

away, and in order to avert it, he did not hesitate to seek aid from the very men he had proscribed, and to assert that his professions to others were false, and that he had only wanted a little capital by which to get back into power. This is the gentleman who now attempts to deal with the people of Nova Scotia, and tell them that they should follow his advice. He has been opposed to the continuance in office of the present Government, and he made overtures to Opposition gentlemen likely to support the Confederation scheme, asked them not to allow the present Government to carry it, that if they would only help him to overthrow the present Administration he and they might, if necessary, pass the measure when they got into power. I am not making this statement rashly. I can prove it by what has passed between them within and without the walls of this building. His opposition is, I am satisfied, not so much to Union as that the men in power should carry the measure. That is the patriotism that influences the hon. member.

There is another gentleman opposite who opposes this measure, and that is the hon. member for East Halifax. I regret to say anything severe about that gentleman, for he has passed through an ordeal in this house which entitles him to commiseration. He endeavored to blacken the character of men connected with the Quebec scheme. We all know the statement made concerning Hon. George Brown, and the refutation it has met, even from his attempt at escape by denying his own words, uttered in our presence. I ask the hon. member to consider the position he occupies on this question. I am prepared to prove by the most conclusive evidence that the hon. member, within the last two or three weeks, would have been willing to go for this very resolution, without any stipulation as to an appeal to the people. What has changed the hon. member since? Have there been any new arrivals in this country since he formed and uttered this intention? Has there been any influence brought to bear upon him? A gentleman has written article after article on the subject, who has stated deliberately that he would be willing to support this scheme, now comes here and tells us that he has yet to hear "the first argument in favor of union with Canada." He attempted to define his position the other day, but I am quite sure that when he was done, nobody knew where to find him.

On the several occasions that this question has been before the House, I have not said a single word on the subject. It was one of those questions that I did not wish to deal hastily with; I was anxious to ascertain how it could be carried out in accordance with the public interests, and how far the measure could be practically dealt with. We went to Quebec, and I listened attentively to the arguments in connection with the subject of Union. When, I saw that a practicable scheme could be matured which would do justice to all interests, and believing it was necessary for the welfare and prosperity of the people of British North America, then alone did I consent to be a party to it. As respects the Quebec Scheme, I may state that I had my doubts as to the correctness of some of its features, and divided the convention on them. I objected to the pardoning power given to the local governors, who are simply delegates from the General Govern-

ment, believing that feature would be regarded by the British Government as against principle. I objected again to that portion of the scheme by which the number of the Legislative Council is stereotyped; I held that it was preferable to continue the principle of the British Constitution, which allowed the Crown to add to the number of the Upper House, but I was overruled by the allegation of the difficulty of arranging the numbers which might be added so as not to alter the relative numbers from all the Provinces. I felt, however, although opposed to some of the details, that it would be for the interest of the Provinces to adopt it as a whole. I felt that whilst they remain isolated, instead of becoming more intimately connected and better acquainted, they were likely to become more and more antagonistic to each other. I had before me the position of two Australian Colonies which came nearly to war in consequence of some financial dispute between them. Some goods were seized by the one, and attempted to be rescued by the other, and they were only restrained from the adoption of extreme measures by being Colonies instead of independent countries. We have trade relations between the Provinces that are injurious to all of them.

The hon. member for East Halifax says that we can have changes, and those relations improved without union. Well, the hon. gentleman tried that on one occasion, and found that the difficulties that met him were of a most insurmountable character. We are told that the currency could be assimilated, but the hon. member must have changed his opinions on this subject very recently, or he would not now desire to alter or assimilate the currency. A few years ago I introduced a bill for the purpose of giving the country a decimal currency, founded on the basis of the American, Canadian and New Brunswick currency; but he voted against it, and he and his party did all they could to prevent us assimilating our currency to that of the neighboring States and Provinces.

The hon. member denies that Union can increase our capacity for defence, but no one is likely to believe that his opinions are entitled to greater weight than the eminent statesmen and generals who have given their views on the subject. At present each of the provinces looks to its own safety, and does not trouble itself much about its neighbour. We can hear with comparative quietude that the Fenians are about to land in New Brunswick, but if we hear that Nova Scotia is endangered and its soil invaded, our blood is excited, and we feel we must rise and defend our hearths and homes. If we were all united in one, if the Canadian felt that the soil of Nova Scotia is as dear to him as that of Canada—if Nova Scotia felt that Canada is a part of itself—we would all have a greater guarantee of security. We are told that disunited we can as effectually defend ourselves. I would call attention to the position of Wellington in Spain. Whilst trammelled by the orders of the British Government, Spanish Junta, etc., he was powerless, but the moment he determined to act on his own responsibility, success crowned his arms. Everybody must see the great advance that is derived from the concentration of authority in one hand. The most powerful government for speedy action is that which is despotic. If we have one concentrated authority in the