

an easily be applied to the building of this railroad. The total population of the three Provinces is 3,000,000, and the length of road, as given by Mr. Fleming, from Truro to River du Loap is 222 miles. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have a population of 682,904, which would make their share a fraction less than 30 miles. Now they are not only willing to build this but have actually contracted for 100 miles from Truro to Moncton, 20 miles more than their share by the principle of population, and all that the Canadians require to meet as of Moncton. I should like much to see them thus reverse the principle and give to a forestate of it, but there is no probability that they will. They know too well that under confederation our excess of contributions to the general fund will more than meet the interest on the entire cost of the road. I shall not trouble the house at this late hour with any calculations or arguments on this point, but I believe on a former occasion I proved to the entire satisfaction of the Provincial Secretary that Nova Scotia alone would be better off in a financial view to build the road herself than enter into this confederation under the Quebec scheme. The hon. Prov. Sec'y has often characterized the proposition of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to build seven-twelfths of the road as monstrous; but the Hon. George Brown, speaking at Toronto of the building of it under Confederation, says:— "It may, however, become a comfort for my friends to know that we have a prospect of getting the road built upon terms much more reasonable than we had ever hoped to obtain." Now, while we object to these terms, we say that if it be so necessary for defence, we have already contracted for 20 miles more than our share by the principles which are represented as just under Confederation. A great deal has been said of the commercial advantages of this road, and of the great effect it is to have upon this city. That it is to make the Province one vast bazaar, and that the traffic of a continent is to centre here. I think the report of the last survey made in 1867 by Mr. Fleming, should be sufficient to dispel any such delusion.

I find that nearly all the lines given by him strike the European and North American railway about 87 miles from St. John, and then he shows that all the freight traffic passing down from Canada will seek the nearest outlet, which will be St. John or St. Andrews. But supposing we take the central route, that route strikes 13 miles west of Moncton, making St. John a nearer port than Halifax by 112 miles. He says on page 90:— "By the projected lines for the Intercolonial Railway, St. Andrews and St. John, on the Bay of Fundy, are the nearest open winter ports to Canada with a British territory, and they would, therefore, be the most available outlets for Canadian produce while other nearer ports remain closed."

St. John must, then, be the outlet for freight, but he says, suppose you build that road, then it is probable that it will be of most advantage to Canada when it is doing the least. It says that the distance from Toronto to New York is 540 miles, while the distance to St. John by Riviere du Loap is 918, and he argues that if Canada is allowed to send produce through the American territory it will seek New York, but he looks at the possibility of America prohibiting such a traffic, and he says, "if you build the Intercolonial Railway the United States Government will see that there is a possibility of the traffic being diverted, and they will grant permission to send produce to New York direct. He says:—

"As the probable through freight traffic depends on so many contingencies, it is impossible to form any proper estimate of its value; but of this we may rest satisfied, if the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, by opening out an independent outlet to the ocean, prove instrumental in keeping down the barriers to Canadian trade which our neighbours have the power to erect, it might in this respect alone be considered of the highest commercial advantage to Canada. It is scarcely likely that the people of the United States would permit any new route to place restrictions on Canadian traffic when they discovered that by so doing they were simply driving away trade from themselves; and in this view the contemplated railway may fairly be considered, especially by the people of that part of Canada west of Montreal, of the greatest value to them when least employed in the transportation of produce to the seaboard."

The European and North American line now under contract, is 25 miles shorter than it will be by the Intercolonial line. He says:— "That it is evident that the passenger traffic of the Intercolonial way, on any of these lines being constructed, be tapped near its roots, and much of it drawn away. Under these circumstances, it is too apparent that the Intercolonial Railway may find in the United States a route for a formidable rival for Canadian passenger traffic, to and from Europe, by way of Halifax. Fortunately, with a view to counteract this difficulty, a line by the Bay Chaleurs would offer special advantages, which may be noticed."

