

to be accomplished in another hundred years on this continent? It is true that it may be said, what is all that to us? Individually, it is nothing to us, but those who come after us will discover that we have had regard to the future. What has taken place in this Province within our own recollection? Have we not seen the place once a desert blossoming as the rose? But if we had a railway, with its vast serpentine train coming in daily groaning with the products of other countries,—Halifax the town of embarkation on one side, and of debarkation on the other,—we should soon see it the very Liverpool of America! We should soon see our country teeming with travel and with riches. It is not known, and you cannot make it known by all the speeches, or maps, or descriptions that can be published. The only way to know a country is to travel through it.

I am not surprised that there are men living in Nova Scotia who have not been able to grasp this grand idea. Short though this resolution be, it touches matters of vast importance. There are those who do not view this question as I view it, but I have yet to find the man who is prepared to maintain that these Provinces must remain in the condition in which they now are, in all time coming. It is an admitted fact,—the bitterest opponents of the Quebec Scheme confess it,—that these Provinces "cannot long remain in their present position." If so, is it not then high time that we should take into consideration the best means of uniting them?

I, and others who framed the Quebec Scheme have been rudely assailed. We have been told that we sold our country to Canada. Much of that sort of abuse and rhodomontade has been hurled at our heads. Sir, there never were men who wrought harder or more faithfully, and did their duty more manfully than the gentlemen who represented these Maritime Provinces at the Quebec conference. The scheme framed there was, as the Solicitor General has said, based upon compromises. On every point we pressed our claims as far as reasonable men could press them, asking all they could reasonably give. We at last arrived at certain conclusions as the best which we could obtain, each for his own Province. When we returned we were told that we had not asked enough, and that view naturally found favor with a certain portion of the people of this country; but where is the individual who has pointed out to us the point in which we did not succeed, in which we ought to have succeeded? We did obtain some concessions in favor of the Maritime Provinces, but there were others which we sought but could not obtain. Now, how has the scheme been regarded in this Province? Some opposed it,—some of my own political friends did so. Many of our friends allowed their feelings to be warped by other influences. I was sent to the Delegation as a member of the Opposition, and discharged my duties in that capacity. I said then, and I say now, that, if the question of Confederation had not then come up, the party with which I have been associated, if not now in the possession of political power, we might and probably would soon have been so. I then felt as I feel now that never were men called on to make larger concessions than myself and my colleague. That feeling was not confined to ourselves, for I know that many of our friends have had their faces averted from us ever since, not because they did not think that we had done our best, but because they believed that if we had opposed the scheme, our party would now have been in power. While I felt all this, and weighed it in my mind, I felt also that as a public man I could not be made the instrument of defeating a scheme which I had previously advocated for the paltry consideration of obtaining political power. The learned Solicitor General smiles,—probably he has a different opinion. I ask, Would it have been worthy of us to defeat the scheme for such a reason and for such a purpose?

What I complain of, and what I have a right to complain of is, that some of our political friends have not sustained us as they should have done. If the Liberal party wished to obtain power, they should have done as the Liberals did in New Brunswick and Canada,—not allowed this subject of Confederation to become a party question at all. While the Government party in this Province have an advantage from the position of the question at present; if it becomes law, it only requires that the men of Liberal principles should unite in the larger area and on the larger platform, I will not say to take possession of the Government to be formed,—but to make

themselves a respectable party. The elements of party still exist, and they will eventually be brought into collision, as they ought to be in every free country. I feel, sir, and know that the Governments to be formed under the larger scheme will be like the Governments in the different Provinces,—that the men who take possession of power and place have difficulties to meet which soon displace them, and make room for their opponents. Had the Liberals in this Province taken the same course on this question as they did in the other Provinces, it might have saved a good deal of heart burning, and it is the want of this action which has created a difficulty in the Liberals ranks of Nova Scotia, which does not exist in Canada, New Brunswick or Newfoundland. Who stood at the head of the Confederation movement in New Brunswick? Mr. Tilley. The men opposed to his Government did, as we did by this Government,—sustained him in his Confederation policy, as we tried to sustain our Government,—but because Mr. Archibald and myself have sustained the Quebec scheme, a party has been organized in Nova Scotia to strike us down, if possible. To-day, while I am addressing you, sir, the friends of Confederation in New Brunswick, are reaping the rewards of their toils, and are being restored to their proper position, and wresting the Government from their opponents. We should look at this question not as party men. The organ of the Liberal party in this country has been made to stultify itself on this question, and a portion of the Liberal press has turned about with a foggyism that has rendered it contemptible. I call past history, sir, to bear testimony to the truth of this assertion. I feel, sir, that we, and those who have stood by us in this matter, occupy at this hour a proud position,—that at last the day is dawning, and the light is coming over the Eastern hills to cheer us. There are more for us than against us. Great Britain is with us,—Her Majesty's Government is with us,—Her Majesty's ministers in all the public departments are with us. Why are they with us? Do they look at the men? No, sir, they look at the question and the principles involved. What signified it to Lord Palmerston, or Earl Russell, whether this or that Government was in power? Do not we all know that one set of politicians was in power in New Brunswick, and another of different principles in Nova Scotia? How could it then be said to Mr. Cardwell that he had adopted the views of this party or that? No. He took the view entertained by the great majority of all parties. Is there any other question on which we ever were all united? How did it happen, I ask? Because we felt that great concessions was required to cement the Provinces together, and to make them one.

