The Free Press.

VOL. 5. BRIDGETOWN, N. S., THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1868. NO 15,

In the Supreme Coutr.

Annapolis, SS.

CAUSE { *Honble William B. Bliss, Pltf.* vs. *William H. Walker, Defdt.*

TO BE SOLD AT

PUBLIC AUCTION,

at Thorne's Corner, so called, in Bridgetown, by Silas L. Morse, a Master of this Court, on

Saturday, 28th day of March,

A.D. 1868, at 12 o'clock, noon, under an order of sale dated the 10th day of February, A. D, 1868

ALL that certain Farm, land and premises situated in the Township and County of Annapolis, bounded and described as follows, that is to say, beginning at the boundary set up and established between the lands hereby conveyed on the east side thereof and the lands conveyed by the said William H. Walker and Amelia Maria, his wife, and James Edwin Walker and Jane, his wife, on the west side thereof to Thomas Sutton Walker, thence running westerly along to main post road thirty two rods, thence turning and running southerly the course of the Township lines along the boundary line between the lands hereby conveyed and the land of the said James Edwin Walker until it comes to the Bloody Creek Stream, so called; thence turning and running westerly down the stream until it comes to the east boundary line of the lands belonging to the estate of the late John Marshall, thence northerly the course of the said line to the rear of the Township of Annapolis, thence turning and running easterly along the course of the base line of the said township to the boundary line of lands conveyed by the said William H. Walker and Amelia Maria, his wife, and Thomas Sutton Walker to the said James Edwin Walker, thence turning and running southerly the course of the township lines along the last mentioned lands to the Bloody Creek Stream, so called, thence turning and running easterly up the stream until it comes to the boundary line of lands conveyed by the said William H. Walker, and Amelia Maria, his wife, and James Edwin Walker and Jane, his wife to Thomas Sutton Walker, thence turning and running northerly along the last mentioned lands, being the course of the township lines to the place of beginning containing three hundred acres, be the same more or less.

TERMS.

Ten per cent deposit—remainder on delivery of deed.

A. MORSE, Pltfs. Atty.

Bridgetown, February 22nd, 1868

Fish!!

SUPERIOR Labrador Herring and dry Polock. for sale by M. TUPPER.

NOTICE.

FOR sale, one eighth of the Schr *METEOR.*

For particulars apply to Capt Peter Nicholson or WILLIAM SANGLES.

Feb 20

G. G. BULLEY & CO.

Commission, Shipping and General Agents.

81 Upper Water St., HALIFAX, N. S.

PROMPT attention given to all orders entrusted to our care, either for execution here, or in the Western Provinces. Drafts authorized and advances made on consignments of produce, &c. for sale here, or to our Agents in Quebec and Ontario. Returns made as promptly as possible consistant with the interest of our friends

References given when required.

SCHR GIPSEY LASS

The above Schooner, Captain Van Blarcum, Master, will ply as a Packet between Bridgetown and St. John, N. B. during the ensuing summer and Autumn. Will start on her first trip first of next week

March 19 1868. Z VAN BLARCUM.

Hotel For Sale

THE subscriber offers for sale the

MIDDLETON HOTEL,

which is a new and spacious structure, thoroughly finished, and is now regarded as a first class Hotel stand. Connected with it are stables and all other necessary out-buildings, as well as an excellent well of water. Situated on the junction of several radiating roads, and being on the great Main Road running through the thickly populated western valley, it is one of the most eligible sites for a Hotel west of Halifax.

TERMS—made known on application to

C. C. DODGE

Middleton, Wilmot, oct 3, 1867.

NOTICE!

THE subscriber, having accepted the office of Inspector of Inland Revenue for New Brunswick, has retired from the auction and Commission business, which in future will be carried on by his sons, Charles U. and Fred S. Hanford, under the name of

HANFORD BROTHERS,

and while he begs to return thanks to his many friends for their former patronage, he would at the same time solicit a continuance of it to the new firm, hoping it will prove worthy of their confidence.