He then goes into an elaborate argument to prove the propriety of sending Shippigan the place of landing for all steamers passing between America and England, thereby taking away all ground of argument regarding the commercial advantages of the Intercolonial road. It may be said that Shippigan being closed for several months of the year, during that period the passenger traffic could land at Halifax; but in the winter months there is little travel to or from Canada, and even the European and North American line, as he shows, will have the advantage. But I do not consider it necessary to weary the House with a discussion of the arguments against the measure, because I believe that we have not the right to change in the manner proposed by this resolution, our constitution. It is not in our commissions. The supporters of the resolution argue on the extent of our powers; but I look more to our right to do so, without first consulting those whom we represent. If I understand Responsible Government, it means that we either have the sanction of the people to carry a measure, or that we shall decide upon questions in such a way as we feel will meet their approval—that we must ever keep in view a going back to the people to have our acts approved or condemned. The charter of our rights is not found in any one despatch from the Colonial Office, but runs through a number, granting one concession after another, all leading to this point, that the people shall be consulted, and to them we are to be responsible for our action here. Earl Grey says to us, 2nd March, 1847:—

"The two contending parties will have to decide their quarrel as present in the Assembly, and with a view to the happiness of the colonies."

Again, on the 31st of the same month:— "The practical end of Responsible Government would be satisfied by the removability of a single public officer, provided that through his public opinion could influence the general administration of affairs."

Under this resolution before us public opinion cannot have its legitimate influence. It is proposed that the action of members is to be passed upon by the people. Neither can it be said that because the question of Union has been for some years agitated, that we were empowered at the last general election to pass it. The resolution of this house in 1847, on which the hon. Prov. Sec'y lays such great stress, speaks of the obstacles to Union

and of the desirability of having "the question set at rest." From the action of the delegates appointed under that resolution it was supposed to be "set at rest" as impracticable, and therefore was not a question before the people at the last General Election, and to pass it now and put it forever beyond their reach would be unconstitutional and unjust. The supporters of this resolution claim Lord Durham as one of the early promoters of a Union of the Colonies. I refer them to his views on this point, as given in his Report to the British Government. He says:— "But the state of the Lower Provinces, though it justifies the proposal of an union, would not, I think, render it graceful or even just on the part of Parliament to carry it into effect without referring it for the ample deliberation and consent of the people of those Colonies."

Strongly as Lord Durham advocated a Legislative Union of these colonies, he tells us it would not be just to adopt it without the approval of the people. But I find that even the politicians of Canada admit that it should be referred to the people, if there be any doubt as to the opinions which they held. Mr. Cameron, in the Canadian Assembly, after approving of the scheme, proposed a reference to the people, arguing that if they gave their approval the Union would be more permanent; he says:—

"If there were any doubt about public feeling there might be propriety in going to the people. But is there any doubt about it? I am not opposing the hon. gentleman's resolution on constitutional grounds, or on not denying the rights of the people; if I had any doubt whatever about what would be the verdict of the people I should be the first to say we ought to go to the people. But it is simply because I am satisfied there would be a sweeping verdict in favor of the measure that I think it unnecessary to take it to the country."

Mr. Brown, whose name has been mentioned in this debate, and on whose abilities the Prov. Secretary has passed such high encomiums, said:— "If we base this structure, as it ought to be based on the expressed will of the people themselves, then I think we will be offering to those who come after us, as well as to ourselves, a heritage that every man should be proud of."

Here is the opinion of one of the first statesmen of British America, that if there be a shadow of doubt as to the opinions of the people, the measure should be submitted to them before being passed. In Canada, perhaps, there was no doubt, but it is very different here. There are few men in this house who do not believe that a large majority of the people are opposed to the measure. The hon. Atty. General, who aids in forcing it through, entertained different opinions in 1861. In a speech delivered here by him on the 5th of March in that year I find him using this language:—

"There is an honorable principle which must pervade and govern men in every position in life, and I would not envy the position of those who, hanging on to the tail of a majority in this house, must feel that in doing so they are betraying the trust reposed in them, and misrepresenting the views of their constituents." Ag- in: "This is a matter connected with the interests of the people, and they should be the sole judges."