I have heard it said that England wanted to throw off these colonies. I give it a flat denial. Never since the days of Lord North,—never was there a time, when England so highly esteemed her colonies as the present. The leaders of the Government and the Opposition alike in England as well, are united on this question of Confederation. I have it from the highest authority that it is as much the desire of the leader of the Opposition—of Lord Derby himself, as it is of the Government that these Provinces should be confederated. When the delegates from the New Brunswick Government went to England last year, Lord Derby was one of the men who told them that they had come upon a mistaken errand. What do we see now in New Brunswick? At the last election when those who were in favor of Confederation went to the polls they were scattered to the winds, but look at the re-action already. Last session there were 31 members in favor of the Government and opposed to Confederation, and only 9 or 10 Confederationists. What have we seen within the last month? The House has been in Session from the 8th of March to the 10th of April, and has not yet been able to answer the Governor's speech, and as a consequence the government has either resigned, or is in the act of resignation.

I may be told that this question of Confederation should be sent to the people at the polls. If that was a constitutional necessity I would be in favor of it. Do we find that that was done in Canada? Nothing of the kind. It has been tried in New Brunswick. The people in England have once and again changed their Constitution as far as Confederation will change ours, and purpose to do so again, without going to the polls. I am sometimes amused at the horror which some people express of changing the Constitution without an appeal to the people at the hustings. What did we do in 1861, when we struck down full one third of the electors of Nova Scotia?

It is not three years since some of these same people consented to change the Constitution of Nova Scotia—radically change it, and yet these same people now hold up their hands in horror at the present proposed change.

I feel, sir, that this is an important question, and one which we ought to approach with the greatest deliberation. It is a matter for weal or for woe of great magnitude, and there is no party aspect about it.

It has been said that the delegates from Nova Scotia had such prizes offered to them in Canada that their minds were carried away in favor of this Confederation. I give that statement the most unqualified denial. Never was I approached in the most distant manner with any offers in regard to the future. Sir, if this question does not commend itself on its own inherent merits, let it fall; but let those who take the responsibility of attempting to defeat the measure gravely consider what that responsibility is. At this very moment armed ruffians are invading and marauding our sister Colony. I have reason to believe from information received within the last 24 hours that marauding bands have by this time landed in New Brunswick. If there are parties in this country who, merely because they differ on a constitutional question like this, will ally themselves with their enemies, let them enjoy their opinions. I know that there is no power that can be organized that can successfully invade our shores unless sustained from within. I believe too highly in the intelligence and loyalty of the people of Nova Scotia to think that such men can succeed. This, however, is the condition of the question with which we are invited to deal. A voice comes to us across the water telling us that if we expect to remain a portion of the Empire we must unite. In that aspect of the case, taught as I have been to believe that the Constitution of a country must be adapted to its condition,—and it is one of the inherent features of the British Constitution that it is elastic,—let us give it our best consideration. Let it not be said that every member of this House has not done so. In more exciting times than this I have been willing to bow to the decision of the majority, and the decision of the majority now will bind us all.

There was a time in the history of this country when men threatened to leave it, because they said that they considered other parties were laying unholy hands on the Constitution. These fears were groundless,—just as groundless as those now entertained in reference to this question. It will be on this question as it has been with regard to the question of Reciprocity. I had the honor of a seat here, as you had, sir, when that measure was introduced. We were told then that our shores would be invaded,—that ruthless invaders would stalk over our coasts and that we should be driven into the wilderness. Those predictions have turned out to be as baseless as those will be which are now sounded in our ears on the subject of Confederation.

