

he most thorough education, calm judgment, and inflexible integrity—would be mere children in the hands of the Canadian Delegates. He has placed the statesmen of the Maritime Provinces in a position so contemptible that if he is to be believed it would be better that the people should throw themselves upon the generosity and fairness of Her Majesty's Government, than send Delegates who will be so insignificant in the presence of three or four Canadians, and unable to obtain justice at the hands of the most exalted and disinterested tribunal in the world.

The hon. member says he is against Union. Of what use will he then be in a Conference? His only object would then be to obstruct and defeat that which is the desire of the overwhelming body of the people to-day—to carry out the wishes of Her Majesty's Government. The hon. member holds a Conference in British America, and then carries us across the water, and then sails back again. Having got the Conference to unite in a common plan—and it would take ninety-nine years to effect it if the honorable member had his own way—and having obtained the acquiescence of Her Majesty's Government, he would bring it back for an appeal to the people. I do not intend to say much just now on this point. I have most unswerving confidence in the patriotism and intelligence of the people of Nova Scotia and of British North America, but I tell the hon. member as much clamour as he has raised, there is not a man in this House that knows better than himself how impossible it is to get a direct verdict on a question like this. The facts in connection with New Brunswick prove that they did not get a verdict on Confederation pure and simple. He knows right well that let any government, I care not of what party, even the remarkable government of which he was a member, go to the country and instead of being able to obtain an issue on any measure, however loudly they may put it, they have to face the opposition of every man that wishes to displace them. They have to meet many of their own former friends and supporters whose hostility they have provoked in some particular question. Is there any one here who does not know that were this government to appeal to the people on the question of Confederation to-morrow so far from their getting an answer on that question they would have to meet first a formidable combination for the purpose of placing the gentlemen opposite in power, and again, those who were supporters of the Administration—and thousands there are of able and influential supporters so situated—entirely at variance with them on the great question of Assessment for educational purposes. — Therefore I would defy you, in that way to get a verdict, but I am not going into that question now. No gentleman who was here in the first session of the House (1864) would dare to say that it is unconstitutional for the Parliament to change the constitution. They recorded a resolution by unanimous consent on the journals of this Legislature which authorized the change of our Constitution without any reference to the people whatever. I moved the resolution myself; it authorized the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province, in conjunction with the Govern-

ments of the other provinces, to appoint Delegates for the purpose of devising a scheme of Legislative Union for the Maritime Colonies. There is not a man who does not know that this proposition was for a more extreme change in the constitution of this country than the one now proposed. The Quebec scheme proposes to leave to Nova Scotia her own Government and Parliament as far as local questions are concerned, and to have a General Parliament with general powers in reference to matters common to all the Provinces; but the resolution of 1864 was to surrender the entire constitution of the country, and take away the seat of Government; it is all probability, from Nova Scotia and place it in New Brunswick, or wherever it might be agreed upon. It provided that scheme of Legislative Union should go into operation and become law—not when it had received the sanction of the people—but the consent of the Provincial Legislatures, and Her Majesty's approval. With that resolution recorded on our journals is there a man who can presume to rise here and say that it is unconstitutional for the Parliament of the country to change the constitution without an appeal to the people.

Mr. McLELAN—The hon. gentlemen knows that the vote was not taken on the proviso that the resolution should not be entered "unanimously" in the journals.

Dr. TUPPER. Every gentleman who did not record his name against the resolution is committed clearly to the proposition which it contains. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Miller) took exception to allowing the resolution to be entered "unanimously," but it was on different ground. He was not in favor of the proposed union—he preferred the larger one; but he did not take exception to the resolution as embodying an unconstitutional principle.

Mr. McLELAN—I was opposed to the resolution, but I did not explain it at the time.

Dr. TUPPER—Then the hon. member is rather late. What will his constituents think of a member who said nothing on an important constitutional question, and three years after comes forward and says he was opposed to it?

The hon. member for East Halifax went on to say that when he was in England he saw there existed a great desire to get rid of these colonies. I was also in England at the same time the hon. member was there. He will admit that I had as many opportunities as he of meeting and ascertaining the opinions of the statesmen and people of England, from the present distinguished Premier down to the humblest person. I am proud to say, that if that hon. member came away with the belief that there was a general desire on the part of the government and the press, and leading men among the people, that England should part with these colonies, he brought back with him an impression totally at variance with those that other gentlemen, either from this or the adjoining Province, received during their visit. There is no question that there is a party in the House of Commons, familiarly known as the Cobden and Bright party,