

our fisheries against the Americans—it is simply preposterous. They could not protect a smoked herring in Digby, much less a live cod-fish or a school of mackarel sporting along our coast. And feeling the force of these facts and the importance of our position, we are told that in declining to form this connection and set up shop in this new concern in company with Canada, we are disloyal; and all through the story these gentlemen have been preaching to us about loyalty. They rightly estimated, to a great extent, the feelings of the country when they played upon that word. They have from the outset labored to make us believe that the measure was forced on us by the mother country in order that the feelings of attachment and the desire to yield to the wishes of the parent state might lead us to favor the connection, and time and again we have been accused of disloyalty in declining to go into this copartnership.

I may be here pardoned for referring to the fact that the history of Canada has shown that her people have not always paid due respect to the British flag. No such charge, however, could be made against our people, and it would seem, from the despatches which have been made public during the discussion of this question, that the statesmen of England felt a security so long as we remained loyal and were not tampered with by the Canadians. It seems that on the 27th of January, 1860, the Duke of Newcastle sent a despatch marked "confidential," in which he commanded that no delegates should be sent to confer with other Provinces without permission from the Home Government, or without the occasion of their conference first being stated to him. So far, then, from the British Government forcing the union upon us, our Government were obliged to obtain permission before these gentlemen could so upon the delegation. The Lieut. Governor says, in a despatch dated the 18th July:—

"It seems proper that I should call your attention to the despatch of the 27th January, 1860, marked 'confidential,' addressed to my predecessor by his Grace the Duke of Newcastle. In that despatch his Grace, whilst apparently expressing no disapproval of the discussion of such a question as that which is now imminent, concludes with the following instruction: 'Previous to sending delegates to Quebec or elsewhere, such a proposal should not be authorized by yourself without previous communication with the Secretary of State, in order that the question of the delegates and the instructions to be given them may be known beforehand to Her Majesty's Government.'"

We have in the public despatches the clearest proof that the question originated with the delegates themselves: they churned up the whole matter in order to butter the fingers of a few leading politicians; and having done so, they tell us we are disloyal because we are unwilling to adopt it. We refuse rather because we feel that our loyalty might be affected by the connection. Canada has been, within the recollection of men around me, twice in open insurrection, and within a few years there has appeared a manifesto declaring that annexation to the United States was the only remedy for the political evils of the country. That manifesto was signed by many public men who have since occupied prominent positions in her Parliament and Government; and yet we are called disloyal because we refuse to join with her. I ask

gentlemen around me—men of family, who have perhaps daughters whose beauty, whose accomplishments and virtues is their just pride, and whose fair name they would at all hazards maintain,—I ask them what they would say if such a daughter was publicly charged with a want of modesty and virtue for no better reason than a refusal to share the bed of one twice taken in adultery—one who declared publicly (as in that manifesto) a determination to again play the harlot? I tell the hon. gentleman that if there be any disloyalty in the question, or any show of disloyalty, he and his friends have given it. We have been told that Mr. Howe and the other people's delegates are disloyal because they referred to the temptations to annexation, in the case which they placed before the British Parliament. Is there any disloyalty in telling the whole truth? Was it not the duty of these gentlemen, as public men writing a letter to Imperial statesmen, to present all the features of the question? When the Financial Secretary gave that taunt, did he forget that that distinguished statesman Lord Durham, in his report to Her Majesty on the state of these Provinces, took the very same course? Earl Durham came out, and examined and understood the whole case of the Canadians; he saw the position of the country, and does not seem to think he makes himself amenable to the charge of disloyalty in stating the whole truth, and in drawing attention to the contrast which exists on the two sides of the boundary line. Lord Durham says:—

"Throughout the course of the preceding pages I have constantly had occasion to refer to this contrast. I have not hesitated to do so, though no man's just pride in his country and firm attachment to its institutions can be more deeply shocked by the mortifying admission of inferiority. But I should ill discharge my duty to Your Majesty—I should give but an imperfect view of the real condition of these Provinces—were I to detail mere statistical facts, without describing the feelings which they generate in those who observe them daily, and daily experience their influence on their own fortunes. The contrast which I have described is the theme of every traveller who visits these countries and who observes on one side of the line the abundance, and on the other the scarcity of every sign of material prosperity which thriving agriculture and flourishing cities indicate, and of civilization, which schools and churches testify, even to the outward senses."

"It cannot be denied indeed that the continuance of the many practical grievances which I have described as subjects of complaint, and, above all, the determined resistance to such a system of responsible government as gives the people a real control over its own destinies, have, together with the irritation caused by the late insurrection, induced a large portion of the population to look with envy at the material prosperity of their neighbours in the United States under a free and eminently responsible government, and in despair of obtaining such benefits under their present institutions, to desire the adoption of a Republican constitution, or even an incorporation into the American Union."

Here this statesman tells her Majesty that very strong temptations to annexation existed, which can only be counteracted by giving to them (the Canadians) the control of their own institutions and revenues. He puts this in stronger and clearer terms than those used by Mr. Howe and his associates? and I have yet to learn that Earl Durham was for this ever charged with a want of loyalty. Mr. Howe, after having presented the case, and exhibited the temptation which exist to annexation provided our rights are overridden