HON. MR. WHITMAN.—I will not occupy much time at this late hour of the evening, particularly as the gentleman who has just sat down has thrown out the idea that every one who opposed his views of the question must be unpatriotic,—that all the patriotism in Nova Scotia is concentrated in himself and those who think as he does on the subject. I do not, however, like his shirking behind the scenes and evading the real responsibility. Let me read the resolution of 1864, appointing Delegates to negotiate a Union of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman then read as follows:

"Resolved, That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, requesting him to appoint Delegates (not to exceed five) to confer with Delegates who may be appointed by the Governments of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, for the purpose of considering the subject of the union of the three Provinces under one Government and Legislature; such union to take effect when confirmed by the Legislative enactments of the various Provinces interested, and approved by Her Majesty the Queen."

Here is the origin of the trouble now brought on Nova Scotia. The gentlemen appointed on that delegation allowed themselves to be led away by Canada. It was never supposed to amount to a great deal, but it constituted one of those pleasure trips called delegations. The delegates were sent to Prince Edward Island to negotiate a union of the Maritime Provinces, and there they were seduced from their allegiance by Canadian statesmen. They obtained an appointment of some kind, from somebody, and now they are trying to excuse what they have done by saying

that they were urged on by Englishmen. These delegates—I cannot tell whether there were four or five of them, for sometimes I find only four names,—should not shirk behind British statesmen in seeking to deprive us of our Constitution.

The hon. and learned gentleman (Hon. Mr. McCully) intimated that all the patriotism and all the virtue was confined to those who sided with him. It was, in fact, the old story of "me and my wife, and my son John and his wife." Everybody that did not sing the song that he did was entirely wrong. Those that agree with him on this question are virtuous, pure and good; while those who do not agree with him are just the contrary.

The hon. and learned gentleman also told us that this was no party question, and he tried to make some capital of that. Every man knows that it is not a party question. Archibald and McCully are names as distasteful to me on this question as Tupper and Ritchie. I mean no disrespect by mentioning the names of these gentlemen in this way, but on this question, which I believe to be the question of questions, the one set are as unpopular as the other. I hold, just as strongly as the honorable gentleman holds the contrary view, that all the intelligence and integrity are not confined to those who side with him. I believe that there are as intelligent men cultivating the soil as he is, although they may not have been brought up to make black appear white, and white no colour at all. There are such men among the potatoe hills in Kings, and they are strongly opposed to Confederation; notwithstanding that three or four lawyers and a doctor went off on an unauthorised mission.—I mean unauthorised by Nova Scotia,—and helped to concoct a scheme, the responsibility of which they now seek to shirk.

I have seen nothing to induce me to believe that the British Government wish to withdraw from us the Constitution they bestowed on us some years since. When hardbills were posted throughout England stating that Nova Scotia was all but unanimous on this question of Confederation, and when immediately after that four Canadian Ministers appeared at the Colonial Office, it was quite natural that the Colonial Secretary should write the despatches urging Confederation upon us. England never asked us to transfer our revenues to a place some eight or ten hundred miles away. She never asked us to unite with any other country and to throw away our surplus revenue.

I find that on the 17th of June, 1865, the Colonial Secretary wrote to the Governor General of Canada as follows:

"Downing Street, 17th June, 1865.

"MY LORD,
"I have the honor to inform your Lordship that several conferences have been held between the four Canadian ministers who were deputed, under the Minute of your Executive Council of March 24, to proceed to England to confer with Her Majesty's Government, on the part of Canada, and the Duke of Somerset, the Earl DeGrey, Mr. Gladstone, and myself, on the part of Her Majesty's Government."

Now it appears from this that they were four Canadian ministers who waited upon the Colonial Secretary. No doubt they were gentlemen well qualified to advocate the cause of Confederation, but there was not a Nova Scotian, a New-Brunswicker, or a Newfoundlander among them. The Colonial Secretary goes on to say:—

"On the first subject referred to in the Minute, that of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, we repeated on the part of the Cabinet the assurances which had already been given of the determination of Her Majesty's Government to use every proper means of influence to carry into effect without delay the proposed Confederation."

The gentleman who has just sat down himself admitted that in Nova Scotia, under its present Constitution, places which were formerly a desert now blossom as the rose. There is as much peace, happiness, and order in Nova Scotia as in any country in the world. Nova Scotia does not rate second to any little spot on this earth for peaceable and order-loving inhabitants. There is as much happiness in little Nova Scotia as in big Canada. I admit the greatness and beauty of Canada, as far as I have been able to see them, and she is worthy of being considered by us as our great and respected sister; but I do not think that we should throw away or risk our happiness by casting in our lot with her. It is not our fault that Nova Scotia is so small,—we are just where Britain set our bounds.

I admit that there is a little force, and but a little, in one of the arguments of the hon. and learned gentleman. I admit that some clever men in the country, when they wanted an extra chance to make a flowery speech, selected this subject, and