

Union offered, or decline more intimate relations with our colonial brethren? The hon. member for Halifax has answered himself. In a Parliament of Englishmen—of gentlemen who all profess to be devoted subjects of their royal Queen, who entertain respect for those institutions which have placed England so largely in advance of other countries, the declarations of the hon. member ought to suffice, ought to be more than enough too for the opinions of the most undecided and irresolute. He has said, and said truly, that we must belong to the United States or to England. If he means anything, he intends that for a declaration of separation from England. He has undertaken to tell you that so regardless are English statesmen of the colonies that they do not know what they are. He has told you that the leading minds and governing classes of the old country desire the separation of the colonies. He has gone further and boldly declared that rather than assist our brethren in Canada to build up a strong power on this side, which will establish British institutions firmly on this continent, he is ready at a moment to rush into the arms of the neighbouring Republic. That is not the first occasion in which the hon. member for East Halifax has taken a similar position. The policy of that hon. member and of the majority of the men associated with him, down to the present time, has been nothing more than annexation to the United States. I regret I have not under my hand just now the manifesto of the anti-Union delegates to the statesmen of England—the case, as they call it, of the Maritime Provinces—but I would ask the people of this country, all who have seen that document, whether it does not contain sentiments most obnoxious to those who desire to live under British laws and institutions, and direct encouragement to those in the United States, who are engaged in promoting the annexation of these colonies. I have said that this hon. member is desirous of annexing this country to the United States, and this is an assertion which nothing but the strongest proof could justify. Let me then recall to the recollection of the House some of the productions of that hon. member's pen—the position which he has assumed from the very commencement of the discussion on this question. What do we find in the paper conducted by that hon. member? From the beginning of this discussion—from the “Botheration” articles down to the present hour—the strongest declarations of the un-British and disloyal sentiments of the hon. member are to be found. In the paper which the hon. member claims as presenting the case of the people of this country—in this paper, purporting to be a vindication of a British colony, the hon. member undertakes to compare the scheme of Union with the sister colonies, and the scheme of annexation to the United States devised by Mr. Banks. Take that document and compare the description of the Confederation scheme—a description which could only emanate from a man imbued with hostility to the country which he pretends to love—with the description of a plan of Union which he proposes with the United States. Mr.

Banks' scheme is portrayed in the most flattering colours; our colonial institutions are vilified, while those of the United States are bespattered with fulsome praise. But to what does he invite us? To pay a portion of the enormous taxation which now weighs down the United States—to participate in the political struggles and convulsions of that country; we are to see our mercantile marine, which is now progressing with a rapidity that no other country can equal, transferred to the United States. And what will be the result when that measure is so transferred? At the present time, according to the belief of the most eminent men of that country, the mercantile marine of the United States is at the lowest ebb, and it would not be at all surprising if a wiser commercial policy does not soon prevail in that country, to see almost all their trade eventually carried in foreign bottoms. Yet the hon. member and his friends would have us enter a union which, in the course of a very few years, has brought the formerly great commercial navy of the Republic to so deplorable a condition.

Let me here call the attention of the House to another interesting fact in connection with this question. The hon. gentleman complains of the indifference of English statesmen to colonial matters. When the bill of Union was introduced to a very full House by the Earl of Carnarvon, in a manner that has attracted the praise of journals of all parties, a noble Lord arose to speak in support of the anti-Union party. And what was the reception he met with? Whilst the supporters of the Government sat in their places, every one of the friends of the noble Lord arose and left the House—so thoroughly did they disapprove of the course pursued by him. Is it at all surprising that the Peers of England should have been disgusted when they read the sentiments expressed by these Nova Scotians professing to be the delegates of the people in favour of annexation to the United States, and that they should have declined to compromise themselves by seeming to encourage their views. When they saw the disloyalty that appeared in every line of that document, I do not wonder that so many of the Peers should have manifested their contempt for those who wished to place them in a wrong position, by rising and leaving the House on the instant. The hon. member tells you that the Parliament of England exhibits the most utter indifference to the interests of the colonies. Yet the same Parliament has always shown the deepest interest in the welfare and progress of the colonies, and we have only to look at the speeches of the leading men in the Peers and Commons to see how deeply desirous they are of promoting the welfare and progress of every section of their great Colonial Empire.

The hon. member says that the governing classes of England desire the separation of the colonies from the mother country. I will take the liberty of joining issue directly with him on that point. I believe that the governing classes of Great Britain have a higher appreciation of what constitutes