THOMAS HANFORD.

HANFORD BROTHERS,

(Successors to Thos. Hanford),

COMMISSION MERCHANTS, Auctioneers, and General Agents,

SAINT JOHN, N. B.

CHARLES U. HANFORD. FRED S. HANFORD.

PARADISE HOTEL

THE subscriber has opened a hotel for the accommodation of the public; having a large and roomy house, and situated at Paradise Corner, hopes to receive the patronage of the public Good stabling attached. THOMAS A. BALCOM.

FALL STOCK

Just received direct from England, Grey and Bleached Cottons, Printed do., Flannels, cloths, Irish Linen, Black Serge for coat Lining &c., 1 bale Horse Rugs.

Daily expected per *R. Haines* from Halifax.

Flour, corn meal, oatmeal, molasses, brown and crushed sugar, rice, tea, coffee, a superior article; raisins, nutmegs, pepper, ginger, pimento, cassia, mustard, currants, cream of tartar, soda, wine and butter biscuits, water, Medford and sugar crackers, mixed pickles, ketchup, sardines candles, soap, fancy soaps, vinegar, mazena, corn starch, canary and hemp seed, castor oil sweet oil, hair oils, essence lemon and peppermint, Cayenne pods, cloves, sulphur, saltpetre, alum, vitriol, fig blue, Liverpool, table and butter salt, kerosene oil, candles, lamps, chimneys, goblets, tumblers, lanterns, side lamps, lemon syrup, brooms, starch, tobacco, pure leaf do, cigars, &c., which, together with a large supply of confectionery, nuts, &c., for cash or prompt pay.

2000 Paper Collars,

A few bbls. Labrador Herring.

A few pairs Canadian Larragins.

☞ *All kinds of Country Produce taken in exchange.*

Dec 5. GEORGE MURDOCH.

The Free Press.

IS PUBLISHED

Every Thursday, at Bridgetown.

A. M. GIDNEY, Editor.
I. B. GIDNEY, Proprietor.

TERMS—$2 per annum in advance; $2 50 if not paid within on year from date of subscription. These conditions will be strictly enforced.

ADVERTISING TERMS—50 cents per inch for first insertion, and 12½ cents for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements continued till ordered out and charged for accordingly.

The following gentlemen are authorized to take subteriptions, collect moneys and give valid receipts for the same, and act, in the places mentioned below opposite their respective names, our

Agents:

Halifax—R. H. Wetmore,
Canning—Foster Woodberry.
Kentville—George W. Barnaby, Esq.
Upper Aylesford—L. Fitch, Esq.
Melvern Square—B. Spinney, Esq.
Middleton—J. E. Chipman, Esq.
Annapolis—Andrew Henderson, Esq.
Lawrencetown—R. B. Durling, Esq.
Granville Ferry—Samuel Pickup.
Clementsport—Moses Shaw, Esq.
Bear River—W. H. Fleet.
Yarmouth James B. Moody, Esq.
Tusket—James M. Lent, Esq.
Barrington—Gabriel Robertson, Esq.
Shelburne William F. McCoy, Esq.
Locke's Island—Curry Condon.
Liverpool—W. B. Phillips,
Mill's Village—Dr. Barnaby,
Milton, Q. C.—Charles Morton, Esq.
Lower Granville—F. Spencer,
Brookfield, Q. C.—Lewis Smith, Esq.
Kempt, Q. C.—Perkins Freeman, Esq.
Bridgewater—James Starratt, Esq.
Lunenburgh—James Bowing, Esq.
Mahone Bay—Lewis Knault, Esq.
New Germany—Morton Wheelock, Esq.

Original Poetry.

LINES TO THE BEREAVED.

BY AGGIE G——.

Close the door softly,
Hushed be your breath,
For a dear heart is silenced
By the Angel of Death.

Smooth his hair lightly
O'er his pale brow,
No care or sorrow
Will weary him now.

