

SPEECH  
OF  
THE HON. JOSEPH HOWE  
ON  
THE UNION  
OF THE  
NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES  
AND ON  
THE RIGHT OF BRITISH COLONISTS  
TO  
REPRESENTATION IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT,  
AND TO  
PARTICIPATION IN THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENTS AND  
DISTINCTIONS OF THE EMPIRE

---

1855.

REPRINTED BY

W. C. & J. PENNY, FROME.

1885.



The following Speech was delivered in the Representative Branch of the Legislature of Nova Scotia on the 11th of March, 1854, on a Resolution, moved by the Hon. James W. Johnson, the Leader of the Opposition. Though republished in Canada and in other Provinces, and referred to by some of the English Newspapers at the time, it has never before been printed in England. The organization of the British Empire, under some system by which, in cases of emergency, all its strength may be put forth, would seem to be a topic that recent events should instruct us to ponder. The Russian feeling evinced by the Press and People of the United States, contrasted as it has been with the fine spirit displayed by the British Americans throughout the war, ought to induce the Mother Country to draw more closely the ties which bind her to her friends, and to accord to them the privileges, without the enjoyment of which, it is quite clear that some of the changes that Mr. Howe anticipates may speedily come to pass.



## SPEECH.

---

MR. CHAIRMAN,

HAD the Government brought this question here, my Hon. Friend from Londonderry might have charged upon us the selection of an inappropriate season, or disregard of the pressure and strain of public business already tasking the industry of this Assembly. But, Sir, this resolution has been brought here by the Hon. and learned leader of the Opposition, and we are challenged to discuss it. Perhaps if we had introduced the measure, it might not have been met in the spirit which I trust we shall display. One half of the House might have fancied that some sinister design lurked within the Resolution, and the supposed interests of party might have combined them against it. But I desire to treat the learned leader of the Opposition with more courtesy—the resolution with the consideration it deserves; and I trust that the day is yet far distant in Nova Scotia, when questions of transcendant importance will be entangled in the meshes of party, or fail to challenge, no matter whence they emanate, earnest and thoughtful investigation in this Assembly. Sir, I differ with my Hon. Friend from Londonderry, and with all those

who are disposed to treat this subject lightly. Come from whose hand it may, the resolution before the committee opens up for discussion the broadest field, the noblest subject, ever presented to the consideration of this Legislature. A day, or even a week, may be well spent upon such a theme. If, Sir, such topics were oftener presented here, our ideas would expand beyond the charmed, it may be, but the contracted circle of party disputations ; our debates would assume a higher tone, and the hopes and aspirations of our people, clustering around their firesides, would point to interests more enduring, than even the result of half our controversies, some poorly paid office, or paltry Provincial distinction.

Sir, I regret not the time which this question will engross, but my inability to do it justice.—When the Prophets and Orators of old were about to discourse of the destinies of nations, they retired to the mountains, or by the streams, to meditate—they communed, in the abundance of their leisure, with God above, and caught their inspiration alike from the tranquillity which enabled them to penetrate the dispensations of His Providence, as from the phenomena of nature all around them, and which tinged with beauty the “thoughts that breathe, and words that burn,” which have come streaming down, like lines of light, even to the present hour. They were often untrammelled by daily duties, and human obligations. Borne

down by official labour and responsibilities of various kinds, I feel that for me, at least, the occasion of this discussion is inauspicious. Believe me, Sir, that my obligations to my Sovereign as her sworn Councillor—to the head of the Government, as his constitutional adviser, and to the Party with which I act, press heavily upon me. But yet rising with the magnitude of this great theme, I shall endeavour to catch its inspiration, remembering only that I am a Nova Scotian—the son of a loyalist—a North American—a true subject to the Queen, but one whose allegiance, to be perfect, must include every attribute of manhood, every privilege of the Empire.

Sir, I wish that my leisure had been greater, that I might have brought before you the ripened fruits of meditation, the illustrative stores of history which research only can accumulate. In no vain spirit do I wish also that the sentiments which I am about to utter might be heard and pondered, not only as they will be by those who inhabit half this Continent, but by members of the British Parliament, by Imperial Statesmen—by the Councillors who stand around, and by the gracious Sovereign who sits upon the throne. Perhaps, this may not be. Yet I believe that the day is not distant, when our sons, standing in our places, trained in the enjoyment of public liberty, by those who have gone before them, and compelled to be Statesmen, by the throbbing of their British blood, and by the

necessities of their position, will be heard across the Atlantic, and will utter to each other, and to all the world, sentiments, which to day, Mr. Chairman may fall with an air of novelty upon your ear. I am not sure, Sir, that even out of this discussion may not arise a spirit of union and elevation of thought that may lead North America to cast aside the Colonial habiliments, to put on National aspects, to assert National claims, and prepare to assume National obligations. Come what may, I do not hesitate to express the hope that, from this day, she will aspire to consolidation as an integral portion of the Realm of England, or assert her claims to a National existence.

Sir, the first question which we men of the North must put to ourselves, is—Have we a territory broad enough of which to make a Nation? At the risk of travelling over some of the ground trodden yesterday by a learned member for Annapolis, I think it can be shewn that we have. Beneath, around and behind us, stretching away from the Atlantic to the Pacific, are 4,000,000 square miles of territory. All Europe, with its family of nations, contains but 3,708,000, or 292,000 miles less. The United States include 3,330,572 square miles, or 760,128 less than British America. Sir, I often smile, when I hear some vain-glorious Republican exclaiming:

“ No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,  
The whole unbounded Continent is ours.”



forgetting that the largest portion does not belong to him at all, but to us, the men of the North, whose descendants will control its destinies for ever. Sir, the whole globe contains but 37,000,000 square miles. We, North-Americans, living under the British flag, have one-ninth of the whole, and this ought to give us "ample room and verge enough" for the accommodation and support of a countless population. It is true, that all this territory is not yet politically organized, but

Canada includes	400,000 square miles,
New Brunswick	28,000
Nova Scotia	19,000
Prince Edward Island	2,000
Newfoundland	37,000

---

Making in all 486,000 square miles, which have settled land marks, and are controlled by Provincial Legislation. Throwing out of consideration the unorganized territory behind, let me shew you by comparison what the rest includes. The great province of Canada is equal in size to Great Britain, France and Prussia. Charmed by her Classic recollections, how apt are we to magnify everything in the old world, and to imagine that Providence has been kind to her alone. Yet the noble St. Lawrence is equal in proportions to the Nile—the great granary of the East, which, from the days of the patriarchs, has fed millions with its produce. Take the Italian's Po, the Frenchman's Rhone

the Englishman's Thames, the German's Rhine, and the Spaniard's Tagus, and roll them all into one channel, and you then only have a stream equal to the St. Lawrence. The great lakes of Canada are larger in volume than the Caspian Sea, and the gulf of St. Lawrence, (with which we are so familiar that we forget what it is) contains a surface of 100,000 square miles, and is as large as the Black Sea, on which the proud fleets of four hostile nations may at this very moment be engaged. Accustomed to think and feel as Colonists, it is difficult for us to imagine that the Baltic, illustrated by Nelson's achievements and Campbell's verse, is not something different from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and yet it is not, Its dimensions are about the same; its climate rigorous; its coasts originally sterile, and the sea kings and warriors who came out of it, made of no better stuff than are the men who shoot seals on the ice flakes of Newfoundland, till farms on the green hills of Pictou, or fell trees in the forests of New Brunswick.

