

in England, but here it never is fought and never will be, until we have a representation in Parliament or until the Legislature votes £5,000 for a luminous agitation of the question. I yield to the association all that I have ever said in its favour. I would do it justice to-morrow had I power to do injury, but I do not believe that one Nova Scotian within the walls of Parliament would do more to reclaim our natural rights in a single year, than the Legislature could do, by remonstrances in seven.

Take the question of the fisheries. Your fisheries, including all the wealth that is within three marine miles of a coast fronting upon the ocean for five thousand miles, are at this moment subject of negotiation. What have you got to do with it? What influence have you? Who represents you in London or in Washington? or discusses the matter in your behalf? The British Minister, pressed upon by the United States on the one hand, and by the prospect of a war with Russia on the other, may at this moment be giving away our birthright. Tell me not of your protest against such an act of spoliation. It would amount to nothing. Once committed, the act would be irrevocable, and your most valuable property would be bartered away for ever. Sir, I know what gives influence to England, what confers power here—the right and the opportunity of public discussion. Your fisheries, if given away to-morrow would scarcely provoke a discussion in the House of Commons; but place ten North Americans there, and no minister would dare to bring down a treaty by which they were sacrificed. How often have questions in which we took a deep and abiding interest been decided without our knowledge, consultation or consent? I am a free trader, and I am glad that unrestricted commerce is the settled policy of the mother country, as it is of this. But can I forget how often the minister of the day has brought and carried out commercial changes which have prostrated our interests, but in the adoption or modification of which we have had no voice? Sir, with our free Legislatures, and the emulation and ambitious spirit of our people, such a state of things can not last for ever. Is there a man who hears me, that believes that the question of the fisheries can be settled well, or ought to be settled at all, without those who are most interested, being represented in the negotiation?

What is taking place at this moment in the old world invests this argument with painful significance. Notes and diplomatic messages are flying from St. Petersburg to Vienna, and from Vienna to London. A despot is about to break the peace of the world, under pretence of protecting the Greek religion. A fleet of Turkish ships has been sunk in the Black Sea. The Cunard steamers have been taken off the mail routes to carry troops to the Mediterranean. To-morrow may come a declaration of war; and when it comes, our six thousand vessels, scattered over the ocean, are at the mercy of England's enemies. Have we been consulted? Have we had a voice in the Cabinet, in Parliament, or in any public department by whose action our fleet is jeopardized? No, sir, we have exercised no more influence upon negotiations—the issue of which must peril our whole mercantile marine—than if we had had in danger but a single bark canoe.

I do not complain of the statesmen of England. I believe that Lord John Russell and the other members of the Cabinet are doing their best for the honour of old England, and for the welfare of the Empire. But I will not admit that they have the right, at the present day, to deal with subjects which so largely affect the interests and touch the feelings of two million five hundred thousand people, scattered over millions of square miles of land, whose canvas whitens every sea—without our being consulted.

(Mr. Howe next turned to the United Services, and showed how slight was the chance of British Americans to rise in the army and navy. Their brethren at home had more money to purchase; they had all the Parliamen-