Mr. ARCHIBALD.—Read what we said. Mr. McLELLAN continued:—We said at that time that we acted with a view to our accountability to our constituents at the next election, and that we were willing to take the responsibility of having our acts endorsed or not; but the hon. gentleman will see the difference between the two cases.—You are proposing to pass a Resolution upon which no man voting for it will go back to the people for the ratification of his act. The Atty. General says we have no precedent for asking a dissolution on this question. I think it is he who should have precedents before handing over the entire Province to a distant colony without the permission of the people. He says, he saw one in the union of New Zealand. The cases differ, but even there he should have told us that the people are dissatisfied and seeking a repeal of the Union by petitions to the British Parliament. And so it will be here, if you pass this resolution and carry out its intentions without consulting the people. But if you can obtain a majority to favor it, then you may hope for it to be enduring. It is one of the principles inherent in the minds of all claiming British origin to accept and obey the opinions of the majority. I do not believe, however, that a majority can be found to assent to a proposition which would sweep away our constitution and even blot out the name of Nova Scotia from the map of the world.

The hon. member for Richmond, Mr. Miller, in calling for this resolution, told us how proud he is of Nova Scotia. It is not he alone who is proud of her. We are proud of being British subjects, of being British Americans, but not less so, of being called Nova Scotians. That gentleman, however, seeks to blot out this name. Whilst he addressed the House I thought of that anecdote told by Hugh Miller of the codfishing captain on a voyage to Newfoundland, who, on going down to his cabin to consult his chart, and finding it in shreds and tatters, told his men they might as well turn about, for the rats had eaten Newfoundland. I do not mean to say that Nova Scotia will be literally devoured, but the rats are striving to eat out the name from the map of North America. Sir, if this proposition be carried into effect without consulting the people, I anticipate the most serious results. There is in the breast of every man claiming British allegiance a principle—a feeling—implanted by God himself that he should be consulted in all changes affecting his rights and privileges and the constitution under which he lives. In no part of the British Empire is that feeling more strong and irrepressible than in this country, and if the Provincial Secretary carries out his proposition without consulting the people, this principle will rebel against the act. I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that he is tampering with the loyalty and allegiance of the people. He knows our attachment to the mother country is strong, but he must not count too much on it. Let me read to him as a warning an extract from the report of that celebrated Statesman, Lord Durham:—

"Indeed, throughout the whole of the North American Provinces there prevails among the British population an affection for the Mother Country, and a preference for its institutions, which a wise and firm policy, on the part of the Imperial Government, may make the foundation of a safe honorable and enduring connection. But even this feeling may be impaired, and I must warn those in whose hands the disposal of their destinies rests, that a blind reliance on the all-enduring loyalty of our countrymen may be carried too far."

Then he says speaking of the evils of having a colony divided:— "If the British Nation shall be content to retain a barren and injurious Sovereignty, it will tempt the chances of foreign aggression by keeping continually exposed to a powerful and ambitious neighbour a distant dependency, in which an invader would find resistance, but might rather reckon an

active co-operation from a portion of the resident population." The passage of this resolution before us seems a small matter, but it may produce the evils named by Lord Durham. The most trifling causes often produce the most alarming results. The Castle may be strong and bid defiance to the invader, but a rat may undermine its walls. The ship may outstrip many a storm but a small insect may destroy the strength of her timbers, that she will go down at the first blast of the next gale. Our city is healthy and happy, but a single breath drawn by a visitor, to the Cholera ship in the harbor, may bring to us pestilence and death. Taking Walter Scott's beautiful simile, the tree may strike deep its roots and send wide its branches, clothed in luxuriant foliage, but a small worm may destroy its vitality and make of it an unsightly trunk, from which the raven and the vulture shall watch for their prey, or the majestic eagle find a perch.

"I asked the strong oak of the forest, wherefore, its boughs were withered and seared like the horns of the Stag, and it showed me that a small worm had gnawed its roots."

Our forefathers brought to this country the British Acorn; they gave it congenial soil. Their descendants have carefully guarded and tended it, and wherever the sons of Nova Scotia have stood, beside the men of the fatherland in the hour of danger, the world has seen that we too have "hearts of oak," but strong and vigorous as this plant of loyalty may be, the passage of this resolution may touch its vitality. It will not wither in a night; it did not spring up in a day, but its decay will be more rapid than its growth. And when in after years the Nova Scotian is asked wherefore the tree is dead—its branches withered and seared and a resting place for the great American Eagle? he will point to this little resolution, as the worm which gnawed its roots.