But, Sir, let us confine our attention for a few moments to the maritime provinces alone. Of these you rarely hear in the mother country. If an Englishman thinks of North America at all, he divides it between Canada and the United States. Except in some sets and circles, chiefly mercantile, you rarely hear of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, or Newfoundland. The learned member for Annapolis truly described the Colonial

condition when he stated, that in the estimation of our fellow subjects at home, a Colonist is nothing. But, with God's blessing, we will wipe away the invidious distinction. The maritime provinces alone cover 86,000 square miles of territory. They are half as large again as England and Scotland together. They are as large as Holland, Greece, Belgium, Portugal and Switzerland all put together. New Brunswick alone is as large as the Kingdom of Sardina, and even Nova Scotia is larger than Switzerland.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with genuine pleasure to the member for Annapolis, when he spoke, as he did yesterday, of the resources of Nova Scotia. I do not listen to him when, misguided by passion, he disparages his country that he may have a fling at its government. I have said that Nova Scotia is as large as Switzerland, a country which has maintained its freedom for ages, surrounded by European despotisms. If it be answered that Switzerland owes her national existence to her inaccessible mountains, then I say that Nova Scotia is as large as Holland, which with a level surface, did the same.

The Hollanders, who almost won from the sea a country no larger than ours, defied the whole power of the Spanish monarchy, swept the British channel with their brooms, and, for a century, monopolized the rich commerce of the Eastern Islands which they had subdued by their enterprise and valour.

Our country is as large as theirs and let us not be told then that we are getting on stilts, when we either point to the resources which past industry has but imperfectly developed, or foreshadow that future which looms before us, so full of hope and promise. Why, Sir, even little Prince Edward Island is larger than all the Ionian Islands put together, and yet they are more thought of by European Diplomats than are our Provinces, only because they sometimes indulge themselves in the dignity of insurrection.

But, it may be said, what is extent of territory if it be a howling Wilderness? If you have not the population, you can aspire to no national existence. Let us see, Sir, if we have not men enough to assert and to maintain any status to which we may aspire.

Canada contains	1,842,264 inhabitants
New Brunswick	200,000
Nova Scotia	300,000
Newfoundland	100,000
Prince Edward Island	75,000
	<hr/>
	2,517,264.

Yet, after all, it may be retorted, what are two millions and a half of people? Not many, indeed, but every thing must be tested by comparison. What have two and a half millions of people done? That is the question. Take Scotland for example. She has but 2,620,000 now. Yet will any man

assert, that if Scotland desired a distinct national existence, if the old Lion which "Punch" affects to laugh at were really angry, that Scotsmen would hesitate to unfurl the old flag, and draw the broad claymore?

True it is, that Scotland has not her separate Legislature, but she has what we have not, and to this point I shall shortly turn the attention of the Committee, her fifty-three members to represent her interests in the Imperial Parliament. British America, with an equal population, has not one.

Turn to our own continent, and, by way of Example, take the State of Ohio. She has but a million and a half of people, yet she has not only her State Legislature and government as we have, but sends nineteen members to the National Congress. She is a sovereign State, but she forms a part of a great confederacy, and her nineteen members guard her interests in the discussions which touch the whole, as ours are not guarded in the great Council of the Empire of which we form a part. Will North Americans long be satisfied with less than every State of the Union claims?

Turning again to Europe, we find Saxony, that centuries ago gave conquerors and Kings to England, has but 1,757,000 inhabitants.—Wurtemberg, with about the same population, is a kingdom, with its European Potentate at its head—its Court, its standing army, its foreign alliances. Denmark, which also gave Kings and ravages to England, and

has maintained her national position from the days of Canute to our own, has but 2,212,074 inhabitants. Yet her Court is respected, her alliance Courted ; she maintains a peace establishment of 25,000 men which is raised to 75,000 in time of war. Look at Greece :

"The Isles of Greece—the Isles of Greece,  
Where burning Sappho loved and sung."

Greece that broke the power of Xerxes, and for arts, arms, oratory, poetry and civilization, stands preeminent among ancient states. Greece, at this moment, has her King who reigns over but 936,000 subjects. But, Sir, does extent of territory make a Nation? Never. Numbers of people? No. What then? The spirit which animates—the discipline that renders them invincible. There were but 300 men at the Pass of Thermopylæ ; yet they stopped an army, and their glory streams down the page of History, while millions of slaves have lived and died and are forgotten. Glance at Portugal ; she numbers less than three and a half millions (3,412,000), and yet, when she had a much smaller population, her mariners explored the African coast ; found their way round the stormy Cape, and founded in the East a political and religious ascendancy which lasted for a hundred years. We, North Americans, sit down and read the exploits of Gustavus Vasa, or of Charles the Twelfth of Sweden. We wonder at the prowess of those Norman adventurers who carved out kingdoms with their conquering swords, and

founded dynasties in France, Italy, and England. Yet we are apt to forget that Sweden and Norway together have but 4,306,650 souls, and that the mingled blood of the Scandinavian and the Saxon courses through our veins. The men who are felling pine trees upon the Saguenay, or catching fish in our Baltic, would make good sea-kings to-morrow, if plunder and not commerce were the order of the day. Let us in heaven's name, then, throw aside our stupid devotion to historic contemplation, and look to realities of our own position fairly in the face.

Sir, I have spoken of Switzerland, but I forgot one striking fact; that with a population less than that of British America at this moment, she has not only maintained her nationality, but has sent armed warriors to fight the battles of half the States of Europe.

Let me now turn your attention to South America. Here we find a cluster of States, certainly not more intelligent or more deserving, but all challenging, and enjoying a higher status than our own. Let us group them :

Venezuela	1,000,000 people
New Granada	1,678,000
Equador	600,000
Peru	1,373,000
Bolivia	1,700,000
Chili	1,200,000
Buenos Ayres	675,000

Some of these countries are, in education and political knowledge, beneath contempt, not one of them contains two millions of people, yet all of them not only manage or mismanage their internal affairs, but form alliances, exchange diplomatic representatives, and control their foreign relations. Is there a British Statesman, then, with a head on his shoulders, who, looking at what North America is and must become, but must feel the necessity for binding her to the empire by some enlightened provision for the protection of her material interests, for the gratification of her legitimate ambition?

