

tion passed in the House under a former Government, or from any despatch emanating from the late Government, of which I was a member, that commits me to Union with Canada. I might refer to these papers, but I shall content myself at present with challenging the hon. member to show that there was a member on either side of the House who was committed to any particular scheme of Union, Legislative or Federal, by the resolution to which he referred. What was the object of the resolution at that time? It proposed a delegation should be held with representatives of the several provinces to consider the question, with a view of its being set at rest. It was considered, but so little noticed was it by the delegates at Quebec that a record was not even kept of the proceedings relative thereto. It was set at rest—no one being bound by any resolution.

The hon. gentleman has carried us to New Brunswick and talked of the change of sentiment in that colony. I have to learn that the people of that province are in favour of Confederation—or that they are prepared to unite on any terms with Canada. I believe that they are not. My view of the position is this—that the Government being composed of antagonistic elements does not unite the confidence of the people; but as respects the Quebec scheme the people, I believe, are as much opposed to it as ever before. But let us pass from New Brunswick to our own Province, and what do we see. What have we had in this country since the question came up. We have had three elections. Has any one of them decided in favour of Confederation? Of the Quebec or any other scheme? I see before me the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Ray) who occupies the seat filled by the late leader of the Government; was he returned to go for the scheme? Nay, was he not elected to oppose it? Again, there is my friend Mr. Hebb, from Lunenburg; who, in spite of the Provincial Secretary's exertions, was returned by a two-third majority against Confederation. Again: in the county of Yarmouth the government could not get a man to run for them—the feeling there is almost unanimous against Confederation. Every constituency that has been opened since the Quebec scheme was propounded, has decided against it, and with the full knowledge that nine tenths of the electors of this Province are opposed to Union, we are invited to change the constitution of the country without an appeal to the people. I am willing to assume that we may be compelled by circumstances to accept some scheme of union, and my object in such an event is not to thwart any reasonable wishes that Her Majesty's Government may have on the subject, but to point out the best mode of arriving at a result that will be less objectionable to the people of the Province than the Quebec scheme. But this is not the time; the question is not sufficiently understood, and the people are not prepared for its acceptance.

The hon. member has referred to the Intercolonial Railway. I have under my hand the speeches made by the Canadian ministers last

year in discussing this question. Do we not all know that whilst Nova Scotia and New Brunswick desired the Intercolonial Railway, and were ready to fulfil their part of the obligation, the Canadians on two occasions shipwrecked the great scheme. These gentlemen would now give us an Intercolonial Railway, provided that they can couple it with Confederation? Does it follow that a union of the Provinces is necessary before the Railway can be built? We know it is not.

We know that the sense of the people is against all union with Canada. We all know the character of the public men that have been dominant in that country for very many years. We know that the money of the country has been corruptly squandered by hundreds of thousands—that they have proved themselves unworthy of all confidence by their action in respect to the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentlemen talk about traitors, but let me turn your attention to the character of some of his Canadian friends, members of the government in that province. We find one of the leading spirits an expatriated rebel; another, the Attorney General, had been found in rebellion with arms in his hands; the Minister of Finance was at one time openly charged with Annexation proclivities; and another gentleman is said to be looking towards Washington. And these are the loyal men who are to govern this country in the event of Confederation! With the representation this Province will have, with the tremendous influence that the Canadians will exercise—I would just as soon go into the British Parliament with only two Representatives. There the people of Nova Scotia might expect to obtain some justice, for their representatives would be speaking to a body of noble men, animated by a high sense of honor and justice; while at Ottawa you would be speaking to corrupt men, some of whose arms have, it is said been plunged up to their elbows in the public chest.

The hon. member said that both sides of this house were represented at the Quebec Convention. I think differently. The Liberal and Conservative sides were represented, but not the two great parties which on this great question divide the people of this country. My desire is, in the event of a new Convention, not to see this house represented as to its political proclivities, but in respect to the position of the question of Confederation in this province. Will the 'ablest statesmen' of British North America say that this question is not now better understood than when they met at Quebec? Will they say that their ability is so great that they were able in the midst of exhaustive festivities, to have a perfect constitution for these Provinces? They might give themselves that credit, but the people of this country do not. This question should not be dealt with hastily. There is no necessity why his scheme should be forced upon the people; if it is to come, let it come quietly; let the public mind be educated up to it; but if you do not wish to make this country