

every variety of soil, climate, and resource. With such a territory as this to overrun, organize, and improve, think you that we shall stop even at the western bounds of Canada? or even at the shore of the Pacific? Vancouver's Island, with its vast coal measures, lies beyond. The beautiful islands of the Pacific, and the growing commerce of the ocean, are beyond. Populous China and the rich East are beyond; and the sails of our children's children will reflect as familiarly the sunbeams of the South as they now brave the angry tempest of the North. The Maritime Provinces which I now address, are but the Atlantic frontage of the boundless and prolific region; the wharves upon which its business will be transacted, and beside which its rich argosies are to lie. Nova Scotia is one of these. Will you, then, put your hands unitedly, with order, intelligence, and energy, to this great work? Refuse, and you are recreant to every principle which lies at the base of your country's prosperity and advancement; refuse, and the Deity's hand-writing upon land and sea is to you unintelligible language; refuse, and Nova Scotia, instead of occupying the foreground as she now does, should have been thrown back, at least behind the Rocky Mountains. God has planted your country in the front of his boundless region; see that you comprehend its destiny and resources—see that you discharge, with energy and elevation of soul, the duties which devolve upon you in virtue of your position.

Allow me in conclusion Mr. Speaker to thank the House for the kind and attentive hearing given to the discursive observations I have been enabled on the moment to offer in reply to the speech of my honourable friend.

**Mr. McKeagney** defended the change of opinion of the member for Hants on the question of Union, holding that a change of opinion, when a man found he was wrong, was not discreditable. He (Mr. McKeagney) was not committed to opposition to Confederation; but he was opposed to the mode and manner in which it had been accomplished. He was here to seek concessions and changes, but did not say that under every circumstance, Confederation would be objectionable to Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear).

**Mr. Hugh McDonald** said, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Cumberland has expressed his sympathy for other gentlemen from Nova Scotia occupying seats in the House, inasmuch as they are not in a position to claim support from the ministerial side, but I feel that we need no such sympathy and, speaking for myself, I feel that I occupy a much prouder position in representing the views and advocating the rights of those who sent me here, than if I had occupied that place which my honourable friend would assign. I am quite well aware that, in the face of what I know to be the Union feeling shared in by a large majority of this House, any observations that I can make are not

[Dr. Tupper (Cumberland)]

likely to win much sympathy or carry conviction, and, at this late hour of the night, perhaps, it would not be just to the House or to myself that I should occupy much time. But I would be wanting in that public duty which I owe to the country which sent me here, if I failed to express my utter refusal to join in the congratulations which we are asked to tender to His Excellency, upon the consummation of a policy which I believe to be injurious to the best interests of my own Province, and which I know to be repugnant to the feelings and wishes of my constituents and of the overwhelming majority of the people of Nova Scotia. My honourable friend says that we are not in a position to apply for a repeal of the Union, because the unanimity of the people of Nova Scotia upon the subject, according to his figures, is questionable. He forgets that for the last three years he and those with whom he was associated, ignored the right of the people to a voice in any Constitutional changes. Who that is conversant with his speeches and pamphlets can forget how persistently he contended that the representatives of the people—not the people themselves—possessed the power and the right to effect such changes? Then, according to his own argument, what matters it that there is not (even if there was not) a perfect unanimity among our entire people? Have we not the whole body of representatives of the people of Nova Scotia—with two or three exceptions—in favour of repeal, and can there be any doubt as to our right to get it? But my honourable friend says that the elections in Nova Scotia were decided upon other issues, and that not a repeal of the Union, but a reproof for the manner of carrying it was the main issue. Now, I am in a position to deny the entire accuracy of that statement. Confederation or no Confederation was the main question in my own constituency, and in several others which I could name, but even if it was a question of reproof, how can we consistently rejoice, as this address asks us to do, at the success of a line of conduct which we invariably condemned and which received such signal reproof at the hands of our constituents. We are told that the Union was carried in Nova Scotia precisely in the manner indicated many years ago by Lord Durham and other eminent statesmen. Let me remind the honourable gentleman that he mistakes the views of Lord Durham; for that nobleman unhesitatingly states, in his report, that it would not be courteous or just to the Lower Provinces to include them in the Union, which he then advocated, without at first obtaining the consent of the people of