Sir, a country must have resources as well as breadth of soil. Are we destitute of these? I think not. Between the extremes of cold and heat lies a broad region peculiarly adapted for the growth of wheat. About half of this, the peninsula formed by the great lakes, belong to Canada. The soil of Lower Canada, of New Brunswick, and of Prince Edward's Island, if less fertile, is still productive. Boundless forests supply us with materials for ships, and with an inexhaustible export. Are there no mineral resources? I believe that the riches of the copper mines of Lake Superior have scarcely yet been dreamed of. We know that, in the Lower Provinces, we have iron and coal in abundance. I have spoken of the St. Lawrence, but have we no other navigable rivers? What shall we say of the noble Ottawa, the beautiful Richelieu, the deep Saguenay? what of the broad Miramichi, of the



lovely St. John? Nova Scotia, being nearly an island, has no mighty rivers, but she has what is better than them all—open harbours throughout the year. She has old ocean wrapping her round with loving embracements, drawing down from every creek, and cove, and harbour, her children to share the treasures of an exhaustless fishery, or to carry commodities across his bosom. Though not large how beautiful and diversified are the lakes and streams which every where glad the eye, and give to our country water carriage and water power in every section of the interior. Already Nova Scotia has shewn what she can draw from a soil of generous fertility, what she can do upon the sea. Sir, I am not a prophet, nor a son of a prophet, and my head will be cold long before my prediction is verified. But I know that the day must come when Nova Scotia, small as she is, will maintain half a million of men upon the sea. Already is she becoming remarked and remarkable for her enterprise. Taking her tonnage, applying to all the other Provinces her ratio of increase since 1846, they collectively own 6139 vessels, measuring 453,000 tons. We are perpetually told of the progress made by the Great Republic, and the learned member for Annapolis ascribes all their prosperity to their union. But the North American provinces have not been united, and yet they own as much tonnage as the fifteen of the United States which I am about to name.

I take North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, and California ; and, altogether, they own only 453,946 tons of shipping, or but 946 tons more than the five North American provinces which have no union—no national existence—no control over their foreign relations—no representation in the national councils of the empire to which they belong. I may be told that some of these States raise more corn, cotton, or tobacco, or have more manufactures than we have. I care not for these. Since the world began, the nation that had the most ships, had the most influence. Maritime countries ever take the lead in freedom, in commerce, in Wealth, and true civilization. Sir, let not the member for Annapolis, while he directs our attention to higher objects, fail to see in the maritime position which his country has achieved, unmistakable evidence of her energy and enterprise. And let it ever be borne in mind that the United States were a century in advance of us in point of time, and they came into possession of all the property that the loyalists left behind them. But, Sir, take the combined tonnage of North America, and you will find that it equals that of Holland, Belgium, and the two Sicilies, three of the maritime powers of Europe. Who then will say that we have not a mercantile marine wherewith to endow a nation ?

Scotland maintains upon the Clyde the greatest manufactory of ships in the world. Vessels glide up and down that beautiful stream like swallows round a barn. Scarcely a moment passes, but richly laden vessels arrive or depart with domestic manufactures or the products of foreign climes. Go into the factories where the mighty engines for her steamers are wrought and the noise of the fabled Cyclops' cave is realised. The roar of the waters behind Niagara Falls is scarcely more incessant or more deafening. And yet, Sir, the tonnage of Scotland is only a trifle more than that of the North American provinces. Her whole commercial marine included but 522,222 tons in 1853.

At the risk of being tedious, let me now turn your attention to two or three curious historical facts illustrative of this argument. Since we were boys we have all read of the Spanish Armada. We all have heard of Queen Elizabeth reviewing her land and sea forces, and preparing, with grave doubts in her royal mind, to defend her sea-girt isle against the foreign invaders. This was in 1588. We read in the old chronicles that England then owned but 135 merchant ships. But then some were "of great size," some 400 tons, and a few reaching 500 tons! If my friend George McKenzie, of New Glasgow, had dashed into the midst of the maiden Queen's navy with his 1444 ton ships, I fear that he would have shaken her nerves and astonished our forefathers, of whose exploits we are so ena-

moured, that we never think of our own. Sir, in 1702, the mercantile marine of England and Wales included only 261,229 tons, and even as late as 1750, not a century ago, it was but 433,922, less than the tonnage of North America at this moment. And yet for ten centuries prior to that period they had maintained an independent national existence.

Let me now enquire, Mr. Chairman, whether or not we have other elements upon which to rest our claims. Is there any reason to fear that our ships may rot in the docks for want of commodities to carry, or of commercial activity? Look to our imports for 1853.

Canada	.	.	£8,200,640
Nova Scotia	.	.	1,194,175
New Brunswick, 1852	.	.	1,110,600
Newfoundland, 1852	.	.	795,738
Prince Edward Island	.	.	298,543

---

£11,499,697

The Imports of the whole United States in 1791, sixteen years after they had established their independence, only amounted to \$52,000,000, but a trifle over what ours are at the present time. Yet with that limited amount of commerce they had gone through a bloody and expensive war with one of the foremost nations of the world, whose Statesmen unfortunately still go on dreaming that they can keep continents filled with freemen, without making any provision for their incorporation into the Realm,

or for securing to them any control over their foreign relations.

Let me now turn your attention to the exports of British America.

Canada . . . . .	£5,570,000
Nova Scotia . . . . .	970,780
New Brunswick, 1852 . . . . .	796,335
Prince Edward Island (about) . . . . .	242,675
Newfoundland . . . . .	965,772
	<hr/>
	£8,545,562

And if we add to this amount another million for the value of new ships annually built and sold, we may take the whole at £9,545,562. Turn again to the statistics of the United States for 1791 and you will perceive, that sixteen years after they had declared their Independence, their exports amounted to but \$19,000,000, or about half the value of our own

Glance again at the Parent State, from whom we have learnt so much, and to whose history we always recur with interest. She occupies a proud position now, but what was she, commercially, a few centuries ago?

In 1354, when the Black Prince was carrying the conquering arms of England half over France, her exports were but £212,338, less than one fourth of what the exports of Nova Scotia are now. Turn to the period of the civil wars, when the people of England felt strong enough to dethrone a King, and cut off his head. When Cromwell's Puritan

sea warriors so raised the national character abroad that an Englishman was secure and respected in every quarter of the globe. How limited was the trade of England then. Even after the Restoration, so late as 1669, the exports of England and Wales only amounted to £2,063,294. I have another remarkable contrast for you, Mr. Chairman. In 1688, England secured, for the first time in her history, that system of acknowledged executive accountability which we call Responsible Government. Now from 1698 to 1701, the average exports of England and Wales did not exceed £6,449,394 less than our own by two millions, not more than ours were when we claimed and established the same political safeguards. The exports of England in 1850 had risen to £175,416,000. Expanding with the principles of unrestricted commerce, their value must now be above £200,000,000. While then we look back at her days of decrepitude, let us borrow hope from her small beginnings, and cherish the freedom and self-reliance which have ensured her prosperity.

But, it may be said, if you are going to look like a Nation—if you wish to put on the aspect of a great combined people, you must have some revenues to support your pretensions. Well, Sir, look at the revenues of these Provinces under Tariffs remarkably low.

Canada collects	.	.	£1,053,026
Nova Scotia	.	.	125,000
New Brunswick	.	.	180,000

Prince Edward Island	.	35,345
Newfoundland	.	84,323

---

£1,478,544.

