our views and measures to some extent when Imperial and inter-colonial interests are at stake. Whilst we are a dependency, we have the protection of the mother-country, and she can at the same time ask from us the yielding of certain rights as British subjects, for the benefit of the whole Empire. We are asked to—(Mr. Killam—To sell us)—the hon. member says to sell us; I would tell him that he would not ask a great deal to sell us to the United States tomorrow. (Cheers in the galleries.) I contend whenever overpowering interests of the empire demand it, the Imperial Government may fairly ask us to modify and amend our constitution, and that the representatives of the people can constitutionally consider and pass upon the subject. Let us then look calmly at the position we occupy. We are told that this matter should be submitted to the people. I would ask these gentlemen to give us examples where such a course has been pursued. Have they cited one case? Not one. How was the constitution changed in New Zealand? By the Legislature first adopting the measures for Union, and subsequently by an Imperial act. I can understand why, if a resolution was moved for Annexation to the United States, some gentlemen would not see anything improper in it, but when we move one, under the

authority of the British Government, with the view of joining the sister colonies, in order to give us strength and security, they present the constitutional objection of the proceeding. Suppose the British Parliament in the interests of the Empire should pass an Act for the consolidation of those Provinces, could the constitutional right of doing so be impeached? The British Government have not intimated a desire to pursue that course but no person can deny its right to adopt that course. All, however, that they have done is to manifest their desire that we should manage the affair in our own way, and to give us their opinion that it is for our own advantage that we should unite without delay. When gentlemen attempt to reduce a novel doctrine in this Legislature they should add some argument derived from the practice of other countries in support of their position. Can they show us an instance of a government after it has passed the Legislature, having been sent to the people? When a government introduces, but fails to carry, a measure, they can go to the country and test the public opinion. When a measure is proposed by a government and passed, the constitutional doctrine prevails that the gentlemen within these walls represent the feelings of their constituents. That must be the constitutional test, otherwise every measure of importance should be submitted to the people after its passage through the Legislature. We are told that the people are opposed to this scheme, but that has to be proved. The people are hardly yet aware of the exact nature of the resolution, and therefore cannot be said to be opposed to it. Some persons have objected to the Quebec scheme; some have favored a legislative union; others are in favour of a modification of the former measure. Various opinions prevail, but nearly all wish union of some shape or other. I hold that it is perfectly constitutional to pass this resolution—that we have an undoubted right to do so—gentlemen will remember that it is only a short time since that the Legislature of Jamaica passed an act to destroy its own constitution? Did these Anti-Confederate gentlemen come forward and declare that to be unconstitutional? Not at all.

We propose only to transfer certain powers to a Legislative body comprising a fair representation of our own, chosen on the principle of population. It is no Confederation in the strict term of the word. It is a Legislative union to a large extent. The people will elect their representatives as they do now, and each county will have its member in the General Parliament. Objection has been taken to the principle of representation based on population, but what else can you have? We could not expect to have as large a representation as Canada, nor could Prince Edward Island ask as many representatives as Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and if the numbers were not to be equal, I ask these gentlemen upon what principle would they be regulated except on that of population? What was the cause of the difficulties that have arisen between Upper and Lower Canada? It was because that principle was not incorporated in the Act of Union. After a few years Upper Canada, at first less than Lower Canada but subsequently largely increased in population, did not consider that it was fully represented, and demanded that its representation should be based on numbers. We are told that this is not a Legislative Union, because all the subjects that come before a Legislature are not embraced in it. If they are not embraced in it Nova Scotia has not therefore much cause for complaint. Education, Roads and Bridges, the control of our jurisprudence, and other subjects in which we take the deepest interest are left to our own control. Then we have the same amount per head for our local government that they have in Canada, and if we manage to spend more money in proportion to our population than she does, it is only right we should pay for it. We go into that Union on the same terms. Every man, woman, and child will owe the same debt—receive the same amount from the general exchequer—as each man, woman, and child in Canada, and we shall have our full share of all the expenditures by the General Government for important public objects. We are told, however, nineteen members will have no influence in the General Legislature. I contend they will have as much influence relatively as the eight gentlemen representing Cape Breton now exercise in this house of fifty-five. That island is felt to be a part of our country, and entitled to a share of the general prosperity, and in Union each of the Provinces will feel an interest in the prosperity of the others. There may be some little rivalries, as we have now, but these will not exist as to local expenditures so much as affecting general principles and measures. Talent and energy will assert their proper positions in the general legislature as it does here and everywhere under free institutions. Nova Scotia may be a small Province, but her men will be able to hold their own in the United Parliament. The nineteen men she will select to represent her will, I have no doubt, be able to protect her interests. As I have just said, Cape Breton receives a large influence in this House; her members have received everything that they can reasonably ask. Party Government must prevail in the new Parliament. There must, as in all countries under Responsible Government be a Government and an Opposition, and Nova Scotia will exercise with her nineteen members a sufficient influence. There is no party, however strong, that can afford to neglect the legitimate local interests of any one of their supporters. This government came into power some years ago, with a majority such as was never seen before in Nova Scotia, and who can allege that the local interests of any section were neglected. It is true that no government can satisfy the demands of all their followers—nor can they in adopting a general line of policy satisfy their friends; but I am now referring to the local interests that are to be represented. If any gentlemen have withdrawn their support from the government it is on general subjects; no one can say that local interests are disregarded; and I am free to say that the gentlemen from Nova Scotia will get their fair share of everything that they require, for there is no party at Ottawa that could refuse to them with impunity. We all know that the Irish party, comparatively few in number, to a large extent, controlled public matters for years in the British Parliament.

