

were asked to sign it hurriedly, and did so, being told that it was merely an address of loyalty to the Queen, and *had no political significance*. Many who signed it were astonished to find afterwards that it contained a clause designed to make Confederation appear popular. If in other counties that address was signed as it was in Cape Breton, I deny that it was any compliment to General Williams. Its being signed in that county was not, I must repeat, intended as an expression of agreement with the policy of those who carried Confederation. In conclusion, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have an abiding faith in the generosity of the British Parliament, and believe that, without doubt, this repeal will be granted. The attention of the British people has been so much turned, within a year or two, to the condition of Ireland, that the Imperial Government will hesitate, I feel certain, before refusing an application like this. I, for one, am content to await the result. My remarks, I fear sir, have been somewhat desultory and void of that eloquence which characterised a debate on a similar subject in England some years ago; but, sir, however weak I may be in reproaching this thing and its promoters, my weakness may be to some extent compensated for, by my sincerity in the cause of Repeal.

MR. BLANCHARD'S SPEECH.

MR. BLANCHARD said:—It was understood, Mr. Speaker, that this afternoon should be devoted to giving me an opportunity to review the numerous speeches made on the subject under debate, and I feel that it never has been, and I trust it never will be again, the lot of any man in Nova Scotia to be placed in my position. However indifferently I may be able to discharge the duties which devolve upon me, and however small may be the abilities which I can bring to bear, yet I feel that it is well that there is some little difference of sentiment here. If it were otherwise the employment of the House would be short, and little or no interest would centre in this debate. I find myself now called upon to reply to about twenty-nine speeches, delivered by gentlemen on the government side of the House. It was said last evening that some of those gentlemen should have the reply, because I might take the whole twenty-nine and lacerate them, but I have no idea of doing anything of the kind. On the contrary, I will say that such an array of eloquence and talent as has delighted the House for more than a week never occurred in a Provincial legislature before. We have seen coming to the fore and delivering lengthy addresses men who, one would have supposed, would hardly have occupied as much time as the last speaker. Talk of lawyers, sir, they cannot compare with some of the farmers and merchants who have been addressing us. Some gentlemen who, before the last election, had hardly ever made a speech except in a village debating club, have delighted the House for two mortal hours at a stretch, with language, it is true, that is somewhat unusual, but with power! eloquence!! and wisdom!! Such as I must congratulate the country on possessing.

Talk of the talent of the House being lessened since the Union Act came into force! Why if we measure the talent of hon. gentlemen by the number of their words, and their ability by the force of their language, nothing to be compared with this debate has ever occurred before. I sat here in the days when we thought we had intellectual giants among us—when Mr. Johnston on the one side led an array of talent that was of no ordinary character, and when Mr. Howe and Mr. Young, on the other side, were sustained by a fair share of talent and ability; but all the debates of those days were as nothing when compared with these twenty-nine speeches all in a row, suggesting to the memory the nursery rhyme about some other things in a row. I intend to go into the subject with good temper, because whenever I have, on other occasions, ventured to indulge in a little retort, by way of satire, on gentlemen who had attacked me, I got a dressing such as no ordinary man would submit to, but I promise two or three gentlemen that before I am done I will return the compliment. If I should omit to refer particularly to any gentleman, I trust he will pardon, and take to himself the remarks I make to his friends.

In the first place, however, I wish to take a broad view of some of the features of the debate. We had a good deal of constitutional argument, and I regret that when I closed my first speech the Attorney General was not allowed then and there, as he wished to do, to reply to my remarks upon that head, for that would have given me an opportunity of commenting upon his observations. I feel that it will be manifest that in the course of his argument he either misrepresented the issues of the question or he was not aware of the facts. We were told that this country had a charter—an inviolate charter, but I ask the Attorney General to meet the argument which I advanced: that if such a charter were given by George II. it has been violated over and over again until there is not a ray of it left—violated in every conceivable manner—torn into ribbons ten thousand times. I will give book and page in proof of my assertion: in Murdoch's History, vol. 2 page 332, it is recorded that by proclamation George III., with the advice of his Privy Council, annexed the Islands of Prince Edward and Cape Breton to Nova Scotia. Again we find the Governor and Council of this Province altering the representation in the legislature and the franchise. What became of the immaculate charter then? In 1769 Prince Edward Island was made a separate Province by the act of the King and Council—the same power separating the Island which had annexed. But going down to 1784, what do we find the condition of the country to have been? Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton were one country, under one Government and Legislature. In 1784 New Brunswick was cut off from Nova Scotia by the Act of the Crown. In 1784 Cape Breton also was made separate; in 1820 that Island was restored to this Province. When I addressed the House before, I was under the impression that Cape Breton was annexed by Act of Parliament, but on careful examination I find I was mistaken,