I ask the Prov. Sec.—I ask the House to pause, and reflect upon the consequences which every judicious man who understands the people of this Province will see are but too likely to flow from the passage of this resolution. When these consequences are developed, then perhaps the Prov. Sec'y will lament the evil he has brought upon the country. Lord Palmerston speaking of the Emperor of Russia said, "there is no greater calamity can befall a man than to be born to a heritage of triumph and honor." Sir, the Prov. Sec'y had not the "heritage." He sought the "wrong," it remains with this House to say whether the "wrong" shall be "triumphant."

I entreat the House to withhold from him the power to make his wrong triumphant—to prevent the evils which may flow from this confederacy. The Financial Secretary says we prophesy evil. I am no prophet, nor yet am I the son of a prophet, but I may close by repeating the words which the great King of Prophets, Isaiah, tells us God himself commanded him to utter, "Say ye not, a confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say, a confederacy, neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid." Sirs, "Say ye not, a confederacy."

SPEECH OF HON. MR. MCFARLANE. Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE said:—It being the intention to divide this evening on the resolution under discussion, I do not intend at any length to occupy the time and attention of the House, but the question is one of such great importance that I cannot allow the resolution to pass with a silent vote. There is no doubt that of all the momentous questions that have agitated this country, this is, beyond measure, the most important. The step we are about to take, in every probability, will affect for all time to come the destinies of our native Province—will doubtless bring prosperity or adversity, and therefore, demands grave and careful consideration. No one should assent to the measure unless assured that it is calculated to promote our future safety and happiness. There is no doubt that a large majority of the reflecting men throughout British America, as well as in Britain herself, viewing the condition of affairs on this continent, have come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when these valuable provinces can no longer continue in their present disconnected position, and must either form a united confederacy for purposes of defence, or be swallowed up by borders. For many years we have moved on peacefully and prosperously under the fostering care of the Mother Country, until we have outgrown the state of infancy, and reached that condition of maturity, population, and prosperity, which entails upon us increased responsibilities.—There can be no doubt that valuable and important as these North American Provinces are to the Mother Land, from their position to the United States they necessarily are the weakest and least secure of the outlying Colonies of the Empire, and more than all others are calculated to cause fears for their safety. Hence the extreme solicitude of Imperial statesmen and soldiers, as well as politicians, to see them, at the earliest possible moment placed in such a position and so united together as will best ensure their safety, and strengthen their connection with the Crown. It is however all important for us as Legislators, empowered to deal with the interests of the people, to see that the contemplated Union is consummated on terms fair and equitable to all the Colonies proposed to be united, and that the just rights of our own Province should be carefully guarded. The question is important to us both in a political and financial point of view.

But above all others, to those who value the British connection, to those who have a deep interest in the question of armed Fenians threaten an invasion of our land, it assumes increased importance. I believe in the maxim that "Union is strength," and the whole current of entreaty and advice from the Mother Land, whence we must look for protection in our time of need, unmistakably points to a similar conclusion. If we desire to ensure a continuance of that protection, it is evident, that whatever opinions in the matter we may entertain, the parties from whom we expect to receive it, believe that protection can be best provided, and our safety secured by the whole of the Provinces being united under one common head. With the financial features of the case I will not attempt to deal as it has been viewed in all its aspects, by gentlemen who have given to this branch of the subject much care and research. It was fully gone into during the debate of last session, and even under the Quebec scheme, I have been unable to discover where the interests of the provinces are not fairly guarded. I cannot however, say that I was ever a defender of the entire scheme of Union agreed upon. Its basis undoubtedly is sound and the measure was prepared as far as possible to guard the interests of the weaker provinces. But where the independent judgments of a number of gentlemen with different interests to serve, are brought in contact, it is impossible that each can have his own way and there necessarily must be mutual compromises, or nothing could be accomplished. This we are informed was the case in reference to the Quebec scheme, and there being no controlling in-