Fold his hands gently
O'er his cold breast,
It has ceased its emotions,
And is now lulled to rest.

His sufferings are over,
His journey is run,
His last breath, but a whisper,
Breathed—"Thy will be done."

Oh! weep not kind sisters,
Let hope brightly burn,
Though the dear one you mourn for
Can never return.

He has crossed the bread river,
Its rapids and tide,
And now stands rejoicing,
By his dear Saviour's side,

Oh! Then would you call him
From that happy land,
To sorrow and suffering,
In this dreary land.

Wish him not back Father,
O! bid him not come,
For soon all will be landed
Safe—One by one.

When your toil is all over
And Jesus says come,
He will be with that number
To welcome you *Home.*

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 12.

Debate on the Repeal Resolutions.

Mr. SMITH said—I feel it to be a duty which I owe to my constituents to state frankly my opinions on the question, which is now agitating the minds of the people of this Province. In doing so I shall endeavor to adopt that temperate and dispassionate style of address which I believe is the best adapted on the floors of any legislature to attract the attention of the gentlemen who are addressed, and to recommend itself to the judgment of every one sitting on these benches. I regret very much, that in the discussion of this question, every gentleman who addresses this House is necessarily constrained to attack the leader of the Opposition, who has advanced the only arguments on his side of the question, and if in the remarks which I am about to make, I am obliged to animadvert strongly upon some of the observations which have fallen from him, I trust that he will believe that I do so with the most earnest desire to avoid anything like personal recrimination. But, sir, every gentleman on these benches has a solemn duty to perform in the interests of the people who have elected him to represent them. This is a most important crisis in the history of Nova Scotia. Whether for weal or for woe the people of this country are now called upon to offer a remonstrance against a union which, in defiance of their wishes, has confederated them with Canada, and has jeopardized, as they believe, the prosperity and happiness of their country. When the scheme was first brought before the public in a substantial shape, I gave to it the calmest and most dispassionate consideration that it was in my power to bestow upon it, and came to the conclusion that if the people of the country consented to allow their interests to be bartered away by that measure, then they had much less intelligence and spirit than I imagined they possessed. Under these circumstances I deemed it to be my duty, casting aside my own feelings and severing many associations, to come forward and assume an independent stand, and advocate the interests of the people of this country. I feel that the scheme in itself does not ensure "a just provision" for the interests of Nova Scotia; and I intend addressing the House and country, and giving to them, in as concise a form as is possible, the reasons why I conceive the measure to be disastrous to the dearest interests of the people. First of all, there was no exigency in the position of this country that required it to be confederated in the manner in which it has been. It must be apparent to every one that the representation which that scheme gives to the people of this country, places them in a painfully humiliating position, and casts them, perfectly impotent and helpless, at the feet of an alien majority. I felt however true this might be, that it was impossible to apply any other principle than that of population in the construction of the popular branch, yet some provision should at least be made to guard the interests of this country in the upper branch—in the Senate of the General Parliament.

We have heard a good deal about the Constitution of the United States in this debate. The hon. member for Inverness has cast many aspersions upon democratic and republican institutions, and however ready I am to admit that the constitution of Great Britain is far superior to that of the American Republic, yet I very much regret that the gentlemen who favored the British North-American Act did not look more closely than they did into the system of the United States which preserves at all events one admirable principle, and that is the one which gives the smallest State an equal representation in the Senate Chamber with the greatest State. It may not be known to every gentleman around me, that although in the Lower House the principle of population regulates the representation, yet in the Upper House the most insignificant State has an equal voice with the largest and most populous. Why, sir, the wise and sagacious men who framed that constitution did not act in the trifling manner which appears to have been the case with those public men who framed the constitution which we are now asked to live under. Not one of the smallest of the thirteen States have gone into the Union unless such a provision of their rights had been assured them. We are not only in a powerless minority in the lower branch, but also in the Upper House—nothing has been done to protect the interests of the smaller member of the Confederacy. I entertain likewise very strong convictions that when any body of men attempt to change the constitution of a country like this, or undertake to sweep away the independence of our Legislature, to trifle as they have done with the feelings of our people,—they should at least have the modesty to say to the people: "Are you willing to have these changes brought about?" They should at least have had the consideration to have asked the people of this country, will you permit us thus to deal with your dearest interests, and sweep you away into the hands of a Canadian majority? Not only did they not do this, but they coolly and unhesitatingly set at defiance and scoffed contemptuously at the wishes of the people of this country. It is not a matter of history with respect to this Confederation that the people of Nova Scotia were not only opposed to the scheme itself, but to the passage of any such measure without its having been first submitted to them at the polls.

