

took a subsequent occasion to say on the floor of the House that now that the Imperial Act had become the law of the land, he was prepared to bow to its authority and give his best aid to carry on the legislation of the country under the new circumstances in which we were placed. While Mr. Campbell who made this statesmanlike and patriotic declaration was returned by acclamation, Mr. Annand, who pledged himself to repeal, was defeated at the polls. I ask my hon. friend who has blamed the unionists so severely for acting without the question having been fairly submitted to the people, how he can, in the presence of facts like these, use the power he obtained for the purpose of endeavouring to destroy and break down this union before giving it that fair trial to which he stands pledged before the people? Can my hon. friend expect that the Imperial Parliament who passed this act with a petition against it, signed according to Mr. Annand's declaration by "about 40,000 petitioners," break faith with this great confederation at the instance of representatives who only succeeded in polling about half that number of electors, and upon the pledge that they would give this measure a "fair trial?"

No man is in a worse position to urge objections to the mode in which this measure was passed than the hon. member who has just addressed the House, as it is well known that he spent years in advocating a system of responsible government by which the affairs of the country should be controlled according to the wishes of the majority of the people's representatives. What guarantee can my hon. friend give the Imperial Government that the same reaction will not take place in Nova Scotia that was witnessed in New Brunswick, where one year an overwhelming majority of the electors declared against the union and the next a still larger majority polled their votes in favour of it? I am not without hope, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend will yet reconsider his position on this question, and assume the same statesmanlike and patriotic position which the former opponents of union representing New Brunswick have taken. I read with great pleasure the manly declaration made by my hon. friend (Mr. Anglin) at Montreal the other night, a declaration that did honour to the head and the heart of that gentleman—that although he had been conscientiously opposed to the union, he was now prepared to give his aid to work it out in the manner best calculated to promote the good of our common country. Sir, I would rejoice to see my hon. friend from Nova Scotia in the same way to assume a position that would enable the country to avail itself of the great ability he possesses. He says that the Government could not give him or those who act with him anything that he could honourably accept. It would, of course, be impossible for any Government to strengthen the hands of those who declare their intention to break down the constitution of the country whenever they obtain the power. But my hon. friend must see that his position renders it equally impossible for him to aid a constitutional opposition in the responsible and important Parliamentary functions they are called upon to discharge, as nothing would necessarily paralyse an opposition so completely as being associated with parties hostile to the constitution of the country and anxious to destroy it.