

tary to use the language he did in respect to a country with which we are at peace, and with which we should ever remain so. What does Mr. Cardwell say in reference to the relations between the U States and the mother country?

"The hon. member for Bradford in the course of his eloquent speech wished me to answer two questions—viz. Whether we can truly state that our relations with the United States continue to be, as they have hitherto been, perfectly friendly. I can without reserve give him such an assurance (hear, hear.) The hon. member also asks whether in that correspondence which has not been given to the house there are not some documents bearing on the question of the Alabama. With equal confidence and with equal pleasure I can assure the house that I can give the hon. member the answer he desires. There are no papers in that correspondence such as he describes as bearing on the question as it stands between the two countries."

Now with an assurance of that kind from so distinguished an authority as the Colonial Secretary why should we be startled with their alarm cries that we are to be overrun by the hordes of the States. But what does Lord Palmerston say?

"I am persuaded that the tone of moderation which has prevailed in this debate will be useful in Canada and the United States. \* \* \* I can only confirm the statement of my right hon. friend that the relations of the two governments at the present moment are perfectly friendly and satisfactory (hear, hear.) We have no complaint to make against the government of the United States. They have acted in a fair and honorable manner towards us in all matters which have arisen between us."

With these opinions expressed by the leader of the government in the house of Commons, why should our attention be directed to the London Times which is given here as an authority upon a matter of public opinion in England. I hold, sir, that the house of commons is the place to look for illustrations of public opinion in England, and for accurate information respecting the relations between Great Britain and the United States. We all know the character of the London Times. On the 7th March, a fire-eating article was issued in the columns of that paper redolent with abuse of the British North America Colonies, a few days before this debate from which I have quoted took place. On the 17th the debate on the Defences came off, and on the following day the Times changed its tone, and was perfectly lamb-like.

#### DEFENCE.

My hon. friend from Colchester referred to the question of defence. He said, "See the advantage that we will in that respect derive from Union. You will have a concentration of men and money." I contend that Confederation will give you no more money, no more men, and as to concentration you have now just as much as you would have then. We are told in the language of the Times that under Confederation we would be all under one military command. Let me ask, Who commands the forces in British America now? Is it not Gen. Williams at Montreal or Quebec? It is true that the Militia may not be marched out of the Province in the event of war, and I admit that it is our duty in the case of hostilities to assist our brethren in Canada and New Brunswick, but under the existing state of our law you can-

not move a single regiment of militia across the frontier. But does it require Confederation to do that? Cannot you, by a simple act of the Legislature, give the Governor the power to march out as many militiamen as you choose? So, really isolated as we are said to be, the Commander-in-chief, at any moment, by agreement made between the several Provinces, can have the militia marched to the assistance of our fellow countrymen, and they in turn can be brought to us in the time of peril. Then we are told that British statesmen look forward to Confederation as a means of defence. Had they been told, as we were three months ago, that this Confederation was only going to give a million of dollars, what would the people of England have said? What did they say in the debate to which I have referred? The report of Col. Jervois was read, and it was suggested that Canada would contribute, not for defence alone, but for fortifications, the enormous sum of \$6,000,000. A million has been granted by Canada during the late session towards fortifications, not to be expended until the delegation learn whether they can obtain from England the guarantee for the war loan they wish. During the late session a million and a half—the half million for frontier defences—was given by Canada alone—or half a million more than we were told the entire Confederation would give. The gentlemen who went to Canada, among other startling things, agreed to do this—to bind, as far as they could, these several provinces to contribute their share towards any sum of money that Canada might raise or borrow towards the defences of the country. That was denied by the delegates at one of the public meetings, but I hold in my hand an extract from a speech delivered since that time by Hon. J. A. Macdonald, and what does he say?

"With respect to the defences they were now the subject negotiations with the Imperial Government, and the fullest information would be given to the house on that subject. He might mention that the Maritime Provinces, recognizing the peculiar position of Canada geographically, and its danger in case of hostilities, had most cordially agreed that any sum this Parliament might vote for the defence of Canada they would undertake their share of."

Mark! That Nova Scotia would undertake to pay a share of "any sum" the Canadian Parliament might vote for the defence of Canada. Then our loyalty has been questioned by the Times, by that well informed organ of public opinion that changes tone from day to day, whose correspondent was down here, and whose knowledge of geography was so extensive that he found himself in Toronto when he came to this province to meet the Prince of Wales. That individual characterized our women as "splay footed" and spoke of our country generally in the most contemptuous manner—who could see nothing in Nova Scotia worthy of notice, though he visited the fine towns of Windsor, Pictou and Truro. It has been long remarked that the sympathies of that journal are entirely with the Australian Colonies, and that its desire has been to shake us off. But we are not to be browbeaten and bullied into Confederation by telling us that our allegiance, which was never