

prominent position in this country—offered a counter scheme of Union in lieu of that submitted to this Legislature. That scheme has been rejected as far as my observation goes by the whole Anti-Union press up to the present hour. I have heard of no opponent of Union who has had the hardihood to advocate the scheme for the organization of the Empire until the hon. member did so to-night. He has had the boldness to declare that this scheme is the one which he and his party favor. He says he does not deny that some political change in our condition is necessary, and has expressed his readiness to adopt the scheme propounded by Mr. Howe for the organization of the Empire. By that scheme we are to pay for the wars of the whole Empire. He says he will make us pay pound for pound with the other portions of the Empire. That same idea was enunciated some years ago by Mr. Howe, but I never heard of any who was prepared to consider it seriously until the hon. member to-night declared that he would make Nova Scotia as Kent or Surrey or any other county of England. The objection to the Quebec scheme was that our representation in the General Legislature was too insignificant, and that we would have to pay for the defence of Canada, that our burthens would be much heavier than they are now. Yet under the plan propounded by Mr. Howe our people may be summoned at any moment to Canada, or any portion of the world, wherever her broad empire extends, to fight the battles of England; we shall be taxed pound for pound with our fellow-subjects of the British Islands—whilst we shall only have a representation of three or four men in the House of Commons. Are the people of this country prepared to accept such a scheme in preference to the one now offered for their acceptance?

In concluding these few imperfect remarks, I may say that perhaps I shall be able to address the House on another occasion when better prepared to deal with it; but I could not permit the remarks of the hon. member to pass without immediate notice. I shall only repeat what I said previously that before the hon. member can lay claim to the favorable consideration of the loyal people of this province, he should explain away the sentiments which say so little for his allegiance and loyalty to the British Empire.

MR. ANNAND:—I desire to make an explanation in reply to the hon. gentleman. I have never advocated annexation to the United States, I advocate nothing but that we all remain as we are, and maintain our present institutions. As to the taunt about my adhesion to the scheme for the organization of the Empire, I reply that I advocate

that scheme because it will make us English. How the hon. gentleman will reconcile his imputation of disloyalty with my desire that we should become as a county of England; I will leave it to his ingenuity to say.

HON. PROVINCIAL SECRETARY remarked that the house would be expected to divide on the question on the following evening. Another opportunity would be afforded for discussion when the papers in reference to the delegation were brought down.

The debate was adjourned.

The house adjourned to the following day at 2.30

TUESDAY, March 19.

The House met at 2.30 P.M.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Speech of Er. McLellan.

MR. MCLELLAN said:—We are told that this debate must be brought to a close this evening, and for those who have opinions to express the time is short. The Provincial Secretary says this haste is imperative, in order that the public business of the country may not be interfered with. The exigencies of the country may now require this, but I ask who produced the circumstances requiring such hasty deliberations and forcing us to decide so important a question in so short a period? We in the country were prepared months ago to come here and discuss this subject and to attend to the ordinary business of the Legislature, but to suit the convenience of certain hon. gentlemen, the meeting of the House has been postponed to such a late period as to require that the most momentous question ever submitted to Parliament should be passed over almost in silence. For that reason we are told that we must limit our remarks to this single point:—the right of the people to be heard upon the question, and to decide on it for themselves. The Provincial Secretary told us yesterday that he felt proud of the position which he occupied on this question—that he felt proud of the improvements in the bill which is soon to come before us, as compared with the resolutions passed at Quebec. I do not see in the position which he occupies anything to warrant such utterances. He told us last session, as he has told us on every occasion, that the Quebec scheme was just and sound in its principles—that it gave to this Province all it had a right to demand; and the hon. gentleman's colleagues in the delegation reiterated the assertion, and they stated that they were prepared to push that scheme through, and to make it the basis of a Union of the Colonies. If the bill gives us more than that scheme, then whatever it gives in addition is due to us who opposed the measure from its inception. If the bill gives us five dollars more, the credit is due to the stern opposition the Anti-Confederates have given the question. The hon. gentleman is in this position: he has told us that the Quebec scheme was just and sound, and he has now come back from England claiming to have got more than justice. If these statements be true, he must have done a dishonest thing to some other people, from