fluence, the wonder is that so much was done. But under the resolution to which the House is now asked to assent, this will be remedied, and the unfair pressure of any province justly modified. We can place the utmost confidence in the integrity and love of justice which characterises British Statesmen, when the facts are fairly brought before them under the terms of the resolution, which affords the smallest and weakest colony, little Prince Edward Island, the same voice in the advocacy of its claims as will be enjoyed by either of the enormous Canadian provinces. There is no reason to suppose that the interests and wishes of each colony will not be strongly urged and justly dealt with. But it is said Upper Canada, from its rapidly increasing wealth and population after Confederation will use her power and crush the Maritime Provinces. I deny that any such power will be exercised. But even should this be the case, what possible motive could there be for such a course? On the contrary, with a common revenue and common interests, it would clearly be for the benefit of the people of Upper Canada, that the lower provinces should prosper equally with themselves—that their population should increase—their resources be developed, and their manufactures and trade be extended. And the same feeling would be felt towards Canada by the lower provinces. The prosperity and advancement of one would be felt to be to the advantage of all, and the local jealousies which now actuate us would speedily pass away. It is true, our present means of communication with Canada are circuitous and liable to interruption; but with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway which will immediately follow union, this defect will be remedied, and with the rapid and easy communication, and the increased trade that will doubtless spring into existence, we will soon get to know each other—confidence will take the place of distrust, and our people will feel that a larger field is thrown open to their enterprise. It is said the corrupt statesmen of Canada, in their anxiety for union, are animated with selfish motives, and want to get control of our country and revenues to pay their burdensome public debts. This is a device of the enemy got up to frighten our people. Any person who has travelled over that vast country and become acquainted with its great resources and growing trade, cannot fail to be convinced that this is entirely groundless.—The public debt of Canada, in proportion to her population, is little in excess of our own, while her resources and ability to meet it are equally good. But I am satisfied that altho' Canadians are certainly anxious for Union with us, it is not on this selfish ground. They know that, while their country is rapidly increasing in population and wealth, without more intimate connection with the Maritime Provinces and an outlet to the sea at all seasons, they will be continually at the mercy of the people of the United States; who having cautiously put an end to the Reciprocity Treaty, threaten also to terminate the transport of Canadian bonded Goods over their territory and thus worry the people into a desire for Annexation. Should this be the case and the United States be thus increased by the addition of three millions of people, and their great country severed from British rule; could the maritime provinces even with the aid of Britain, for any length of time maintain their connection with the empire? No, Mr. Speaker, let Canada fall under Yankee rule, and we may make up our minds soon to follow. The old flag under which we have hitherto rested in peace and revelled in liberty will depart from our shores, and the Stars and Stripes flaunt in triumph over our Citadel and Forts. But it is agreed by our opponents that this resolution should not be adopted without an appeal to the people being first made—and that the course we are pursuing is unconstitutional. In my opinion the objection is unsound and if the request was assented to it would lead to no practical result. Of the constitutional right of the Representatives of the people in Parliament, to deal with all matters affecting their constituents, there can be no doubt, the principle is admitted by all authorities on constitutional law, and certainly under no circumstances could representatives of the people be returned and this House so untrammelled by pledges, and free to exercise an independent judgment on the question as the gentlemen who now occupy these benches. But we are told that nine tenths of the people are against Union, and that they have proved this to be true from the petitions laid on the table of the House. Now what proofs do they give us that this is true, or that any large number of the people are opposed even to the Quebec Scheme? I have before me a list of every petition presented from every part of this Province during this session up to this time. The only parties that have done anything—which have sent in any respectable number of names—are those to which the hon. member for Richmond was instrumental in sending petitions; namely Inverness, Richmond, and Antigonish. From Inverness we have 1119 petitioners out of 20,000 people; Hants sends 607; Lunenburg, 502; Digby, 584; Antigonish, 1930; King's 448; Guysboro, 367; Victoria, 531; North Colchester, 126; Shelburne, 250; East Halifax, 205; Cumberland, 173; Richmond, 638. Making a total of 8900. Digby, Cape Breton, and Yarmouth do not appear to have sent in a single petition. Are not these facts proof that there is no such feeling of excitement against the scheme as has been represented? Is that evidence that the people of Nova Scotia are working to exhibit their indignation against any person who deals with this scheme? I believe that the people of this Province having considered this matter, have made up their minds that the event is inevitable, and that they are content to trust their rights and liberties to the gentlemen who are within these walls. They are satisfied that tied up with the people as we are all of us—that whatever we possess being bound up in the prosperity of the country—we are not likely to jeopardize the public interests. Under these circumstances I feel that we are safe in passing the resolution before us, and that on its adoption largely depends the safety of the people of this country. It is for us to consider if the Confederation of these Provinces will increase their strength and power, it is not our duty as well as interest, to yield to the advice of the British Government and pass this measure. I believe that such will be the results of Union, and I am therefore ready for one to support the resolution, believing that in doing so we are tending to perpetuate British rule, and British liberty through the length and breadth of British North America.

