

noon; and, in reference to defence, the Legislatures of the several Provinces could pass laws similar to each other's, under which the militia of each might be called out at any time, without a political Union. We are told of one heart, and one soul, and one mind, in respect to the defence of the Provinces. Now I hold that the British Government, as long as this Province remains a dependency, is the party to be charged with our defences; and I would draw out of our treasury a sum of money to be given by each Province every year, under an Imperial act, if you please, with the consent of our own Legislature, notwithstanding the strong language which the hon. Provincial Secretary made use of in respect to this matter on a previous evening. I would hand over this question of defence to the Imperial Government who possess the material of war, combined with the skill and science required in naval and military operations. Now you grant considerable sums for the militia, but how are they expended? Do they do a large amount of good? Would not any money you would give be expended much more satisfactorily by officers under the control of the Imperial authorities? Let each Province contribute liberally, according to its ability—and, so far, I have yet to learn that there has been any complaint made in regard to the sum of money contributed by this Province towards its militia and defences.

REPLY TO PROVINCIAL SECRETARY.

The hon. Provincial Secretary defended his action in reference to the Union question on the ground of the opinions held in this House, and elaborated from time to time by Mr. Howe, Mr. Young and Mr. Johnston, and also by a lecture delivered at Temperance Hall by Mr. McGee, which was most enthusiastically received, and on the conclusion of which a vote of thanks was moved by two of the gentlemen I have just named, to the lecturer. I would remind the Provincial Secretary that no action was ever taken practically upon this question. We have been told that a resolution was passed in the session of 1861. I was one of the delegates in 1862, and although the question of Union was supposed to be before us, the subjects that were really considered were Free Trade and the Inter-colonial Railway. I may state frankly that there was no formal discussion at that convention on the question of Union. It was looked upon as a matter in the distance, to be consummated after an Inter-colonial Railway and Free Trade had been enjoyed for years by the separate Provinces. Then, I say, the hon. gentleman had no right to assume from anything that occurred there, that the people of this country, were in favour of Union, particularly such an one, as has been propounded for our acceptance. The city of Halifax is not the Province of Nova Scotia, and the expression of opinion that we hear there—which will be heard to-morrow night—is not that of the people. It can only be gathered by the votes of the several counties, and whenever the opportunity is given for the people to speak out on the question, they will do so, in a manner that will not be agreeable to the feelings of those

gentlemen, who have attempted to strike down our liberties, and change our constitution. Then we have been told Mr. Cardwell, the Colonial Secretary, is in favour of this scheme. Of course he is—as well as the people of England. The Colonies have been a heavy burden upon them, and any scheme that holds out a prospect of relief from taxation, is naturally acceptable to them. Now there are five British North American colonies, with which the Colonial Secretary must keep up a correspondence; and a Union of these would doubtless largely decrease the labors of the office.

But we are told that the 33 gentlemen, who went to Quebec, were unanimously in favour of the scheme. They may have been very unanimous there, but, somehow or other, some of them changed their minds very quickly, when they returned to their respective homes, and were brought face to face with their constituents. We are told too that the Press of England are in favour of the scheme. I respect much more the public opinion of our own country. We are the parties who are to be affected for weal or for woe by any change in our condition. How has New Brunswick acted? How is it that three-fourths of the recently elected representatives of the people in that Province have been returned to oppose the Union with Canada?

REPRESENTATION.

The Hon. Provincial Secretary has alluded to Representation by population, and defended it as a sound principle, and quoted Lord Durham as a high authority on the subject. If this system is right as applied to a colony, why is it not equally so, in respect to the mother country? Is it in operation in Nova Scotia at the present moment, or in any of the colonies, I ask the hon. member for Cape Breton opposite how it is, if this principle is right, that he sits here with only one colleague, when the small county of Queen's, small in extent, as well as population, has three representatives. Is it right?

MR. BOURINOT—No.

MR. ANNAND—Cape Breton has a right to additional representation by other considerations than those of population; look at her coal fields, and the vast amount of capital that is now developing the resources of that fine county. It is a round principle that property and classes, should be represented as well as numbers. That principle was recognized as long ago as the time of the Union of England with Scotland. Some of the most convincing arguments that I ever read was delivered by Mr. Seton, one of the Commissioners for arranging that Union, on the very point that property and classes should be represented as well as numbers, and that the smaller number of representatives was given to Scotland in proportion to her numbers, was justified on the ground that England was a wealthier and more heavily taxed country, whilst the former had to bear smaller burthens of taxation. Lord Durham, it should be remembered, highly respectable an authority as he may be, was considered a radical reformer, as the radical nobleman, and holding opinions opposed both to the Whigs and Conservatives of England. Is Earl Russell, the author of the Reform Bill, in