We have had all sorts of aspersions thrown upon us. It is said that we are actuated solely by selfish motives. One gentleman is to be a governor, another a judge, every body is to get something. I believe that the gentlemen who talk this way have some ideas floating in their minds that by opposing this scheme they may become something of the kind themselves. They believe, and the secret was let out by the hon. member for East Halifax, that the government is unpopular, in consequence of the School Bill; that if they can only keep things as they are for a few months longer, until a general election, they may come into power themselves; that when the present government is defeated, and they step out of of-

ice, they can, if necessary, carry Confederation themselves—then, no doubt, the people will be in favor of it—nothing will be then said about the constitutional objection of dealing with it irrespective of an appeal to the people; or they will have their choice of leaving things as they are, and holding an office as long as they can. Vision of Financial and other secretaries; offices of Queen's Printer and others, are no doubt urging their powerful influences upon the patriotic minds of these gentlemen. So we may fairly suppose that these are the reasons that sway some hon. gentlemen, rather than those suggestions of patriotism of which we hear so much, but in practice see so little. They wish to have the alternative of choosing or rejecting Confederation, according as it may suit their own personal interests. Therefore they urge delay on the part of the present government in reference to the question. What unselfish patriots!

The hon. member for Halifax has admitted that he said to gentlemen in this house that he would go to New Brunswick to see some Anti-Confederates for the purpose of ascertaining whether they would not agree to a resolution something like the present one. He will allow me to say that if he had gone to the sister Province he would not have found Mr. Smith opposed to a union of the Provinces. I am not taking a liberty with that gentleman when I say that he has never pronounced himself against a scheme which would remove the objections he entertains to the Quebec plan of Confederation. The state of things in that Province itself proves that the large mass of the people entertain similar views on the subject.

I know that I have not dealt with this question as its importance demands, but although I could not allow the resolution to pass with a silent vote. Present and aiding in the Charlottetown and Quebec Conventions, I came to the conclusion that it was for the interest of Nova Scotia, as well as her duty to the great Empire to which she belongs, that she should adopt this Union. I have endeavored to give these crude observations in a dispassionate and calm manner. I have given some of the reasons that influenced my judgment in favor of the resolution before the house and now say most emphatically that if there are any persons who prefer annexation to the United States, let them, in Heaven's name, follow the example of the hon. member for Yarmouth, but do not let them attempt by false representations to thwart the efforts of those who would bring about a Union of the Provinces. I say, however, to gentlemen around these benches, who value the flag that "for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze," and that has planted liberty and freedom in every quarter of the globe—to all those who are inspired by a desire to perpetuate the connection with the British Empire, come forward and support the measure, which will at once achieve this result, and at the same time give that dignity of position and security to the Provinces that in their present isolated position they can never hope to obtain. (Cheers.)

SPEECH OF MR. KAULBACK.