When the hon. member for Inverness scouted the idea of leaving a question of such a character to the people, he endeavoured to bring forward some arguments in support of his position. He boasted of the absurdity of leaving questions of this kind to the people at the polls as manifest from the whole of British authority. He asked the House whether Sir Robert Peel, a man whom he eulogized in the most expressive terms, and the potency of whose colossal genius has left its mark upon the history of the world, was not a good authority on constitutional questions, and proceeded to assert that that statesman passed the Catholic Emancipation Bill without leaving it to the people. But his case has no similitude here. I am free to admit that Catholic emancipation was an alteration of the constitution, but I tell the hon. gentleman it was not an *overthrow* of the constitution It was the passage of an act which the very Parliament it who passed it might have afterwards repealed. It was not an infringement of the rights and privileges of the British public—it was done with their consent, in obedience to the spread of mere expansive and generous ideas, which taught them that the time had come to strike down bigotry and intolerance, and open the door to her Majesty's Catholic subjects to come in and enjoy the same political privileges which were extended to their Protestant brethren. In the case of ourselves, the rights and privileges which we had so long enjoyed were swept away at one "fell swoop."

The hon gentleman next referred to the abolition of the Corn Laws. There is no more similitude here than in the previous case. That question was before the people for years, and we know that British statesmen occupy a different position from the public men of this country. Invariably the leading public men of England, after a session of Parliament, go down to their constituents and address them upon any question which may be agitating the public mind they take every pains to ascertain the views of their constituents, and communicate their own. The repeal of the Corn Laws was a question with which the British people were perfectly familiar; but is it to be said that because Sir Robert Peel refused to submit a question of this kind to the people—because he held such a course to be unconstitutional, therefore is it a precedent for the passage of the Confederation Act? Is it to be a precedent for making, not merely a material change in, but actually *destroying*, a constitution? I hold that responsible government has been *destroyed*, as far as the people are concerned, by the character of our representation at Ottawa. Suppose every member from the Maritime Provinces was to oppose any measure which the government of Canada might think proper to introduce affecting the interests of Nova Scotia, and that that measure was nevertheless passed; the people of Nova Scotia might feel that an act had been carried outraging their feelings and injurious to their peculiar institutions, but at no election in the Province could the men who carried that obnoxious measure be responsible to anybody. They would be responsible only to the Canadian people, and not to the electors of Nova Scotia whose interests would be peculiarly affected. Therefore I say that under the circumstances Nova Scotia, standing as she does numerically inferior in both branches of the General Parliament, occupies a position not only humiliating, but positively dangerous.

We have been told time and again by the press in the interest of the Confederate party that Nova Scotia would exercise a controlling interest in the House of Commons in consequence of the antagonism existing between the Upper and Lower Canadians; but what has been the result? I laughed at the idea when I heard it for the first time, because it was so palpable to any one that had a mind to think that the moment Canadian interests were affected Upper and Lower Canada would unite as one. Has not that actually happened? Take the tariff question, for instance. We find all the representatives from the Maritime Provinces except three voting against that tariff, and what was the result? You find Sir John A. MacDonald leading up the Upper Canadians to pass the tariff despite the opposition of the Maratime Provinces. The tocsin of alarm has only to be sounded, and resistance is in vain! We have, however, our Local Legislature, and it is only here that we can speak effectively; and I hope and trust when our voices have been heard that the Canadians will see that there is spirit enough left, in the people of Nova Scotia to nerve them to every effort to shake themselves free for ever from the hated thraldom.