We raise this amount now, without any extraordinary effort, with but a very inefficient force to collect it—without any body feeling that it is collected. The sum is not large, but other people, even in trying times, have had less, and see what they have done with what they had. Take the United States : at the Declaration of Independence the Revenue of the 13 States was but \$4,771,000, or £1,200,000, so that when those thirteen Colonies entered upon a mighty struggle with the Parent State they had less Revenue, by £300,000, than these five Provinces have now. But, Sir, we are told every now and then, that there is something in these northern regions adverse to the increase of population—that the Mayflower may flourish under our snow drifts, but that children will not—that, compared with the procreative powers of the “sunny south,” here they must be “few and far between.” I deny the soft impeachment. In the North marriage is a necessity of nature. In the South a man may do without a wife, but in the long cold nights of our winters he cannot sleep alone. Large, vigorous, healthy families, spring from feather beds in which Jack Frost compels people to lie close. The Hon. Member for Annapolis shewed us yesterday that the inhabitants of Canada have increased 68

per cent in 10 years. New Brunswick has advanced in about the same ratio, while Nova Scotia has quintupled her population in fifty years. At the same rate of increase Nova Scotia will count her population by millions before a new Century begins, and British America, taking every means of calculation into account, will probably then contain at least 10 millions of people.

If, then, Mr. Chairman, the British and Colonial Statesmen of the present day, cordially co-operating, do not incorporate this people into the British Empire, or make a nation of them, they will, long before their numbers have swelled so much, make a nation of themselves. Let me not be misunderstood, Sir, I shall say nothing here that I would not utter in the presence of the Queen. If disposed to declare our Independence to morrow, I do not believe that Her Majesty's Government would attempt to prevent us by force. If they did, they would fail. But what I want them to understand is this, that they lost one-half of this Continent from not comprehending it, and that just so sure as they expect the sentiment of loyalty to attach the other half to England, while the people of two small islands divide the distinctions and the influence of Empire among them, they will by and by be awakened by the peaceful organisation of a great country, whose inhabitants must be Britons in every sense of the word, or something more.

This may seem to be vain and arrogant language,



and I may be asked to support it by some reference to the *ultima ratio* of nations—physical force. Taking our population at two millions and a half, every fifth person should be able to draw a trigger, giving 500,000 men capable of bearing arms. Such a force would be powerless as an invading army, but in defence of these Provinces, invincible by any force that could be sent from abroad. Put into these men the spirit which animated the Greek, the Roman, the Dutchman, or the Swiss—let them feel that they are to protect their own hearthstones, and my word for it, the heroic blood which beats in their veins will be true to its characteristics. How often have we heard that our republican neighbours “down South” were going to overrun the Provinces. They have attempted it once or or twice, but have always been beaten out, and I do not hesitate to say, that the British Americans over whom the Old Flag flies, are able to defend every inch of their territory, even though Her Majesty’s troops were withdrawn. Indeed, Sir, if these 500,000 men are not able to defend our country, they deserve to be trodden down and made slaves of for the rest part of their natural lives.

Why, Sir, the standing army of Great Britain, charged with the defence of an Empire, including Provinces in every quarter of the globe, numbers but 120,000 men—in war this force is raised to 380,000, so that North America can muster for the defence of her own soil more men than are required

to maintain the honour of the Crown or the integrity of the Empire, at home and abroad. The whole standing army of the United States includes but 10,000 men, a number that we could call out in a day from our Eastern or Western Counties. Sir, my hon. friend from Pictou has only to sound the Pibroch in the County he represents, and 10,000 sons of the heather, or their descendants, would start up with musket and claymore, and I am not sure that there would not be Bagpipes enough found in the county to cheer on the warriors with the wild music of a martial nation. Why, Sir, the old thirteen colonies, sixteen years after their Declaration of Independence, deducting slaves, had but a little over three millions of people, while, at the declaration of independence in 1775 they had only 2,243,000, all told, or a smaller physical force than we have now.

My father used to tell me curious old stories of the Colonial Army that went to take Louisburgh. The whole New England force fitted out for that expedition was but 4,070 strong, just about as many as upon an emergency the honourable and learned Leader of the Opposition could turn out from the County of Annapolis. I should not like to see him clothed in more warlike habiliments than those he usually wears, but if he fancied military command, I am quite sure that he could enroll in his own county 4000, as daring and gallant warriors as went to the capture of Louisburgh. I do not think

that I am mistaken when I say, that the women of that country are as well worth fighting for as any on this continent, and that they can regale their defenders on the best cheese and apple pies that are to be found on either side of the line.

But we have all heard of another armament, some of the wrecks of which, on a calm day, may still be seen reposing at the bottom of Bedford Basin. I mean the great fleet fitted out by France for the conquest of the old colonies, under the Duc d'Anville. That fleet consisted of 70 sail, but it transported across the broad Atlantic but 3150 fighting men, an armament that this province alone should defeat in a single battle. At the battle of Bunker Hill there were but 3000 men on one side, and 2000 on the other: though there was a fine stand-up fight, the physical force engaged was nothing compared with the great political principles which have rendered the conflict immortal. I turn to Scotland again, to keep my Hon. friend from Pictou from going to sleep; he has heard of Bannockburn. Well, at that great battle, which secured the independence of his country, there were but 30,000 Scots engaged, about half as many men as Nova Scotia could arm to-morrow, if an emergency demanded an appeal to physical force.

In 1745 six thousand Scotchmen marched to Derby, in the very heart of England, "frightening the Isle from its propriety," and at the battle of Culloden, where the power of the Stuarts was

finally stricken down, there were but 4000 Scotchmen engaged, with muskets a great deal worse than those which we affect to despise.

At the Union of England and Scotland in 1707, the population of the latter country was but 1,050,000—her shipping not 50,000 tons, her revenue only £110,694. These facts are curious, for with such apparently straitened resources Scotland had maintained her national independence for ages—often fighting great battles, and passing through fiery trials. Where, Sir, is my friend the Financial Secretary? He wants something to lend dignity to the dull figures which he pores over day by day. Let me assure him that he need not fear to contrast his revenue of £125,000, with that of all Scotland at the Union. As late as 1766 the shipping of Scotland measured but 32,818 tons, but trifle over what it was a century before, while ours has increased enormously in the same period of time.

Historical events, which genius illustrates, dazzle us, as stage plays do, so that we rarely count the strength of the company, or measure the proportions of the scene. The Royalist army at Marston Moor mustered but 20,000 men, and yet the crown of England hung upon the issue. The Scots at Dunbar had but an equal number. Three such armies could be furnished by Nova Scotia alone. I am often amused at the flippant manner in which our old arms are spoken of, but at Naseby King

Charles had only "12 cannons," and they were not much better than those which are used for firing salutes at our mud fortresses in Guysborough and Lunenburg. Why, at the battle of Crescy there were but 30,000 Englishmen, about one half of the militia of Nova Scotia. At Poitiers there were but 12,000, fewer men than our friends from Cape Breton could muster without drawing a man from the main. Man for man then, we have, in North America, force enough to fight over again all the great battles that emblazon our national history—that is if the blood of the sires has descended to their sons, and if the mercurial atmosphere of the north, which ought to lend it vivacity, does not render it sluggish and inert.