MR. KAULBACK said.—I feel some diffidence in addressing the House upon a question of such importance; but I consider it a duty devolving on me to express my views upon it, and in doing so I shall have occasion to refer to the arguments of some gentlemen who have preceded me. I conceive that this subject, having been long before the country, is no new question; it has been before the people for more than half a century, and has been agitated by our leading men for a great many years. Every man considering the question should surely have solved it and matured his mind by this time. In 1814 Judge Sewell, of Quebec, urged the necessity of a scheme of British North America on His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent. A Union of the Colonies was urged by the Earl of Durham in 1839 when a scheme analogous to that now before us was mentioned. In 1849 a British American League was formed in Toronto who seemed to have had the matter fully before them. In 1854 we had Mr. Johnston moving in the matter, supported by Mr. Howe and Mr. Young. From 1854 to 1860 we have correspondence on the subject. In 1857 Mr. Johnston was delegated to go to England in connection with intercolonial matters. In 1858 there was a delegation from Canada of the same kind. In 1860 Dr. Tupper delivered lectures on a Union of the Colonies; in 1861 Mr. Howe moved a resolution which was adopted by the House. In 1862 Mr. Annand, Mr. Howe and Mr. McCuig went to Canada on the subject. In 1863 Mr. McCuig lectured in Halifax, and in 1864 I was present at a banquet in this city when Mr. Howe gave an eloquent address on the question. It cannot therefore be said, that the time has not arrived when the question should be solved. The hon. member for Shelburne made a reference to some distinguished Canadian politicians and styled one of them an Irish rebel. I have only to reply that we find that Mr. Howe, in 1863, on a platform in Temperance Hall, enlabeled Mr. D'Arcy McGee, and declared that he "was with him in all he said" in favor of a Union of all the British North American Colonies;—now he ridicules Mr. McGee, and denounces any Union with Canada!

In 1857, Mr. Howe declared in Temperance Hall "Taste of the Fall of Quebec being a source of sorrow to the inhabitants of this Province. It would be more if the St. Lawrence were in the hands of our enemies." WE SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO RESUBMIT TO TEAR DOWN THE BRITISH FLAG. What he wished for Nova Scotia was, that she may be the frontage of a mighty Colony upon which it may be truly said, the sun never sets.

Notwithstanding this we find Mr. Howe writing the Bothearting articles, and his public character is open to much doubt from that time. As others who were present at the dinner to the Canadian guests, in 1864, have said, the question of Union was then in the public mind. I will recollect the speech made by Mr. Howe on that occasion; and as his observations were more eloquent than anything that I can say, I will ask attention to a few of his sentences:—

"He was not one of those who thanked God that he was a Nova Scotian merely, for he was Canadian as well. He had never thought he was a Nova Scotian, but he had looked across the broad continent, at the great territory which the Almighty had given us for an inheritance, and studied the mode by which it could be consolidated, the mode by which it could be united, the mode by which it could be made strong and vigorous, while the old flag still flew over the soil. (Loud cheers.) He was delighted to see such a scene as this, which gave promise that which was the dream of his boyhood would be realized before he died."

"Thank God the time had come when Her Majesty's subjects, whether English, French Scotch, or Irish, might meet together under the old flag, and maintain common sentiments of unity, and look forward to the time when we should make a new England here; not a new England with republican institutions, but a new England with monarchical institutions. He had always been in favor of the Intercolonial Railway. He wished every now and again to see

the setting fall of Montmorency, to see the Indians of Lorette dancing about the silver stream; he wanted to visit Canada not once in a lifetime, but once in five or six years, but once a year, twice a year."

"With the territory of 'anna', with the rivers of Nova Scotia, with the inexhaustible fisheries, what a country to live in! and why should Union not be brought about? Was it because we wished to live in our own insularism, that we would sooner make money rather than that our country should grow? God forbid! He felt that it was too late to say much, though there was much to say. (Go on, go on.) He knew that the Canadian gentlemen would take in good part what he was going to say. He had always been in favor of bringing a two, three, four, or the whole five of the Provinces. Well, they knew the history of the past in Canada; they knew that a division had produced there, and how, under the divine dispensation, they at last became united into one magnificent colony. There now came rumors across the land that they were going to split Canada into two parts again; that they were going to reduce that low country to its low status of two Provinces instead of one. O my friends, said the hon. gentleman, go back to your homes, and say that there is at least one Nova Scotian honest enough to say to you this—that if you do that, you will commit an act of political suicide, and although I ought to perhaps to give you the advice, I would rather see every public man upon both sides of politics crucified, than I would divide Canada now that Canada is united. Join the Maritime Provinces if you can; but, at any rate, stick together—hold your own. Let the dog return to his vomit, rather than Canada to division (cheers). In conclusion Mr. Howe said that he was pleased to think the day was rapidly approaching when the Provinces would be united with one flag above their heads, one thought in all their bosoms, with one Sovereign and one Constitution. (Loud and prolonged Cheers.)

