

ment of delegates to see if a better scheme than the Quebec scheme could be devised, I felt it my duty to oppose them, not because I was averse to the principle of union—for it is not merely since I occupied a seat here that I felt the conviction that we could not long occupy our present position—but because of these two reasons: first, I did not know what kind of a bargain the delegates might make when they went thousands of miles away, and I thought it wrong that we should not have the opportunity of saying whether we approved of their arrangements or not; and second, because I knew that a great many of the people were opposed to union. From causes that cannot very well be explained, the people are afraid of change. The first reason for my opposition has now been done away; and, as far as I am able to judge, I am disposed to think that the bargain which the delegates have made is a great deal better than the Quebec scheme, though even that I was not afraid of. I had intended last year to go further than I did; I intended not only to have opposed the resolution but to have supported the amendment, but before the discussion was over I discovered something I did not like—I discovered among some gentlemen a strong desire for annexation to the United States. I was brought up in loyal principles, and taught to cherish British institutions, and while I wished to give our people time for consideration, I could not and never will consent to make a change from the English flag to a flag which I never wish to wave over my head or the heads of my children. And now, although continued opposition might be consistent, I consider the question has come to be in that state in which further opposition would not only be useless, but dangerous. We are all proud of the eloquence and abilities of Mr. Howe, and when he went to England I waited with great anxiety to see if he was going to give us something which we would consider better than the scheme of Confederation; but when I found him propounding a scheme which was long ago condemned by himself as impracticable, I began to think if he had nothing better to propound, there was nothing better to be expected than the scheme which had been before us. If the Quebec scheme would bring taxation to the value of one cent, Mr. Howe's would bring taxation to hundreds of times that amount.

Another matter which operated strongly on my mind was the fact that our American neighbors opposed Confederation. Is that on account of their love for us? No, but because they do not want to see the British power grow up alongside of them. If then I have been sincerely and honestly opposed to the measure hitherto, after viewing these facts and finding that the British Parliament and people, and our honoured Sovereign herself have given their approval of it, I feel that I should be no longer so. I will not deny that among the people opposition still exists, but while no man attaches more value to the wishes of the people, or is more willing to defer to their wishes, I am constrained to take the responsibility of doing what I believe to be right whether I gain popularity by the act or not. I am convinced

the day is not far distant when the people will acknowledge that I have done the best thing for them, and surely they cannot think that I would do more for them than for myself and children—I will take my chance under the new system, and I have as much at stake as many who are less willing. I regretted to hear an hon. gentleman state that if the measure passed he would still do all in his power to oppose it.—I cannot agree in that, and if the bill passes, as I believe it will, I will use my humble endeavors to make it a blessing to our people and to the great Empire to which we belong.

Remarks of Dr. Brown.

DR. BROWN said that he was sorry to hear the hon. Provincial Secretary bear so hard on Mr. Howe in his absence. He was not Mr. Howe's apologist. He had not approved of many of that gentleman's acts when at the head of public affairs, but he entirely concurred in the object of the mission in which he was now engaged on the part of the people of Nova Scotia. He thought that it would have been more manly and generous in the leader of the government if he had waited for an opportunity of conducting the discussions face to face. As to the question before the House, at that hour of the night he had but few words to say. He did not care whether the course pursued by the Government was constitutional or not—he would not enter into the legality of the case; the only question was, was it right, was it just, was it expedient to pass a measure so vitally affecting the rights of the people, as it were by stealth and without their consent? It could not be argued that an appeal to the people would be inconvenient, because an election must necessarily take place in a few weeks, or months at the furthest. He had heard much talk about loyalty. He thought that loyalty like charity began at home. He thought if the British people and Government passed this bill, compelling our people into a union highly distasteful to a large majority, they might be justly accused of disloyalty towards us. The best loyalty was to take care of ourselves, and if Great Britain was weary of the connection, we must only look elsewhere for friends and allies. It was clear that free trade with the United States was the greatest boon we could now enjoy. The trade with Canada could never be large, and we could encourage it as well without union as with it. But free trade with our republican neighbors would be our salvation, in a commercial sense. He hoped the Government would pause before they passed an act so arbitrary and so unjust to the people.

Speech of Mr. C. J. Campbell.

MR. C. J. CAMPBELL—I did not intend to say much on this question, but the hon member for Inverness has made an observation which I must contradict. He says that the people of Cape Breton are proud of their connection with Nova Scotia, and that the only man opposed to the union has passed away. I think I am as fully acquainted with the feelings of that people as he is, and I therefore feel justified in contradicting the impression which his remarks would leave. The case of Cape Breton is not at all parallel with the case now before us,—the union was effected without the consent of the people, and indeed without their knowledge.