

if it does pass. Do you wish to heap insult upon injury by trying to delude the people of this country with such a resolution? Sir, I say again do you wish to insult the common intelligence of Nova Scotians? Several questions that should be answered by the promoters of this scheme are these: Did not the delegation at Quebec sit in secret? Did they not conclude that Quebec scheme with closed doors? Was it not understood by all the parties then that the terms of the scheme were not to be disclosed until all the delegates should return? Did not the Canadian delegates proceed post haste to England, there to implore the Secretary for the Colonies to aid their propositions? And was it not urged at the Colonial Secretary's office nearly as soon as in Temperance Hall? Sir, I do not wonder that the Canadians should with such haste endeavour to excite the sympathies of the British government in favour of this scheme when they had made a bargain so much to their own advantage. I believe that could the disadvantages that this involves to Nova Scotia have been shewn to the British government they could not have been so blind to our interests as to favour such a scheme; but all this will be represented to the British government. It is not impossible nor unlikely that this may yet be a question of greater moment in the Parliament of England than may now be imagined, and when it is known that this Quebec scheme is so distasteful to the people of this province; when the injustice of the case comes to be known, and the discontent and strife that will be engendered thereby, I feel some hope that the British government will pause before they pass an act to make this resolution become the law of the land. I presume that the British government will have a detailed account of the whole scheme; a pounds shillings and pence version of the whole affair; a matter of fact proposition for them to solve; and when they do know, as I believe they do not know, that Nova Scotia must lose at least \$200,000 a year by the arrangement, which they will have to make up by direct taxation—and that that will be a mode of raising money—that will be likely to create a very bad feeling and perhaps almost a revolution in the country, they will pause before they pass the act. But, sir, in making use of this language, I am quite aware that I shall be styled by the promoters of this infamous scheme an annexationist; but this I deny, and I claim to possess as loyal feelings to my beloved Queen as any man in this assembly, and it is with feelings loyal to the crown of Great Britain that I warn you now of the danger there is of creating a feeling of hostility to the Government of Britain by the passage of this act. The feelings of the people of England have been quoted here by the hon. Attorney General, and the applause he received at the Manchester dinner when introduced as one of the union delegates. But, sir, did the honorable Attorney General ask them their views of our relation to England under the union? If he had they would have told him that united we would no longer be an expense to England for protection. And this is the general impression of the people of England. I was in England last winter, and in Manchester, and was in conversation with gentlemen there of high standing, some of the Manchester school, and found that

this was the general idea that these Provinces united would no longer be a burthen to the people of England for protection, and I found this to be the idea of a very large proportion of the people there with whom I came in contact, but I do not mean to say that the British government entertain that idea. Now, sir, having kept the house so long at this late hour I will not prolong my remarks, but should have done so if time had been allowed. I feel that I am doing my duty to Nova Scotia, as my native land, to the people I am here to represent, and to myself, by voting against the resolution laid on the table by the hon. Prov. Secy., and for the amendment offered by the hon. and learned gentleman from Guysboro.

REMARKS OF MR. HATFIELD.

Mr. HATFIELD said:—I feel that the duty devolves upon me of expressing my views on this resolution. I may state that until this evening no one has been informed of the way in which I intend to vote; when meetings were held at Yarmouth and Argyle I said I would not give a decided opinion until the legislature met, and the pros and cons of the question laid before us. I have come here, I have heard speeches upon both sides, and have made up my mind to vote against the resolution which the government have introduced. I feel that the duty which I owe to my constituency, and that duty is not a small one, requires that I should take this action. Since coming to this house I have supported the government almost to a vote, sometimes with a disregard of my personal position, but on this measure I will do what is right irrespective of political feelings and with a determination to stand or fall by the course which I pursue. I have frequently felt diffident in addressing the house, feeling that I was a young member and unaccustomed to public speaking, in comparison with some gentlemen who frequently address us, but to-night I stand firm in the conviction that the course I am taking is one that becomes my position. We find that out of the ten or eleven lawyers who have seats in this house, nine are in favor of the scheme, and what is their object unless it be personal aggrandisement? To-night we have seen a gentleman sitting here, and not revealing even to his own colleagues that he had "paired off" with another member and did not intend to vote on the division. That certainly looks suspicious, and has convinced me that all the circumstances connected with the transaction have not been revealed. I have made these few remarks without preparation, and would not have spoken to-night if the Prov. Secretary had not forced the division.

REMARKS OF DR. BROWN.

Dr. BROWN said:—At this hour of the night, Mr. Speaker, and fatigued as I am by a long journey, it is not possible for me to collect my thoughts sufficiently to make a two hours speech on this all-important subject, I shall therefore content myself with a few remarks directed to one or two points only. I should not object to the resolution before the house, provided the people were allowed to decide the question. It is not impossible, though I confess I cannot see it, that Union with Canada may be ultimately beneficial to the country. If so, the people in process of