Mr. TOWNSEND—I wish simply to observe that the people have not petitioned because they feel that the petitions are not regarded.

SPEECH OF MR. TORIN. Mr. TORIN said:—I feel that I cannot allow this question to be decided without at least offering a few observations on the resolution before the House. I have waited until the last hour to address the House on the subject, feeling that every opportunity should be given to my constituents, as they are in this immediate neighborhood, if they wished to raise their voices against the Confederation of these

Provinces of British North America. I have waited, and now find that no united action has been taken by my constituents in the Western Division of the county of Halifax, against this scheme, although they have had abundant time to do so. It is hardly necessary for me to allude to their sentiments, since the hon. member who has last spoken has shown that the Western Division of Halifax has not sent in a single petition against the Confederation of these Colonies (Cheers.) Before I came into this Legislature—before I had any idea of political life, I was in favour of a Union of British North America. I was in favour of it because I thought it would give a higher standard to the people—that it would give them an elevation of sentiment and thought, and a respectability of position that they cannot expect to have in their present isolated position. Therefore it has been from my first inception of public life that I have earnestly and zealously advocated the object which the public men of this day have in view—a Union of British North America. When I looked at the state of feeling in this House last session, I was of opinion that there were hardly half a dozen of men belonging to the party with which I was connected, that were ready to come up to the mark and vote for a Union of the Provinces. To my utter surprise, on the meeting of this House, I found that an entire change had taken place in the opinions and feelings of gentlemen, and I of course could not otherwise than suppose that they are influenced by the knowledge they have gained of the views of their constituents during the recess of Parliament. I have in my conversations with members of this House stated over and over again that I was not in favour of a Union of these Provinces without the consent of the people. I feel that with their consent a Union might be consummated that would be highly beneficial, and be regarded with esteem and respect.

I have offered my opinions so often on this subject, that if the question was not to be taken to-night, I would not raise my voice, for I am utterly unable to address the House at length, labouring as I have been for some days under indisposition. Now I find that the discussion of his question in the Canadian Parliament, in 1855, occupied from the 3rd Jan. to the 26th March. The House discussed the question as in Committee, and everybody had an ample opportunity of expressing his views. The subject, however, has been so often discussed in this Legislature—at public meetings, and in the Press, that it is an old question here, whilst it is a comparatively new one in Canada. Therefore, it is not at all necessary that a great deal of time should be occupied with the discussion of this question.

If we regard the condition of these Provinces we must at once see that the time has come when a change must take place in their present condition. They have, to some extent, outgrown their present Colonial condition—their state of pupillage; and, therefore, we believe the time has come when they want to be united for greater security—for mutual protection. I believe that the people of this Colony do wish to continue the connection with Great Britain, and if Union is an indispensable condition to the perpetuity of that connection, as we are told by the British Government and statesmen, we should not hesitate to adopt it. Great Britain has turned her attention towards the condition of these Colonies; she has looked at them with a parental regard, and offered them her advice; and it is only our duty that we accept that advice in the same spirit in which it is offered.

In view of the importance of this question, it is necessary that we should all approach its discussion with that gravity and respect that is due from us as the representatives of the people. In the commencement of the debate I raised my voice against anything like a display of personal feeling and party prejudices—that we should deal with the question in a becoming spirit, and entire regard to the interests of the people who have entrusted their affairs to our care.

