

which was established with the treaty of peace which followed the rebellion. That treaty would not have been acceded to by Upper Canada unless the representation had been framed according to her wishes, Lower Canada having then the largest population. The result was that equal representation was made the basis of the treaty. This gave rise to nearly all the difficulties which Canada has since had to encounter. Not very long ago we saw a Government formed there which lasted but two or three days, owing to the equal system of representation. This difficulty led to the conception of the present scheme, the basis of which is representation by population. It is true that the Canadian politicians had also an eye to the revenues, but their main object was to remedy the political difficulties which their system of representation entailed. This may have suited Canadian policy, but in common with those who have preceded me in this debate I protest against it as far as Nova Scotia is concerned. I was struck with the argument of the hon. member for Inverness the other day, when, in support of the constitutionality of the measure, he instanced the repeal of the Corn Laws and the Emancipation of the Catholics in England. Every one knows that the members of the British House of Commons received instructions time and again on these questions from their constituents. The Catholic Emancipation Act, it must also be remembered, only extended the privileges of the people; it did not restrict them. It aimed a blow at the prejudices of the age, but not at the constitution itself. It did not transfer to another country the revenues of Great Britain, nor did it extinguish the Lords and Commons, and that instance is therefore not at all analagous. The mode of passing Confederation has been much commented on, and very properly so, for even if the measure were good, the manner in which it was passed would have been reprehensible. So was the conduct of some of its supporters. I will not travel out of my own county to illustrate this, but will refer to an address delivered in 1865 by Mr. Bourinot, my predecessor in this House. After an earnest remonstrance against that measure, he concluded by saying—

“Now that the people should be told that they were to have nothing to do with deciding so important a question as changing the constitution of the country, but that the House could deal with it irrespective of the wishes of those they represented, was something most preposterous to propound in a country like this, enjoying the principles of Responsible Government—where the people are the fountain of all authority. The Provincial Secretary must have known that the House was elected under our existing constitution, and could not change it without consulting those that elected them. Yet the Provincial Secretary was quite ready to strike down all existing rights and privileges enjoyed by this people, in order that he might march on to Ottawa. But far and wide the spirit of the people asserted itself. Little by little a feeling arose which spread over the length and breadth of this Province, and showed the Government that they must pause in their rash career. In my own county at first much indifference was felt on this question, but as the discussion proceeded a strong feeling of dissatisfaction at the scheme exhibited itself among all classes of the people.”

These were that gentleman's views in 1865, and I here assert that his constituency ap-

proved them, and yet I find that in 1866 he voted for the measure. Had any change occurred in the meantime? I contend that nothing occurred which should have materially altered his views. He delivered a speech in 1867, and by way of explaining his vote said.

“The reasons for my opposition to the Quebec scheme are known to many of my friends, and as I have stated them at large to the house, I need not refer to them again, excepting to say that I support the measure from conviction. My mind was not influenced by any freak of a moment, or by any desire for office. It is well known that I never held office and that I do not desire any either under the general or local government. In the opinion of some gentlemen every man does wrong who does not strictly conform to their views, but I can fully justify the course I have taken. When I came to the session last year there were many conflicting reasons operating in my mind and I was not fully determined as to whether I should support or oppose Union. In the first place I found on reading attentively that the opinions of the most intelligent men in England were favourable to Confederation; then I saw that the organs of the various religious denominations were likewise favorable, and that the proposition had received the support of the leading men of every political creed.—Everywhere evidence was to be found that the wish of the Imperial Government was to see Union consummated, then came the Fenian excitement, and the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, and, at length, when our own territory was menaced, I felt that the moment had arrived when a true and patriotic lover of his country should decide. I then came to the conclusion that I should support Confederation, in order that we might be prepared to meet the emergencies which were approaching. I gave the proposition my support, however, with the understanding that the Quebec scheme should undergo modification.”

Perhaps I am hardly justified in saying that this was an eye opener to Mr. Bourinot—that the mists cleared away as soon as he discovered that there was room for him in the Senate, but I cannot help saying that he exhibited a total want of that patriotism which he so gloriously talked about. Patriot is hardly the word to apply to him. Sir, if this be patriotism, our lexicographers should revise their works and find some term or combination of words better fitted to convey to the mind—love of country, and devotion to our country's interests. Sir, I can scarcely trust myself to dwell upon the conduct of those who have been instrumental in consummating this measure of Confederation. Suffice it that these records (Debates of House of Assembly, 1864 to 1867) abound with the tergiversations of those of whom the people of this country did hope better things.

I turn now from all the inconsistencies which that record illustrates to a subject which has not been touched on by those who preceded me. I refer to the address to Genl. Williams, which was got up for the purpose of whitewashing some individuals. I was much struck with the view taken of that address by some of the Confederate organs; it was taken not merely as an expression of loyalty to the Queen through the Governor, but as announcing to the English people that the people of Nova Scotia were in favor of Confederation, and a clause to carry out that view was inserted in it. When we reflect upon the means by which that address obtained its signatures, it loses its effect, and should do so. When introduced to my county, it was sneakingly taken around, and people