It has been urged by the hon. member for Inverness that it is absurd that any one acquainted with constitutional law to declare that the people should be consulted at the polls. I contend it to be constitutional, and I intend to argue it from speeches and letters written by two gentlemen, one of whom assisted in transferring this country over to the Canadians. I will now first call your attention to what occurred in the House of Commons, when this bill was introduced. You will recollect that Mr. Bright, in the interest of the people of this country, stood forth for their rights, and asked the House not to press the measure; he wished action to be suspended until the next general election, when the people would pass upon the scheme. When he told that august body of men that the people of this country had never had an opportunity of passing upon this measure, what was said by Mr. Watkin—the gentleman who had been in constant communication with the Delegates? Did he treat that remark of Mr. Bright as trifling? Did he say that it was necessary that the people of this country should not be consulted? No, he felt the force and efficacy of this argument; and what did he do? I take it from the speech of the late leader of the Government (Dr Tupper) previous to the general election, in which he describes the scene between himself and "Mr Watkin," he said, "came to me and asked me, what is your answer to Mr. Bright?" If Mr. Watkin thought there was no force in the argument of Mr. Bright he would not have referred to the hon. member for Cumberland. The answer has been sent broadcast over the Province of Nova Scotia, it was untrue, but on whose shoulders the falsehood rests I will not undertake to declare. That a gentleman occupying the proud position of Mr. Watkin would perpetrate a statement which everybody knows to be as false as the fabric of a vision, seems almost incredible. We find that every Parliament refuses to coerce Newfoundland and P. E. Island into that Union; and why?

Because the people of these Colonies were opposed to the measure, and therefore in common justice, and in accordance with constitutional usage they refused to draw them into the operation of this Act. We find the same principle observed with reference to this province. The preamble of the Act shows that the Parliament believed the people of Nova Scotia were actually in favor of the Union. Therefore I believe if the statesmen of Great Britain had not been egregiously deceived, they would not have placed on the records of the country an Act taking away the rights and privileges of the free people of Nova Scotia.

I find the hon. member for Cumberland entertaining the same opinion that I hold, and I believe if we could understand the real feelings of the hon member for Inverness, you would find him dissatisfied with the manner in which the scheme was passed. We find this feeling cropping out in one of the amendments moved by the hon member, where he says, "however desirable it may have been to leave the question to the people," but occupying the position which he does, it would not have done for him to have made any greater admission. Are there not gentlemen here who remember the constitutional questions that arose in 1861? Two or three certainly will recollect when the present Equity Judge and Dr. Tupper urged upon the Earl of Mulgrave to dissolve the Legislature because the people were opposed to the government. Petition after petition was brought into the House in favor of a dissolution, although the government had a majority in this body. The hon. member for Cumberland expressly said that it was unconstitutional and wrong for any government to bring down to the house an important measure when it was evident that they were in a minority in the country. In January 1861 Dr. Tupper wrote a letter to the Earl of Mulgrave, pressing him to dissolve the House, in which he says:

"Several large and influental constituencies have condemned the present government, and have prayed Your Excellency for that redress which as the representative of Her Majesty, you are empowered to afford when imperatively demanded, in order to preserve that *fundamental principle of the Constitution* of this Colony, which requires that the government shall be conducted in accordance *with the well understood wishes of the people.*"

That is not all. Writing to the Duke of Newcastle, the then Colonial Secretary, the hon. gentlemen said:—

"Having proved to His Excellency that he has a Ministry around him acting in defiance of the well-understood wishes of the people, I consider that there is but one course that can justly be pursued. And, sir, if the people of this country are treated with contempt, if they are deprived of the true constitutional mode of expressing their opinion, *there is but one resort left to them.* Then the constitutional opposition in this House would be driven to assume a duty which they have never yet been called upon to assume—a course shewn by Earl Grey to be open to us. Sir, the moment so flagrant a violation of our rights was permited as the continuance in power of a government after it had been shewn by the clearest evidence that it had been shorn of its strength, not only the people of Nova Scotia, but of British North America, and wherever free institutions and the principles of liberty are upheld, would rise and vindicate thier rights by that determined struggle for freedom, which must ever ensue when an attempt is made to put down the liberties of freemen."