You will be amused to find that Frederick the Great had only two and a half millions of people to develop his schemes of conquest, and to defy a world in arms. So that really nobody ought to be surprised if two and a half millions of British subjects, accustomed to the forms and securities for freedom, physically as enduring, and intellectually as intelligent, should at least ask for the same political status as the cockneys of London or the weavers of Manchester.

But, it is sometimes said by politicians, for party purposes, that all the world is advancing faster than we are. Is it so? Take Halifax for example. It numbers 25,000 inhabitants. How many cities in the whole United States are larger? Only twenty

one. Montreal has 60,000 people—there are only eight cities in the Republic more populous.

Let us now, Sir turn to another aspect of the question. If we have got the resources, the trade, the territory, the men and the cities to begin with, have we not got the Freedom? Look to your old monarchies or recent republics, and see if any of them have exhibited more of the love of liberty, or of capacity for securing its practical enjoyment than we have. The very tone of this debate proclaims Nova Scotia a free country; and that, whatever we may lack, we have the first best gift of God to man—freedom of thought, of speech, and of public discussion. The people of this country select every public officer from one end of it to the other, either directly or by their representatives, with one single exception. The Lieut.-Governor alone is appointed by the Imperial Government. We have more power over those who manage our affairs than they have in England, where the Peers are permanent—the Crown hereditary. Our people, in their Town meetings, do their local business—this Legislature forms the Administration and sustains it. We are as free as any people in Europe, Asia, or Africa; and as for America, I believe the principles of the British constitution secure a sounder state of rational freedom than the constitution of the Republic. And, Sir, let us bear this in mind—that these form the only cluster of colonies that have devised a system which makes freedom compatible with

allegiance, and to whom free constitutions have been conceded. I recollect when in England three years ago meeting delegates from Australia and the Cape in search of constitutions for their Colonies. I told them that we had a very good one in Nova Scotia, which they ought to copy. But their heads were filled with theories. Repudiating, as we have not done, the principles of the British constitution, they saw visions and dreamt dreams. The delegate from the Cape wanted an Elective Council, the members to be elected by the constituency of the whole Colony. I tried to make him understand that canvassing a county in Nova Scotia was no joke, and that before a gentleman got through his canvass of the whole Cape Colony he would either be devoured by lions or shot by Kaffirs. My friend would not believe me, but before he got home, the Kaffir war broke out, and I fear he has been either killed or eaten before this, while in search of his new constitution.

If we look across the border, Mr Chairman, we have, in some respects, not much to envy. I have never sought to disparage the United States. Familiar with their early history, their trials, their achievements, and their blunders, I give them credit for all they have accomplished, and make liberal allowance even for their mistakes. They speak the same language, and are descended from the same ancestors, but have they more of rational liberty than we have? Until recently they might

boast of their Universal Suffrage, which we had not, but we have it now, and even the Member for Annapolis tells us that their institutions are more conservative than ours. As regards public burdens how do matters stand? The United States, with a population of 30,000,000, owed in 1846 \$224,000,000 or \$7 to each inhabitant of the country. Nova Scotia, with a population of 300,000, owes but £100,000 (half of it paying 4 per cent and the other half paying nothing), or about \$1 55c. for each inhabitant. Even if our railroads were completed, and were entirely unproductive, we would have the use of them, at all events, and even then we would not be as deeply in debt as are, at this moment, the prosperous United States.

I think then, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that whether we take—extent of Territory, Rivers and Lakes, extent of Sea Coast, Natural Resources, Shipping, Imports and Exports, Revenue, ratio of Increase, Physical Strength, size of Cities, the enjoyment of Freedom, General Education, or activity of the Press—we are entitled to form a nation, if so disposed, and to control our foreign relations as well as our domestic affairs.

How can this be done? In various ways; and, Sir, I shall discuss the modes with the same freedom as I have done the means. First, it may be done by annexation to the United States. What would be the advantages of that step? All commercial questions now agitated between the two countries,



would be settled at once—we should have unlimited intercourse with the sea board of that great country, and free trade from Maine to California. Our public men would no longer be depressed with the checked aspirations of which the Hon. and learned Member for Annapolis spoke last night. Every North American, whose pride is now wounded by degrading contrasts, would be eligible to the highest offices and positions—not in a colony, but in a Nation ; and we should enjoy perpetual peace with our neighbours along 1,500 miles of frontier. Sir, I do not deny that any man who sincerely and honestly advocates annexation to the United States has powerful arguments in his favour. I am opposed to it, and would resist such a step by all means within my reach. I believe it would be, unless forced upon us, morally wrong ; being a violation of our allegiance, and a breach of faith plighted to our brethren across the water for more than 100 years. Of course, if they expect us to be Colonists for ever, and make no provision for our being anything else, upon their heads, and not on ours, be the consequences of the separation, which, when this is apparent, will be inevitable. I prefer full incorporation with them, in one great empire—free participation with them in its good and evil fortunes, its perils and its distinctions. All this I believe to be practicable, and shall not despair of its fulfilment.

But, Sir, there are other considerations which

would deter me from any thought of annexation. At the revolutionary struggle the Loyalists were driven seaward—they lost their homes, right or wrong, acting on their honest convictions ; and I rejoice that, whether right or wrong, believing themselves right, they had the courage and enterprise and energy, so to act. They sacrificed everything but their principles—their property was confiscated—and they cast their lot into a comparative wilderness. They and their descendants have made it to “ blossom as the rose.” They have fraternized with the French Canadians and Acadians. English, Irish, Scotch and German emigrants have gradually come over to be incorporated with them—to fill up the country—to form one race ; so that North America presents the outline of a great improving and self-dependant community. Sir, the Loyalists left all they owned in the United States, and their possessions were merged in the general property of the Union. The Republicans cannot restore it to us ; and I should be ashamed to go back to tell them, “ our fathers made a great mistake—they thought their glorious old flag, and time-honoured institutions, worth preserving ; but we, their sons, with a territory larger than yours, and a population larger than you had when you framed your Constitution—with education that our fathers taught us to prize, free of debt, and at peace with all the world, are not fit for national existence, are unable to frame a Constitution, but come back, after a separation of

seventy years, and ask to take refuge under the Stars and Stripes !” No ! Mr. Chairman—I for one will never prefer such a craven request.

