

half a dozen can be found to support the Confederation of the Provinces. The wealth, the stamina, the bounties and sinews of the country are against this scheme of Union. One hon. gentleman amused me by asking what was there among us to satisfy the ambition of our young men. What more will there be when we are confederated? Gentlemen talk as if Canada was a foreign country, and as if, at present, we could not go there and embark in any branch of business whenever it may suit us to do so. Is it not notorious that the young men of Canada are crossing by hundreds and thousands to the United States, in much larger numbers than from the seaboard Provinces? Our Province is too small now for some people, but I would like to know the country under the sun where men, with steady industry and strict economy, can more readily acquire independence. My hon. friend from West Halifax was a young man himself when he first came here, and the country would appear to have been large enough for him to acquire, in a comparatively short time, a handsome fortune and a position which we all hope he may live long to enjoy. And if disposed, I could point to dozens of that gentleman's fellow-countryman, who at no distant period landed upon our shores, poor but industrious men, who have become wealthy, and who, with my hon. colleague, have no reason to complain that the country in which it was made was too small.

Reference has been made to the franchise law, and I am not sorry it was made. I was one of the Government that introduced the bill, and Mr. Archibald and the Provincial Secretary, now colleagues, were the two antagonists who fought out the question in this Assembly. The former gentleman was then Attorney General,—he was the father of the bill,—he pressed its acceptance upon the Government, but I am willing to take my share of the responsibility attaching to a measure, which if had the majority opposite have it in their power to repeal. If the franchise act is, as they say, distasteful, why not bring in a bill to repeal it? If such a bill were introduced I would allow the gentleman who originated the term "gutter men" and his new friend, the Provincial Secretary to fight it out and would not oppose it. I am willing to try out this question upon the old franchise, and see if the majority of the men who returned this Assembly are or are not in favor of Confederation. The gentleman who preceded me took passage to England in the same steamer as that in which I went. I enjoyed his society during the voyage, but did he visit England as his position entitled him to. He is a prominent supporter of the Government, perhaps the most influential in their ranks. He is beside a merchant of standing in the community, and to the shame of the Government be it told that neither he nor any other merchant was appointed on the delegation. Five lawyers and a doctor were selected to change the constitution of the Province. No one identified with the commerce of the country, its fisheries or agriculture need apply—and the lawyers and the doctor had it all to themselves. My hon. friend has fully earned his position—and why, I ask, was he treated, as I know he was, first by the Government who ignored his

claims when here, and then by the Delegates on the other side. We have heard of the festivities at Stowe and other places, but who ever heard of that gentleman being included in the invitations? And if not, why not? I think that those gentlemen having secured his support, the least they could have done was to have paid him that attention to which his talents and position fully entitled him. It has been asked, what position will we be in if we carry this amendment? We will be situated just in this way: that while the result is trembling in the balance, before the bill is assented to by the Commons, we can telegraph across the Atlantic to say: "The Parliament of Nova Scotia have declared the right of the people to speak on the subject." When that message arrived all action would be stayed and the Imperial Government would await the deliberate opinion of the people of this country. We will then have done justice to the men who sent us here—who did not give us authority to change the constitution, but to make laws under the constitution which we now enjoy. The hon. gentleman who spoke first this evening (Mr. Shannon) alluded to the union of Scotland and England as a case analogous to ours;—but let me point out one or two distinctions. England and Scotland had been at war for centuries, and they formed parts of the same island. Scotland gave England a King, she was without colonies, and by the offer to share the trade of the larger kingdom had every inducement to union with England. These were the arguments addressed to the Scottish mind, and we must all admit their force; but what has Canada to offer us? Does she offer us additional trade with colonies from which we were previously excluded? Have we ever been at war with her? Are we part of the same island? And instead of our giving her king will she not lord it over us? Is her geographical position like ours? Nature evidently formed the Island, now England and Scotland to be under one government, but with a narrow strip of land connecting the Maritime Provinces with Canada, in many places not more than twenty-six to thirty miles wide, is it not evident that geography protests against the union of Provinces, whose railways and telegraphs in time of war could be severed in fifty places, and all communication intercepted. We are asked to be united to a country which is frozen up five months in the year, which has no trade to offer us of which we cannot avail ourselves now. More than that, Scotland went into the union with the advantage in a pecuniary point of view, and we go into Confederation with the money part of the arrangement all in favour of Canada—so that the cases instead of being parallel, are entirely opposite. We being a maritime and consuming people, will consume, man for man, \$3 for every \$1 consumed by Lower Canadians, and more than even the better class of Upper Canadians. In the face of these facts I think the hon. gentleman has not shown that the measure is desirable from a commercial point of view, nor yet in relation to defence. Reference was also made to the banner which I should hereafter display. I am not prepared to elevate any banner but the one we now have. I prefer to remain as I am until a change is forced upon me. I am opposed to