

rating the subject had been presented—before our “case was printed—the indecent spectacle was witnessed of the bill being hurried through a second reading. I give that has a reason why the petitions were not laid before the house. The bill was brought down, as it were, yesterday, and before they could be presented on the following day, it was read a second time

I can fancy I understand the influences that were brought to bear upon some members of Parliament, among whom was the late Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. There was evidently a feeling that it was necessary to smuggle the measure through. But although there was hot haste as to the second reading, time was afterwards given for consideration, and I am not without hope that there may yet be manly spirit enough to send the scheme back to the people of Nova Scotia. That second reading was carried by declarations that we had no grievance at all, that the subject had been before the people at the last general election, that the opposition was factious and did not represent popular opinion. One very significant fact has already transpired; last year it was said that the Queen desired Confederation—that the Secretary for the Colonies, the Parliament, press, and people of England all desired it, but now, when the responsibility is thrown on the British Cabinet, what do they say? Her Majesty says that the bill has been prepared in conformity with the wishes of the delegates from the various provinces. And what does the act itself say? It says it is introduced because the delegates desire the measure. Her Majesty's Ministers, fearing that trouble may come—that the new nationality may come to grief—shake themselves clear of the responsibility, and can hereafter point to the bill and say—“This is no measure of ours; we merely gave the force of law to the enactment, which you desired.” I was amused to hear the Provincial Secretary say that the friends of union were sustained by the friends of British connection in England. I have had opportunities unsurpassed by any Colonist of ascertaining the feelings of gentlemen connected with the press of England, and I here declare that the leading opinion of the governing classes of England is, that these colonies should be made into an independent nation, and they would gladly have separated Canada from the Maritime Provinces, but they felt that a maritime frontage was essential for her existence. The opinion, I repeat, of the friends of Confederation is that we should be united, and put in such a position that by a single stroke of the pen we may be separated from the parent state. Examine that bill and you will find that the only link of connection which it will leave us is the Governor General who is to receive out of our revenues a salary of \$50,000 a year. Do you suppose that when we are charged with our foreign relations; as was intimated by Mr. Adderly, when we have our own army to maintain; for the troops are evidently to be withdrawn un-

less we are prepared to pay them, when the appointment of the Governor General by the Crown is the only connecting link, can it be supposed that it will be long before we have our President? You cannot engraft this mongrel system upon monarchical institutions,—when you change you must become a Republic, and the game played by the American Government in Mexico will be played over again here. I look upon this scheme as the first step towards a separation from the Mother Country, and I prophecy that ten years will not pass before this new nationality will drift into the United States. Look how easily the thing can be done—just as easily as the Confederation scheme was accomplished.—Several gentlemen were appointed, at the instance of this house, to attend a conference in Prince Edward Island to mature a scheme for the union of the Maritime Provinces. The Canadians came down and spirited them to Quebec where, for reasons best known to themselves, they all agreed to go in for the larger union. They afterwards by some means succeeded in securing the assent of New Brunswick and of this house, though not of the people, and they are now about to consummate it. Can it be supposed that the Americans will not imitate an example which has been so successful, and that by the exercise of that acute diplomacy for which they are famous, and by the expenditure of money, when it is required, sweep the whole concern into the American Union? The Canadians are just the men, and the Confederate Government will be just the place to try such an experiment.

I have ever felt that the moment we ceased to be separate provinces, and came under the dominion of Canada, her fate must be our fate, and we must be dragged wherever she might be pleased to carry us. Many leading men in England entertain that opinion strongly, and tell us that it would be our advantage to join the American Union. There is another reason given why we should confederate and be got rid of, and it has force from an English point of view. It is said in England, “as long as we maintain these colonies, particularly Canada, with its long and defenceless frontier, so long must we have a running sore; but if we were rid of them, we would talk to the Americans in a different style; we would not submit to insult and indignity which we are now obliged to do from day to day.” But we are told that the friends of British connection are the friends of union. What, for example, says the Times? In a recent number that great organ of public opinion wished Confederation God-speed, and trusted it would soon eventuate in the independence of these colonies. But those supporting our opinions took a larger and more