Sir, I believe annexation would be unwise for other reasons. I believe the United States are large enough already. In a few years the population of that country must reach 100 millions ; they have as much work to do now as they can do well ; and I believe before many years, if their union is preserved they will have more work to do than any Legislature can despatch, after their modes, in 365 days. Congress now sits for half the year. Our legislation occupies about ten weeks—that of New Brunswick about the same time. In Canada the Session often lasts three or four months, so that if annexation were seriously contemplated, there would be no time in the National Congress to get through with the work that ought to be well and wisely done. There is another question which must be settled, before you, or I, Sir, or any Nova Scotian, will be a party to annexation. Sir, I believe the question of Slavery must be settled, sooner or later, by bloodshed. I do not believe it can ever be settled in any other way. That question shadows the institutions, and poisons the springs of social and public life among our neighbours. It saps all principles—overrides all obligations. Why, Sir, I did believe until very lately that no constable armed with a law which violated the law of God, could capture a slave in any of the Northern States ; but the Fugitive Slave

Law has been enforced even in Puritan New England, where tea could not be sold or stamps collected. British North America, Sir, has not a slave in all her boundless territory, and I, for one, will never cast my lot in with that of a people who buy and sell human beings, and who would profane our soil with their Fugitive Slave Laws, or involve us in agrarian war for the preservation of an institution that we despise. There is another reason that would make me reluctant to be drawn into the vortex of the Republic. There might arise some cause for conflict between that country and Old England. Sir, there is not a man in this Assembly who does not aspire to hold his head as high as the head of any other man on earth ; but I trust, nay I know, that there is not one who would raise his hand in hostility against that revered country, from whose loins we have sprung, and whose noble institutions it has been our pride to imitate. If the slave States could be cut off, and the free States could be combined with us in perpetual peace with England, we might see nothing objectionable in a union such as that.

Having discussed the question of Annexation, let me inquire how else could we organize ourselves into a nation ? By forming North America into a kingdom or confederation by itself, establishing friendly connections with other countries, with the entire concurrence of our Brethren at home. I agree with the Hon. and learned member for Anna-

polis that there would be great advantages arising from a union of these colonies ; but there must be differences of opinion as to the various modes of accomplishing that object. We may have a King or a Viceroy, and a legislature for the whole of North America ; or we may have a Federal and Democratic Union. The advantages of the first would be a strong executive, a united Parliament, the crown hereditary, distinctions permanent. But there would be disadvantages. Such a government would be expensive ; there would be no peerage or feudal bulwarks to sustain a sovereign ; and we might get a dynasty of knaves, fools or tyrants. We should have the monarchial and democratic elements warring for ascendancy ; and our people would soon feel the loss of their local legislatures. What has been the complaint of Ireland for years ? That there was no Parliament in College Green. Of Scotland, at this moment ? That there is no Parliament at Holyrood. A higher description of talent, a more elevated order of men in a united Legislature, would not compensate the people for the loss of local legislation which they have enjoyed for a century. By a Federal Union of the colonies, we should have something like the neighbouring Republic ; and if I saw nothing better I should say at once, let us keep our local Legislatures, and have a President and central Congress, for all the higher and external relations of the United Provinces. We should then have nationality with purely Re-

publican Institutions. But if we so far change our organization, we must substitute American precedents and practice for British. We now refer to Hastell as our guide in Parliament perplexities, we should then have to take the practice of the neighbouring Republic. There might be one disadvantage in having a King or a Viceroy. The Queen across the water, because the Atlantic rolls between us, offers nothing obnoxious to the prejudices of our American neighbours; but once establish a monarch or viceroy here, and I am not quite sure that we would not have a fight to maintain him on his throne, with those who apprehended danger from our example. Under a Federal Union, we should form a large and prosperous nation, lying between the other two branches of the British family, and our duty would evidently be to keep them both at peace.

But Sir, I will say to the Hon. and learned member for Annapolis that before we can have this organisation, or any other, we must have railroads. The Company which has made a line of railway from Hamilton to Windsor, Canada West, deserve great credit for their enterprise and energy. I admit that the Grand Trunk Company of Canada is preparing to connect a great part of that country with these indispensable lines of communication; but Sir, it will take years to complete what Canada has begun; and then we have New Brunswick between us. It is clear we cannot have a United

Parliament without railroads, for if any of us were summoned to Quebec to-morrow, we should have to travel from the end of our own country to its metropolis through a foreign state. We must have railroads first, and then, take my word for it, the question we are now discussing will assume a form and shape that will soon lead to a tangible solution. Once put my Hon. friend from Clare (Mr. (Comeu,\*) on a railway, and send him up among the habitants of Lower Canada and he would feel no longer as a poor colonist, but as one of a million of men, speaking the same language, animated by the same hopes, participating in kindred aspirations. Let him see the noble St. Lawrence and the Lakes that lie beyond—let him survey the whole of this magnificent country that God has given to his race, and to mine, on this side of the Atlantic, and he would come back to meet, without a blush of her capacity, or a fear for her fortunes, an Englishman, an Irishman, a Scotchman, a German, a Frenchman, or even a braggart from across the border. Over-spread the Colonies with Railways, and I care not what you have—a united Congress or nothing. The people of British America will then be united, and will soon assert the position they will feel their capacity to maintain.

Pondering on these themes, Sir, my mind ever turns to an old statesman who has gone I trust to Heaven, but whose name will be dug up, and whose writings will be read with interest in years to come,

\*A French Canadian.

on both sides of the Atlantic—I mean old Governor Pownall. Looking through the strife and passion which preceded the American Revolution—through the fire and smoke of it, at the stupid prejudices and blunders which it engendered and has entailed, it is curious to see how a calm mind and sagacious intellect penetrated into the philosophy of a great controversy, and would have laid the foundations of the Empire in mutual confidence and respect. What was his advice when the rebels of the colonies were preparing their muskets and the statesmen of England were deaf and blind? He said—“ You are one family—the ocean divides you—you must have different forms of government, but that is no reason why you should not be a united family—arbitrate on disputed points—keep the peace—have distinct forms of government if you please—but establish a zolverin, and let there be perpetual anity and Free Trade between the British races on both sides of the Atlantic.” Had his advice been taken, the Revolution would never have occurred—we should have been spared the second war, and the paltry jealousies which any sneering scribbler or unprincipled politician may now blow into a flame would never have existed.

Let us as far as we can, lend ourselves to the realization of this grand idea. I feel now as I felt yesterday, every word that dropped from the Hon. and learned member for Annapolis, was pregnant with meaning, and full of interest. Let us suppose



Sir, that our railroads were finished, and that we had the rapidity of intercourse necessary for union. Are there no difficulties in the way? First, the French Canadians may not favour a union. I should like to be assured that they did, but certain facts have given me a contrary impression. Upper Canada favours a union, because the people there think it would tend to keep the French Canadian influence down. That view of the matter has been propagated in Lower Canada, and it has raised prejudices which cannot, perhaps be easily overcome. The lower Provinces would never sanction inequality or injustice of any kind, but yet the French Canadians may have their fears. My Honourable friend from Clare might indeed be sent up as a missionary to convince his brethren that we would not be less just to them than we are to him; —that Nova Scotians treat those of French descent as brethren, who are never permitted to feel any political, religious or social distinctions. The prejudice may be overcome, but it exists in Canada, and may be found a difficulty in the way of a union of the Colonies.

There are other difficulties. If a project of union is to be discussed, let the proposition come from the other Provinces. For various reasons I have but little desire to re-open Inter-colonial negotiations about anything just now. The seat of Government would be a knotty question—the large debts that Canada has contracted, another. The new Bruns-

wick papers invite the Lower Provinces to form a union with Amherst or Sackville for a capital. The former would be most convenient for me, for I should live in the midst of my constituents. If we have a confederation of all the Provinces, the capital should be at Quebec—the natural fortress—the Gibraltar of British America. Montreal is indefensible, and I put Halifax out of the question, as it is not central.