Again he says:—

"Destitute of representation in the Parliament of Britain, with our most eminent men systematically excluded from the highest position in their own country, and for which their colonial experience and training eminently fits them, it is impossible that the free spirit of the inhabitants of British North America can fail soon to be *aroused to the necessity* of asserting their undouted right to have their country governed in accordance with the *well understood wishes of the people.*"

Now, I ask the hon. member for Inverness to explain why it should be constitutional to appeal to the people under the circumstances in question, and unconstitutional to do so in reference to a measure far transcending in importance any question ever before submitted in this country?

The hon. member for Inverness said he laughed at the idea of referring to American intimations as a guide for the country. Now we find the hon. member for Cumberland making use of expressions like these in the same letter which he addressed to the Duke of Newcastle:—

"The people of this Provinc have been content, my Lord, to pay a salary of fifteen thousand dollars to a Governor sent from England, besides a large additional sum to keep up his establishment, while the State of Maine, with twice our population, has the *privilege of electing* from among her people, and pay him fifteen thousand dollars."

The hon. gentleman has endeavored to ridicule the legal knowledge evidenced by the Attorney General. He has treated the observations made with reference to the right of the British Parliament to pass any Act touching the constitution of this country as futile. He declares that the British Parliament, whenever they thought proper, have changed the constitution of these colonies. He has referred to Australia and Jamaica; but I ask him if the constitution in these colonies was not changed in accordance with the wishes of the people? Was it not done in Jamaica when it became necessary for Imperial interests to destroy the constitution after a rebellion and bloodshed? Was it not done in accordance with the wishes of the people? And therefore there is no parallel in the cases whatever. We find that this country occupies a very different position from Great Britain—the constitution of the latter has grown to maturity by degrees—it has reached its present position by precedent and custom with unlimited power; but a constitution like ours is of a very different character, and therefore the analogy which he has drawn from the repeal of the Corn Laws, and the Catholic Emancipation, is without application to the case we are now considering. Our constitution is based upon that charter which the Hon. Attorney General referred to, and a though it may have been materially changed by despatches from the Colonial Secretary—although it may be altered by the action of this parliament—yet having a charter from the Crown limiting our authority, our rights and privileges cannot be taken away from us without the consent of the people.

The hon. member has also refered to the question of mines and minerals, which have for a long time occupied the attention of the people of this country. He has told you that before that question was settled, the people of Nova Scotia had to resort to the Imperial Parliament, and there obtain a surrender of their rights. I have under my hand the decision of learned English Counsel, taken at the instances of the House, where the principle laid down by the Attorney General is fairly established, that this country belonged to the Crown—that it was not held in trust for the people of Nova Scotia, but purely in Sovereignty. The hon. member Inverness knows the decision to which I refer.

Mr. BLANCHARD—I never said a word about the question of Mines and Minerals; I only refered to the Civil List.

Mr. SMITH—The principle, however, is the same in both cases. The decision in question reads thus:—

"In the sense in which we understand the first question, we are of opinion that the Crown does not hold the mines and minerals of the Province of Nova Scotia for the benefit of its subjects there settled, for we think that the mines and minerals in question, were so absolutely vested in the Sovereign, as that he might dispose of them in such manner as he should think fit, without any limit to his discretion. We therefore are of opinion, that the grant of all the mines and minerals to an individual for sixty years was not an undue exercise of the prerogative."