I would ask what is Mr. Howe's position on this question to-day? He now appears advocating a new line of policy one day, and another the next. The dream of his childhood he told us was Colonial Union, and now he says that it would be ruinous to the constitution. In his recently published letter he has gone far beyond what any public man should go, and his sentiments I consider a disgrace not only to himself but to those who accord with them. He tells us that we have an enemy before us whose number and power are not to be despised in the Fenians, whose views are sympathized in by the Americans, and what does he advise us to do in the matter? Does he advise us to stand by our country and our flag? No, he desires us to lay down our weapons; he tells us it is too late that we cannot defend ourselves, and that we are at the mercy of the enemy. His statements are the strongest argument that can be adduced in favour of a Union of the Colonies—they prove that the time is at hand for this measure, and that no time is to be lost. He speaks about putting on a blue-jacket and assisting in our defence; I consider that a man holding such sentiments as his would be dangerous in such a position, for he has been endeavoring to excite a rebellion throughout the country, telling the people that they cannot defend themselves, that our connection with the mother country is unsafe, and that at this moment our better course is to lay down our arms on the approach of an enemy. He tells us that those who advocate the Union now will not be the men who will go to Canada, and the meaning of his letter seems to be that we must wait for him; only bring him back to power and he will not trouble himself to enquire whether he has been elected on this question or not. He will be the first man to advocate the Union when he returns to office and position. I am inclined to believe that all the opposition on this question are in favour of Union, and that they oppose it because they cannot avail themselves of the highest positions. Mr. Howe opens his second letter by saying "my advice has not been taken"; we have taken the advice he gave us formerly as to a Union of the Colonies, but how could his more recent advice be taken when it is well known that he is writing disloyal letters injurious to the Province. I say, sir, that we have seen enough of this gentleman to know that he has broken faith on every public question, and that everything he can say must be received with a large amount of doubt. When in days gone by he advocated Union, did he ask for an appeal to the people? No, the Legislature was to decide the question, and yet he tells us it is unconstitutional to take such a course. That is the position which this gentleman has assumed. He declared some time ago that Halifax would not be safe without connection with Canada by rail; now he tells us that Canada is only a source of weakness. These are inconsistencies which no man can reconcile. Again he agreed that Nova Scotia should build three-and-a-half twelfths of the whole cost of the Intercolonial Railway. We are now to get the Railway built for one-twelfth, and yet he comes out in opposition to the whole thing.

Reference has been made to the recent election in the county of Lunenburg; all I can say is that the result proves to my mind that there is a large majority of the people in favour of Confederation. The government were perfectly indifferent to the election, and it was only the day previous to the nomination that, to my great surprise, I received a telegram stating that the Provincial Secretary was coming down. All the opposition made most strenuous efforts; they came down and made no secret that they intended to buy the county. Their friends said at a caucus that they could not carry the county on the issue of Confederation, for the people were largely in favour of it. They then resorted to every subterfuge to win the election. The result proves that of 3200 voters only 1300 were in favour of Mr. Hebb. The School Bill was the question that settled the election. I had not taken any part in the affair, until I saw that the hon. member for Richmond had come down. I did not feel inclined to take any active part because we had no man up. There were two men actually on the same side. I preferred Mr. Zwickler, however, because he declared himself for progress; but on Nomination Day he declared against the School Bill and Confederation. He spoke, then, however, under excitement, and his card led us to believe he was not as likely to oppose all measures of improvement and progress as Mr. Hebb. He was, therefore, in some respects preferable to the latter. We went into the township of Chester where the question of Confederation was raised and discussed. The day before Nomination Day we had a meeting in the town, which lasted till a very late hour. And what was the result at every polling place? The friends of the Quebec scheme were two to one. That was the only township where the scheme was put to the people. I am no new convert to Union; but from the first hour it has been before the people I have been in favor of it. I believe in all sincerity, after the consideration I have given the subject, that our future prosperity depends largely on the issue of the present movement. I would be willing to go back to-morrow to my own county on this question, but I want to have the same people that sent me here pass

on my side. I wish to have the same franchise that returned me to the Assembly. The leading minds in the county of Lunenburg are in favor of Confederation. Have you seen more than a single petition against the scheme for my people? There is one purporting to be signed by 111 persons, but any one who reviews it will see that the majority of the names are all written by one or two persons, and evidently at the same time. They had to secure the whole county, too, before they got the names they have to this document. Every man who got up the petition is known to be hostile to the School Bill. This is the way the House is led to believe that the people are opposed to Confederation. It is the easiest thing in the world to get people to sign petitions; that everybody knows.