But suppose, Sir, we were united to-morrow. Might we not have some diversities of interest? It is just probable that the farmers of Western Canada, in their anxiety to get their wheat into the United States, might throw our fisheries overboard? The Hon. and learned member for Annapolis hopes such would not be the case—so do I. But he will agree with me that the interests of all the Colonies are not the same in every respect; and what we have to fear is that the smaller Provinces may be swamped, and their interests sacrificed, for the benefit of their more populous neighbour. Past experience leads me to guard against such a contingency, for I know that in negotiations which deeply stirred the hopes of our people, Canada has been satisfied to sacrifice National and Provincial interests, for not very weighty or very worthy considerations.

There is yet another position, Mr. Chairman, which North America may aspire to, and to my mind it presents a solution of all the difficulties which attach to this question in other directions I

think the time is rapidly approaching, when there must be infused into the British Empire an element of strength which has scarcely yet been regarded. North America must ere long claim consolidation into the realm of England, as an integral portion of the empire, or she will hoist her own Flag. Let us look at this proposition in its broadest light, and in its local bearings. We are and ever will be a commercial people. It is our interest to have free trade, and close alliance with the largest number of human beings who produce and consume, who have commodities to carry, and who will give the greatest activity to our Commercial Marine provided always that our security and honour can be as well maintained. Suppose Nova Scotia were to form a union with New Brunswick and Canada, to-morrow, and that they were all to withdraw from the Empire, as they will, if not elevated to equality with their British brethren. Sir, I do not undervalue the claims or standing of the Colonies, but we would withdraw from an Empire peopled by hundreds of millions and unite our fortunes with but two and a half millions of people, with an exposed frontier of 1,500 miles and with no fleets and armies to spare, to protect our sea coast. Suppose we should prefer annexation to an independent national existence ; we should become allied to but 30 millions, and though the proportionate advantages would be greater, the loss by withdrawing from the mother country would be immense. We should be

part of 30 millions of people, it is true, but they have neither troops nor ships of war to spare, to aid us in any great emergency—they would have enough to do to defend themselves. Now, Sir, let me claim your attention for a moment while I develop another view of this question. What is the British Empire? Look at the outlying portions of it, which contain :

West Indies,	900,000 inhabitants
Australia,	307,645
Africa,	218,908
Ceylon,	1,506,326
Maritius,	159,243
New Zealand,	204,000
India,	94,210,218

---

97,497,331

This includes the colonial portion of the empire strictly speaking, but to these ninety-seven millions, three times the population of the United States, we must add 133,110,000 being the population of states which are our allies or tributaries in the East. Add again 30,000,000 the population of the British Islands, and we have in round numbers 260,000,000 of people within the boundaries or subject to the influence of the Empire to which we at present belong. All the States of Europe include but 233,000,000 of people. Then, Sir, I ask will any Nova Scotian, who pretends to be a Statesman, will any North American with his heart in the right place, lightly entertain the idea of withdrawing from

the enjoyment of free commercial intercourse with 260,000,000 of human beings, from participation in the securities, the sources of pride, which such an Empire affords, to form, without cause, an isolated community of two millions and a half, or even ten millions, or to seek a dishonourable share of the advantages enjoyed by 30,000,000?

While, however, we value our connection with the Empire highly, let not British Statesmen, too intent upon the intrigues and squabbles of Europe, undervalue our resources, our claims, our pride in that connection, or our physical force to achieve another whenever this becomes irksome. All that I seek for is entirely compatible with our present relations—by elevating North Americans to a common level with their brethren at home, I would but draw the bonds which bind us closer together. There is no necessity to endanger the connexion, commercial, physical, or international, which we enjoy in common with so many human beings. “Ships, Colonies, and Commerce” have long formed the boast of old England. Ships we have in abundance. Her Colonies are ours. The Empire includes every climate which the sun diversifies—every soil—every race of men, every variety of production. It is guarded by the largest fleet and by the best disciplined army in the world. It has for its metropolis, the most populous city of modern times—the nursery of genius and the arts—the emporium of commerce—the fountain head of capital—the nurs-

ing mother of skilled labour in every oranch of manufactures. Let us then, not cast about for new modes of political organization, until we have tested the expensive powers and intellectual capabilities of what we have. Let us, then, demand with all respect, the full rights of citizenship in this great empire. It is clearly our interest to do this, surely it is congenial to our feelings. Sir, I would not cling to England one single hour after I was convinced that the friendship of North America was undervalued, and that the status to which we may reasonably aspire had been deliberately refused. But I will endeavour, while asserting the rights of my native land with boldness, to perpetuate our connexion with the British Isles, the home of our Fathers—the cradle of our race. The union of the colonies is the object of the resolution, but in my judgment such a proposition covers but a limited portion of ground which the agitation of that subject opens up. What questions of importance have we to settle with Canada, New Brunswick or any of the other colonies. We have Free trade and friendly relations with them all. What have we to ask or to fear? What questions are at issue with the United States? None but that of a reciprocal Trade, which would have been settled long ago, if North **America** had a voice in the making of treaties and in the discussions of the Imperial Parliament. But have we not questions of some interest to adjust with the mother country? There is one, of more

importance than any other except the Railroads, the question of our mines and minerals. Does any man believe that any company would have monopolized for thirty years the mines and minerals of an entire province had British America been represented in the Imperial Parliament. That monopoly would go down before a searching investigation for a single night in the House of Commons. No Ministry could justify or maintain it. Here there is no difference of opinion ; but what avails our unanimity, the battle is to be fought 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 believe that one Nova Scotian within the walls of Parliament would do more to reclaim our natural rights in a single year, than this 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 5000 miles, are at this moment subjects 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 prospects of a war

with Russia on the other, may at this moment be giving away your 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 in 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 down 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 cannot 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 negociation.

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 6000 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 2,500,000 of 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 shewed 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 Parliamentary interest to ensure promotion. What inducements had our young men to enter either service? He had five boys, but he would as soon throw one of them overboard, as send him to compete where the chances were all against him—to break his heart in a struggle where money and friends, not merit, would render emulation vain.\*]

The Statesmen of England, Sir, may be assured that if they would hold this great Empire together, they must give the outlying portions of it some interest in the Naval, Military, and Civil Services, and I will co-operate with any man who will impress upon them the necessity for lengthening the ropes and strengthening the stakes, that the fabric which shelters us all may not tumble about our ears.