I do not intend to refer to the speeches which have been made on this question, but there is one part of the address of the hon. member for Yarmouth that I cannot allow to pass without a comment. He pointed to the map and showed the difference of latitude and longitude between Nova Scotia, Montreal, Toronto, and other parts of Upper Canada, for the purpose of showing that the characteristics of the country were unfavorable for union. I confess the confederacy will not present that compact appearance which the United States present, but when you look at the difference of longitude between Maine and California, you need not think of the difference between Halifax and Toronto. You do not hear of California being disconnected with the Union, separated as she is by natural barriers from the rest of her sister States. She is a flourishing member of the Union. Railroads and telegraphs have brought communities together heretofore at distances which precluded the possibility of feeling. It will therefore be seen that the argument of the hon. member does not amount to a great deal after all. When we look back at the position which this question has occupied for a great many years, we find that all of the leading minds of this province have advocated Union; but it was not until 1863 that Canada was willing to listen to propositions from the Maritime Provinces. Circumstances have changed in the Province of Canada, and as an evidence of the feelings of the people I need only refer to the fact, that after the Quebec scheme was matured, no less than 60 constituencies were appealed to, and only four opposed to it, and only one was returned in opposition. Here you have an evidence of the popularity of the scheme of Confederation in Canada. The result of the elections in New Brunswick has been different, but now we find that a great change is rapidly taking place in the sentiments of the people of that Province. In Newfoundland the question has assumed a most satisfactory aspect; although occupying an isolated position, the legislature has shown a most favorable disposition to enter the union with Nova Scotia and the other provinces give their assent to the measure. As respects Prince Edward Island I am not able just now to say anything definite, but no doubt she will also fall in in good time. It has been said by the Provincial Secretary that a Union was impracticable whilst New Brunswick occupied a position of uncompromising hostility to the scheme, but the feeling of that Colony, as I have just stated, is undergoing a constant change, and it is therefore right that we should be prepared to embrace the first opportunity of dealing with the question. As respects the Quebec resolutions, I have examined them myself. They were submitted to the Imperial Government, and Mr. Cardwell only takes exception to two of the resolutions—with respect to the constitution of the Legislative Council, and the pardoning power granted to the Lieutenant Governor. After having been examined by the statesmen and press of England, as well as of North America, and approved by such eminent authorities on both continents, I think these resolutions must be entitled to much respect; and therefore I cannot

go to the... point of... Union... practice... by Low... they h... fore I... gentlem... we cau... thought... of time... to red... side G... Mr. T... taining... could... on acc... and set... In a... Secret... tion of... a close... far adv... return... nary br... Mr. I... should... House... ready... peculi... House... Some... with... gues... gells, I... the ful... made... justify... affairs... that w... charged... was at... last r... should... be pre... be sa... who h... speak... the in... lege, s... that h... what... Mr. C... ing th... and t... conne... fully... those... the o... with... been... to be... Ho... to p... speak... this e... Ho... mem... durs... we v... prop... this... H... obli... been... Hon... them... are a... M... shon... H... of t... made... leys... oppo... of it... thin... leng... gup... M... affra... latur... con... well... The... tion... a pr... the... stat... adjo... far... deb... wou... mo... for... to... ed... I... tou... jour... ally... me... the... fea... for... vie... Le... sh... the... to... G... so... as... str... gi... en... etc.

go to the... point of... Union... practice... by Low... they h... fore I... gentlem... we cau... thought... of time... to red... side G... Mr. T... taining... could... on acc... and set... In a... Secret... tion of... a close... far adv... return... nary br... Mr. I... should... House... ready... peculi... House... Some... with... gues... gells, I... the ful... made... justify... affairs... that w... charged... was at... last r... should... be pre... be sa... who h... speak... the in... lege, s... that h... what... Mr. C... ing th... and t... conne... fully... those... the o... with... been... to be... Ho... to p... speak... this e... Ho... mem... durs... we v... prop... this... H... obli... been... Hon... them... are a... M... shon... H... of t... made... leys... oppo... of it... thin... leng... gup... M... affra... latur... con... well... The... tion... a pr... the... stat... adjo... far... deb... wou... mo... for... to... ed... I... tou... jour... ally... me... the... fea... for... vie... Le... sh... the... to... G... so... as... str... gi... en... etc.