

annexation to the United States as well as to union with Canada; but I think it may be easily shown that every argument that can be found in favour of the smaller Confederation would apply with greater force to the larger. Let me, while upon this branch of the subject, read an extract from the case of the Maritime Provinces, and I will not shrink from defending every line and word that that document contains:—

"The terms offered to the Maritime Provinces are far more liberal than those grudgingly yielded by the Canadians. Let us contrast them. By Gen. Banks's bill Nova Scotia would at once secure free trade with thirty-four millions of people, whose markets are accessible at all seasons, instead of with three millions, who are frozen up for half the year, and in summer can only be got at by a long tedious river navigation. They would participate in the American fishing bounties so long as these last. They would secure protection abroad, which the Canadians cannot give them. Capital would flow in from Boston and New York to work their mines and employ their water-power. Canada has none to spare. Turning from material to political interests, how would matters stand? Nova Scotia would enter the Union as a State clothed with the accustomed rights, and guarded by recognized securities. She would select her own governors, judges and senators, uncontrolled by any Federal authority. All these, by the Quebec scheme, are to be selected for her by the ruling parties at Ottawa; and, while she elected all her own state legislators and officers, the Supreme Court should protect her in case of collision or encroachment." * * * * *

"With all the temptations offered us at Washington, we ask simply to be let alone, or we ask to be folded to our mother's bosom, and not cast out into the wilderness of untried experiments and political speculation. Nova Scotia says to England, as Ruth said to Naomi, "Where you go we will go; your people shall be our people." This love and affection spring from a thousand sources that we need not linger to describe, but which it would be a fatal mistake to suppose can ever be transferred. You cannot endorse our hearts or our allegiances over to the Canadians as you would a note of hand, or invest a village on the Ottawa with the historic interest and associations that cluster around London."

These lines were penned in London.—I endorse every word of them here and continue to avow that every material advantage offered by Confederation with Canada is offered to us with much greater inducement by Confederation with the United States. But I am opposed to both. I have never sat down to calculate the advantages which annexation would bring to us. I never had any desire to do so, but have deliberately shrunk from the task, because I am too much attached to British institutions. I prefer the British form of government and will not yield it up until I am compelled, but I cannot shut my eyes to the commercial advantages of closer connection with the United States while my sympathies are all with England.—Mr. Shannon said that he disliked the name Canada as applied to the new Dominion. In that particular he and I entirely agree, but it would not have done to have called it *British America*, for the time is coming, owing to the Confederation scheme, when we will not be British, when we will be nothing but Americans. The change of the names of the Provinces shews that we are to be made a Colony of Canada, and I should like to hear some gentleman rise and reply on that branch of the question. But the hon. gentleman has defended the scheme prepared in

England as superior to the scheme laid before us by the delegates to Quebec. It will be remembered that the Quebec scheme left the Provinces concurrent jurisdiction in reference to the fisheries, but by the London arrangement the matter has been removed from the control of the local legislatures so that an agricultural country having no immediate interest in the fisheries and possessing a tonnage out equal to half that of Nova Scotia, is to control an interest deeply affecting the people of the four Maritime Provinces. The government of Canada, in the hope of conciliating the American government, last year compelled us to give up our fisheries for the paltry consideration of 50 cents per ton while a tax of \$2 per barrel was imposed upon our mackerel. What security have we that they will not surrender our entire interests in this particular to the Americans? And who can doubt that the agricultural counties in the rear with their large representation in the Confederate Commons, will receive far more consideration than the seaside Provinces with their handful of members?

The hon. member for South Colchester, Mr. Archibald, with singular inconsistency, says in one breath we must be a new nation, and in the next that our relations with the Mother Country will not be changed by Confederation. I join issue with him upon both points. We want no new nationality. We are well enough as we are, and although I think it would have been wise to have legislatively united the Maritime Provinces in one Government under the Crown, I cannot concur with those who wish to make these Provinces independent of the Mother Country.

We all know how the American Colonies were lost to England, which probably never would have happened had the sage advice of such men as Adam Smith been taken, and a voice given to the old Colonies in the imposition of taxes and the making of laws. These States would now have been a part of the British Empire, and that Empire would now be invincible against the entire universe. What power would dare to assail the Empire if these, the now two greatest nations in the world, were one. Our true policy I contend, and our duty as British subjects are not to dis sever the Empire, but to share the fortunes of England, to cling to, and, if need be, to defend her. I differ entirely from those who advocate the dismemberment of the Empire, and I believe this Confederation scheme to be the beginning of the decline and fall of that great country of which we are all so fond. How long will the West Indies be retained when we are gone? And will not the cry then come up for new nationalities and independence from the Australian Colonies and the Cape. New Zealand and the smaller Colonies will catch the infection, and when all is gone this now powerful and noble Empire will be reduced to two small islands. Against this fatal policy, the inevitable result as I believe of this Confederation scheme, I sincerely and solemnly protest. It is said that in twenty years our