

wish is, to submit the broad question on broad grounds and leave it to the decision of the independent action of the Legislature. *No more groundless statements could be made than that there would be an attempt made to force this scheme upon the people. In the discharge of my public duty I have felt bound to go wherever I would and submit myself to the criticism of every man—to give all the information in my power—ready to submit as a member of the Government and as a public man of Nova Scotia, to what I believe to be the great fountain of authority—that is the clearly understood wishes of the people. I am quite certain that under the present Government and Parliament no measure will be ever passed that will be contrary to the public sentiment of the country.*"

Here then, you have the recorded opinions of the Delegates themselves, recognizing the right of the people to be consulted before such a radical change in the constitution of our country. And again, the Provincial Secretary recorded his opinion, and it was a sunshone that the time of peace and prosperity is the time to consider a change in our institutions, and not when we know not at what hour our country may be invaded and our homes desolated:

*"The people sent us together not to consider the means of aggression on the throne; but to enquire how far we could advance our interests in connection with the parent state, and they wisely sent us at a time (mark now!) when we were not convulsed by the throes of civil strife, but when we could meet in the midst of peace and prosperity to consider the means of securing our privileges."*

The House of Lords the other day refused to consider the state of affairs in Ireland because that country was in danger of civil war, and we have the authority upon this point of Earl Russell, who, at the time of the Crimean war abandoned his Reform Bill, and allowed it to slumber until now. These are the examples of the mother country, and they should challenge our admiration and respect. How can you ask the men of Shelburne and Yarmouth, knowing the strong opinions they hold, to rally with true enthusiasm and earnestness in defence of the country, when their most valued institutions are being swept away? The government in taking this course assume a fearful responsibility. Members may take this step but they will do an act bearing no example in the history of modern times, and they will leave behind them a riven and distracted country. If they borrowed lessons from the past, and looked at what has occurred in other countries, they would pause before they consummate the unholy deed. It is a serious thing to deprive a people of all the institutions they hold dear, and I trust that whatever the government may do in the matter—whatever the delegates to Quebec and their friends may do, I trust there will be found in this House a sufficient body of men, knowing as they must that nine-tenths of their constituents are opposed to the scheme, to stand by the rights of the country.

Mr. MILLER said:—I feel it a duty I owe to a gentleman occupying a high position in British America who is not here to defend himself, to give the version of the conversation referred to by Mr. Annand, as he stated it to me just after it took place. I do not desire to misrepresent the hon. member for East Halifax in a single word, and if, in what I am about

to say, I make a mistake, it will be an error of memory and nothing more. On the occasion of Mr. Brown's visit to this city, Mr. Annand and myself were requested to call and see him. Being very busy at the time I was not able to have that pleasure, and I could do no more than leave a card for him a short time before his departure from the city. The hon. gentleman did see him, and had, as he afterwards informed me, a long conversation with Mr. Brown. (Mr. Annand) afterwards told me that they took up the question of Confederation, and that he beat Mr. Brown on every point of the argument. He informed me that Mr. Brown having been beaten on the argument of Confederation, and the mode of convincing him had used language something like this: "You and I have been personal friends, we have long acted together, and it is too bad that at this period I should be obliged to throw myself into the hands of our opponents to carry this measure; the liberal party to which we both belong are going to rule, if the provinces are united." These remarks having no effect, he (Mr. Annand) told me that Mr. Brown then said that "the Maritime Provinces, during the present winter, failed to do anything to meet the views of the British Government on this question, Canada would seek some other mode of settling her difficulties, and leave the Maritime Provinces to their fate." At the conclusion of the conversation I understood the member for East Halifax to say that Mr. Brown used this language: "Annand, you should not oppose union; you have nothing to fear; a man of your ability would always have his proper position under Confederation." I will not deny that Mr. Annand remarked that he thought Mr. Brown's language held out an improper inducement to influence his action, but the words money, place or preferment were never mentioned by Mr. Annand to me, as I feel confident they would have been if they had been used. He would have been too glad to reveal anything of the kind to me if it were true. This was the extent of the conversation as the member for East Halifax detailed it to me. Mr. Brown first arguing the question of Confederation, then appealing to Mr. Annand's party feelings, and then using the words I have already given. Whether the inference which he has drawn from these expressions is a legitimate one, and whether he did or did not colour the facts in relating them to me, I am not prepared to say. But I will say the hon. member was disposed to make the most of Mr. Brown's remarks in his conversation with me. I feel bound to give this contradiction to the hon. member, in justice to an absent man.

Mr. ANNAND.—It is unnecessary to say any thing more than that the hon. member has not stated correctly what I reported as having passed.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said he had to request, in accordance with a well known rule of Parliament, that the hon. member for East Halifax lay upon the table the letters which he read as a portion of his speech.

Mr. ANNAND contended that there was no such rule of Parliament, and that the chair had previously decided against such a demand.

The SPEAKER reserved his decision.