They state thirdly: "We see no reason for thinking that such warrant, or any grant or lease made, or to be made under its authority, would be subject to be revoked *quia improvide emenavit*, or any other cause"

In conclusion they state: "Our opinion on the whole case rests upon the principle that the mines and minerals in question belonged to the Crown in absolute and uncontrolled dominion and property, and that they were therefore disposable at the pleasure of the Crown. It would be vain to attempt to cite cases upon the several questions put to us, but upon the general principle on which our opinion is founded, the observations of Lord Mansfield, in Campbell *vs.* Hall, 1st Cowper, 204, may be referred to."

Now it will be seen that these legal gentlemen deliberately came to the conclusion that this country is held as the exclusive property of the Crown. They say the Crown has passed a charter, granting to this country certain rights, and it is unconstitutional, under that charter, for the Parliament of England to overthrew our constitution without the consent of the people

The hon. member made another reference to show the power of Parliament, turning our attention to the case of Cape Breton. Every one knows that that case bears not the slightest resemblance to the position which we occupy. That country had no independent Parliament; the views of its people were not represented in a legislature of their own. Consequently, when the hon. member produced such a case, he must be perfectly aware that his ground is untenable. He also made several references to the United States, and one would suppose that he had, all of a sudden, become perfectly horrified at democratic institutions. He told the Attorney General that he had always known him as "the Tory of Tories." I have always heard the hon. leader of the opposition spoken of as being associated with the democratic party of the country. I have always understood that he owes the postion which he occupies, and the "flourishing practice to which he referred, to the influence of that element, which he was seeking to advance, and which professed to regard most highly the rights and interests of the people.

The hon. member told us with what admiration he views "the wealth and intelligence" of the metropolis. We have heard *ad nauseam* about the wealth and intelligence of Halifax. Is all the wealth and intelligence of Nova Scotia concentrated in the metropolis? I can look around the streets of Halifax and point to men of both wealth and intelligence who are arrayed with us in the ranks of the great anti-confederate party; therefore it is idle for the hon. member to boast that he has the wealth and intelligence of the country on his side. However much we may acknowledge the influence of the metropolis, yet throughout Nova Scotia there are men of as good character and as high intelligence to be found even among the laboring classes as many who roll in their carriages through the streets of Halifax. The men even of that class, who bring to the subject sound intelligence and practical common sense, are capable as he is of knowing when their rights are trampled on, or the prosperity of the country jeopardized, and is it to be said that these men, because the wealth and intelligence of the city are arrayed against them, are not to be consulted on a change of the constitution? No sir, when I look around these benches I see a good indication of where the intelligence of the country is, and when I know the gentlemen who reflect here the opinions of the people of Nova Scotia, I wonder to hear the hon. member for Inverness, occupy the position which he does, as the solitary voice to be raised in the advocacy of the confederate party, undertaking to say that that is a *great* party. I know not in what it is great, unless it is because it represents the wealth and intelligence of Halifax? There are men in this community whom I respect, but when the interests of the people come into contact with the influence of Halifax, I feel it is time that their representatives should stand up and advocate the interests and propound the principles which we do to-day; that before the constitution is changed or overturned it is incumbent and necessary to consult the feelings of the people. Does not everybody know that the question never was laid before the people in a tangible shape, until the last election, although it may have been discussed as a purely theoretical question through the press? I undertake to say that previous to the passage of the Quebec Scheme, there were not a hundred men in Nova Scotia who could tell you what confederation meant, in reference to the interests of the Province. I believe in my heart, having an abiding faith and confidence in the British public, and believing England to be governed by able and honorable men, that when they come to know the position of our country, and the views of its representatives, and when they are told that they have acted on false information, no matter how valuable they may regard the union in the light of Imperial interests, the British Parliament will acknowledge that a wrong has been done, and will resolve to meet out to us the same measure of justice and fair play which has been shown to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