I have heard with much regret the expressions that some gentlemen have been using on the floor, as well as in the lobby of the House of Assembly. I could hardly control my feelings when I listened to the disloyal statements of some gentlemen in reference to the Queen and the representative of Her Majesty in this Province. They have been positively insulting to Her Majesty and the "Hero of Kara." Then we are told it is better to be annexed to the United States than to unite with Canada. What is the use of our militia and preparations for defence, if we are to be handed over to the American Republics tomorrow? Every man who loves the flag under which he lives should sink all personal and political considerations, and join with those who are laboring to unite the Provinces more closely to the British Empire.

It is not necessary that the hon. member for East Halifax should utter disloyal expressions on the street; we have only to read the articles in his own paper. The logic of events for months past, has been telling us of the danger that is imminent. We know that the Fenian organization has attained to most formidable dimensions. The President of the United States has himself deigned to receive delegations from these men. At so critical a period we have the hon. member copying from papers in England (he Pall Mall Gazette for instance), and endorsing their statements, to prove that we are not safe—that all the money England could expend upon us would be spent in vain—that we must eventually absorb into the American Union. Is it any wonder, then, that men in the States are to be found in favor of Annexation? Here is a specimen of what we read in the hon. member's journal—

"At present we are arming and drilling expending money, time and men without stint, that we may resist invasion of our territories by the Fenians. Is this because we are Colonists, or because we are Britons? It might be supposed from statements of the Press that it is as Colonists we are arming; but such is not the case. We are arming and drilling not so much to defend our homes, not so much to defend Canada, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, as such, but to defend the honor, the integrity, and prestige of Britons. All the expense, annoyance and danger to which we are exposed is for the sake of Britain, not for our own. Were we free from Britain we should have nothing to fear from the Fenians."

What is telling us a statement like that inclined to make among our own people? We are told that we are in bondage to Great Britain—that we are endangered by our connection with her, and that our safety lies in getting rid of her. This is the way that these gentlemen have been endeavoring to indoctrinate the people with their Annexation ideas. They would rather belong to the United States than even remain Nova Scotians. Shame, I say, upon men who can come into the presence of this loyal assemblage with sentiments like these in their hearts!

When the hon. member was Financial Secretary in 1862, the government brought up and carried this very question. He went then on a delegation to Quebec for the express purpose of carrying out the resolution passed unanimously in this House, and uniting us to Canada. Now he veers round from his former political associates, Messrs Archibald and McCullough wish to carry the question, and oppose all Union. Last session he stated that the local revenue under Confederation would be \$390,427—the same years he says in his paper that it would be only \$62,700. Again, last session he admitted that this province under Confederation would receive from the General Government (beside the 80 cents per head of our population) \$731,595. On December 12th of some year he says that all the surplus over 80 cents a head would go to the Northwest of Canada. Could inconsistency go further? Then he spoke to us about taxation in Canada—that we would have to pay double what we now pay. The fact is that the people of Canada are not taxed, man for man, as much as we are. He tells us Canada is in debt. So are we. But Canada can point to public works equivalent to her debt—which is more than we can do. The hon. member should know that if Canada falls, we fall too; if she is safe, we are safe. Has not Mr. Howe told us this himself? But what more does Mr. Annand do? He has actually proposed to tax the people to a larger extent than they can, by any possibility, be taxed under Confederation. He is ready to pass a law by which the men of this country shall be sent to Canada when there is no Confederation—when we have no legislative control over her—when we are different countries. He even goes so far as to express his willingness to pay in the same proportion for defence as all other portions of the British Empire. Remember, this is not for the protection of British North America alone, but for the whole Empire. Yet this is the gentleman who objects to Confederation because it may heavily burden us. I believe that if we have railway communication with Canada, it will be the means of making this country safe from invasion. When we feel we are one people—when we have a national sentiment—when we can present a united population of four millions of people animated by the same interests and affections, we shall have a guarantee of security and prosperity that we cannot have now.

Mr. H. we has told the people that the Citadel of Halifax would not be safe unless we had connection with Canada by means of an Intercolonial Railway. I think that neither he nor his friend, the hon. member for East Halifax should talk about persons being bought. I heard the hon. member quite distinctly say that he could have had money from hon. George Brown if he had wished it, and place and preferment too, if he would only promise to support Confederation. If any person should attempt to bribe me with Canadian or American gold, I would look upon it as the greatest insult that could be offered to a man, however humble. Mr. Brown must have had a very low estimate of the hon. member if he made such an offer; but how the hon. member attempts to deny that he ever made the statement he did on Friday last on the subject. Well, I shall not press the matter further, for he has al-