

interests of the country, who would be. Taking the first view of the question which I took—that annexation to the United States will follow annexation to Canada, it will be seen that we are doing a positive injury to Great Britain by considering, because the moment she loses her Colonies England must become a second or third rate power. It will be recollected that the celebrated “Junius” said in one of his letters, “The feathers which adorn the royal bird support its flight;” strip it of its plumage and you fix it to the earth.” The moment you take away the Colonies from Great Britain the feathers which support her flight are taken away, and she ceases to be a first rate power. As loyal men, we should stand by our country in this emergency. It is not certain that New Brunswick will fall in with the scheme. A telegram informs us that a majority of the Assembly will move for the recall of the Governor and that will postpone Confederation for some time. It seems to me that the Government are too hot and too hasty in this matter. Give us time to consider the question. I do not ask them to dissolve and go to the country, but I think we should have the chances of one year more to see if the people will be indoctrinated into favouring the measure, not that I expect them to willingly favor such a union, for I want not, we are prosperous and happy as we are. I ask the House not to agree to the proposed delegation, for we very well know that the delegates will come back with the Quebec scheme. Mr. Cardwell having taken a decided stand in its favor. I, therefore, call upon the government to lay their hands and to give the country time to consider what is the best course to pursue. But if this new scheme to send a delegation to England to settle terms of union there, should be carried in this House, I would demand as a right of the people of this Province, that after terms being agreed upon by the British Government and the delegates, that it should be referred back to this people for their sanction. If any other course be pursued, you trifle with the liberties and privileges of a free people in bartering them away without giving them a voice in the matter, and the consequences, be what they may, will rest upon the men who have so acted.

#### SPEECH OF MR. BLANCHARD.

MR. BLANCHARD said:—The hon. member who has just sat down has very forcibly expressed the opinion that this is one of the greatest questions ever presented for our consideration; and I feel that I approach it under no ordinary responsibilities, and with the conviction that I am dealing with the great interests of the Province of Nova Scotia. We have been told by that hon. gentleman that in favor of Confederation are arrayed the chief legal talent and nearly all the trained politicians of the country. I consider this a strong argument in favor of Confederation that the trained politicians of all the Provinces—the men who are accustomed to look at great questions and to judge of them, have deliberately made up their minds that the scheme of Union is favorable to the interests of the Province and to our connection with the British Crown. Let us look at any of the deliberative assemblies, and will we not find that when the leading men

adopt any particular view of a question, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand they are right. I might refer to a great variety of instances in support of this position. In the history of Pitt it is seen that in some cases Fox, Burke, and Sheridan, his greatest adversaries, were found coinciding with him, and history proves that in all such cases they were right. I do not think the hon. member did justice to himself in saying that the trained politicians were all on one side, for his speech showed an amount of eloquence and research seldom exhibited on such occasions. That we have nine lawyers upon this side of the question is true; but I claim that we occupy the right position, and one which many of the lay members of the house will willingly endorse.—The hon. member for Shelburne also told us that he represented a people truly loyal, the descendants of those who sacrificed much for their principles and for their attachment to the mother country. Sir, I yield to no man in the loyalty of myself or of my constituents. I too am a descendant of a loyalist who sacrificed as much for his loyalty as any of the men who came to Shelburne at that time; nineteen-twentieths of those whom I represent are Scotchmen, and what race have done and suffered so much for their country, and where do you find patriotism if not among them? It has been said that there are influences at work in reference to this question. Sir they have no effect upon me. My friend can say nothing to me upon that score. My position has all along been different from that of those who actively opposed the measure and who, I presume, are prepared to give good reasons for their change of mind. I feel that I am not called on, nor would it be advisable that I should go into a discussion of the merits of the scheme recently submitted to the country or of its details. That theme has been exhausted, and there will be little effort on my part to crush down the opposition to confederation. I do not therefore intend to discuss the details of the question, but to explain the position which I occupy, which is very different from that of many gentlemen around me. I have felt that the question should be approached with great care. I have felt it my duty as a representative of the people seriously to weigh it before coming to a conclusion, and no man can say that, up to this time, I am bound by any pledges or promises to take any particular position. We have heard about “traitors” and “treachery,” and “Canadian gold;” I feel it is hardly worth while for me to contradict the statements upon these subjects as far as I am concerned. I have not come from a school of traitors, and the reproach cannot fall upon me. I regret that I am called upon in connection with this subject, to differ from some of my friends, and I regret that personal recriminations, private conversations, have been introduced into this discussion. This is a matter which ought to be discussed calmly, and without temper. We live in an age in which progress is not to be measured as it once was, it is exceedingly rapid at the present day, and men live more in one year now than they formerly lived in twenty. Changes are rapidly approaching, and it is now our duty to look them fairly in the face, and to honestly to consider the probable future. The question before the house