On what principle can the British Government keep Nova Scotia in this Confederation? If she is to be united against her wishes, why should not Newfoundland be dragged in? It would be doubly insulting when we represent our views respectfully to England, that she should coerce us into a Union simply calculated to alienate our feelings towards the mother country. It would be unfair in me to do more than lay my views briefly before the House after the length of time that this debate has occupied. The hon member who preceded me has left me but little to say, having met many of the arguments which I was prepared to answer. I will not therefore travel over matters with which every member must be familiar. I would say, however, to the hon member for Inverness, that if he propounds, for a moment, the idea that the people of this Province intend to depart from the position they have taken; if he believes for an instant that we are misrepresenting the views of our constituents, he is greatly mistaken. It was said in the House of Commons that a reaction had taken place in this country in favor of Confederation. That is not the case. I have conversed with my constituents up to a recent period, and I can assure you that if it were possible to intensify the disgust of the people at this Union which has been forced on us, that disgust has been increased an intensified. The people have seen, sir, since the passage of this Act during the late session, that the interests of Nova Scotia are in the hands of men who, however faithful in the discharge of their duties, are unable to resist successfully the majority that would trample on their rights. One of the amendments says that the Act has not been long enough in operation to judge fairly of its results. That reminds me of the stable door been lockad after the steed has been stolen, it is to late too seek for relief when the Act has become irrevocable. Now is the time for the people to act, and nobly are they doing so. Nobly will they continue to act—faithfully and loyally—to the crown, but with the most solemn and serious earnestness that ever affected the minds of a high-spirited people. They are determined to resist at every sacrifice but that of their allegiance. Is it to be wondered at that such is the opposition to the scheme? Is there a man here who, in the silence of his own chamber, has not had his blood boiled by the remembrance of the manner in which he and his countrymen has been treated.

True it is that one boon has been extended to Nova Scotia by this Confederation Act—the power to tax ourselves. Precious ungrateful Nova Scotians. Why do you not go down upon your marow bones and give thanks for this beneficence? Ah, by the way, there is another boon—we get 80 cents a head to console us for our position. When I contrast this picture with the revenues which have been taken from us, I am reminded of the man who, after stealing a pig, gave away the tail in charity to satisfy his conscience. It was said that the delegates were going to England to ask the British Government to adopt republican institutions, but I think it would be hard for the hon member to shew the act constitutional and right by either British or republican authorities. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I sincerely desire a repeal of the union, and I trust that the gentlemen, whoever they may be, who are entrusted with the delicate and responsible duty of going to the authorities of England, and of placing the case of our people before them, asking them under all the circumstances to restore us to our original position, and to repeal so much of the act as affects Nova Scotia, will do their duty faithfully and with a due sense of the responsibility resting upon them. I well know that the eyes of Nova Scotia will be upon them, the heart of the country is with them, the prayers of thousands will ascend to Heaven for the accomplishment of their object. I ask the delegates to go firmly and independently, and to tell our sovereign that the people of this country are true and faithful to her throne and her throne—that we still cherish and revere the mother country, around which so many historic recollections cluster—that there is not a Christian mother within the land who does not teach her child to lisp the name of our Gracious Sovereign with admiration and respect; but that nothing will satisfy the people of this country until they are placed in the position which their honor and interests require by the repeal of an act passed in defiance of their wishes, and in derogation of their rights.

MR. NORTHUP'S SPEECH.

Mr. NORTHUP addressed the House as follows:—I rise for the first time to address this House with a great deal of embarrassment, and I trust that if I shall say anything which is not strictly within parliamentary rule, that I may be pardoned. I feel that the question now before this Legislature is one of rare importance to the people of this country; every other question here to be under consideration in comparison with it sinks into insignificance. Wherever I look I see nothing but doubt and uncertainty as to the future. I know men who have spent many years in accumulating property, who are now anxious to learn what the future condition of this country will be before engaging largely in enterprise as they have accustomed to do. Under these circumstances, I feel that every gentleman in this house occupies a position of great responsibility—a responsibility which he must not and cannot avoid. As far as I am myself concerned, I shall endeavour to discharge my constituents and to my country as faithfully as I can. The hon. and learned leader of the case of Jamaica as analogous to our own, but he must be aware that when the bill in