I turn now, Mr. Chairman, to a topic upon which it may readily be supposed I feel keenly, the negotiations touching our inter-colonial Railroads. To impress the minds of Imperial statesmen with the truly national character of the works we had projected, I spent six months in England. Here was a noble scheme of internal improvement, requiring

\* Two Cadetships in the Navy, annually, have since been given to Canada; one to Nova Scotia, and one to New Brunswick. This is a move in the right direction, for which the Ministers deserve much credit.

about £7,000,000 sterling to carry it out. Had it been a question about Holy places in Turkey, or some wretched fortress on the Danube, seven millions would have been risked or paid with slight demur. The object was, however, to strengthen and combine four or five noble Provinces, full of natural resources and of a high spirited people, but, unfortunately, with no representation in the National Council of the Empire to which they belong. The single guarantee of England would have saved us nearly half the cost of this operation, or £200,000 a year. The Queen's name would have been stamped upon every engine running through 1,500 miles of her dominions. On the hearts of 2,500,000 people would have been stamped the grace of the act which while it cost nothing, for our revenues were ample enough to pay principal and interest had the roads been unproductive, would have awakened grateful recollections, and a sense of substantial obligation, for a century to come. At last, by the true nobility of the enterprise rather than by the skill of its advocate, Her Majesty's Government consented to give the guarantee. The Provinces were proceeding to fulfil the conditions, when, unfortunately, two or three members of the Imperial Parliament took a fancy to add to the cost of the Roads as much more as the guarantee would have saved. It was their interest that the guarantee should not be given. It was withdrawn. The faith of England, till then regarded as something

sacred, was violated, and the answer was a criticism on a phrase—a quibble upon the construction of a sentence, which all the world for six months had read one way. The secret history of this wretched transaction I do not seek to penetrate. Enough is written upon stock books and in the Records of Courts in Canada, to give us the proportions of that scheme of jobbery and corruption, by which the interests of British America were overthrown. But, Sir, who believes, that if these Provinces had ten members in the Imperial Parliament—who believes, and I say it not boastingly, had Nova Scotia had but one, who could have stated her case before six hundred English gentlemen, that the national faith would have been sullied or a national pledge withdrawn?

There are other questions of equal magnitude and importance to the empire and to us—Ocean steamers, carrying British mails past British provinces to reach their destination, through a foreign state; Emigration uncared for and undirected, flowing past them too, or, when directed, sent at an enormous cost to Australia 14,000 miles away, while millions of acres of unsurpassed fertility remain unimproved so much nearer home. Upon these and other kindred topics I do not dwell. But there is one to which I must, for a brief space, crave your attention.

Sir, I do not envy our neighbours in the United States, their country, their climate, or their insti-

tions. But what I do envy them is, the boundless field of honourable emulation and rivalry in which the poorest man in the smallest State may win, not mere colonial rank and position, but the highest national honours. Here lies the marked distinction between Republican and British America. The sons of the rebels are men full grown—the sons of the loyalists are not. I do not mean that physically or mentally there is any difference—I speak of the standards and stamps by which the former are made to pass current in the world, while the latter have the ring of metal as valuable and as true. This was the thought which laboured for utterance in the mind of the member for Annapolis yesterday. Let me aid in its illustration. Some years ago I had the honour to dine with the late John Quincy Adams at Washington. Around his hospitable board were assembled fifteen or eighteen gentlemen of the highest distinction in the political circles of that capital. There were, perhaps, two or three, who like Mr. Adams himself, had been trained from early youth in diplomacy, in literature, and in the highest walks of social and public life. These men were superior to any that we have in the colonies, not because their natural endowments were greater, but because their advantages had been out of all proportion to ours. But the rest were just such men as we see every day. Their equals are to be found in the legislatures and public departments of Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia—men superior to most

of them I have seen on this floor every session for twenty years. There equals are here now. But how different are the fields of emulation—how disproportioned the incitements to excellence—the distinctions—the rewards. Almost every man who sat round me on that night either then enjoyed, or has since won, some national distinction. They were or are now senators in the national council, foreign ambassadors, governors, secretaries of state, commanders of squadrons or leaders of armies.

Sir, my heart rose when I compared these men with those I had left at home, their equals in mind and manners. But it sunk, aye, and it sinks now, when turning to the poor rewards which British America offers to those who run with these men the race of emulation. What national distinction ever lights upon British America? Has she ever supplied a Governor to the Queen's widely extended dominions, a Secretary or an Under Secretary of State? Have we ever had a man to represent us in either House of Parliament, or in any imperial department? How long is this state of pupilage to last? Not long. If British statesmen do not take this matter in hand, we soon shall. I yield to no man in respect for the flag of my fathers, but I will live under no flag with a band of inferiority to the other British races stamped upon my brow.

[Mr. Howe here contrasted Mr. Johnston, Mr. Huntington, Mr. Wilkins, the Speaker, with those who had governed the Colonies within his own ob-

servation. He thought the learned leader of the opposition would make quite as good a Governor as some that had been sent across the Atlantic. He convulsed the House with laughter, in describing the attentions paid at Liverpool to a whiskered Yankee, who was the bearer of despatches from Washington, and who, with a huge bag under his arm that might have contained his wardrobe, was instantly permitted to land, unquestioned and unsearched. "I," said Mr. H., "was also the bearer of despatches, from a British Governor to Her Majesty's Secretary of State. I represented the Province of which I am a native, and the Government of which I was a member. I explained my position, and showed my despatches, more in jest than in earnest, for I knew what the result would be. The Yankee was in London long before I could get my portmanteau through the custom House, being compelled to pay duty on half a dozen books and plans necessary to the success of the mission with which I was charged. Imagine what five and twenty British Americans on board the steamer would feel at this practical commentary on the respect commanded in England by successful rebellion, but denied to devoted loyalty." Equally animated was Mr. Howe's description of Massachusetts cotton spinners and backwoodsmen from the West, snugly ensconced in the diplomatic box in the body of the House of Lords, when Parliament was opened by the Queen, while Colonists looked

down upon them from the galleries, to which, not as a right but as a favour, they had been admitted.]

Mr. Chairman, the time will come, nay, Sir, it has come, when these degrading distinctions must no longer peril our allegiance. Will any man say that North America does not produce men as fit to govern States and Provinces as those who rule over Maine or Massachusetts at this hour? As most of those who are sent to govern the forty Provinces of this empire—as many that we have seen sent to darken counsel and perplex us in the West. How long will North Americans be content to see their sons systematically excluded from the gubernatorial chairs, not only of the Provinces that they occupy but of every other in the empire? Not long if monarchical institutions are to be preserved, and the power of the Crown maintained, the leading spirits of the empire must be chosen to govern Provinces, and the selection must not be confined to the circle of two small islands—to old officers or broken down Members of Parliament.

Look at the organization of the Colonial Office—that department which is especially charged with the Government of forty Colonies, and yet has not one Colonist in it. How long are we to have this play of Hamlet with Hamlet himself omitted? Sir, I do not share in the vulgar prejudices about the ignorance and incapacity of Downing Street. No man can now be elevated to the office of Secretary of State for the Colonies who is not a man of busi-



ness habits holding high rank in either House of Parliament. There, is, perhaps, not a man in the department who is not able or adroit, in the performance of duties which are admirably subdivided. The Under Secretaries are men of genial manners, high attainment, and varied information. They are something more—they are thoroughly well disposed to serve, and to stand well with the Provinces committed to their charge. But what then? They have no personal knowledge of Colonial public or social life—no hold upon the confidence or the affections of the outlying portions of the empire. Compared with the men who might, and ought, and must be there, if the empire is to be kept together, they are what the clever Secretaries of the old Board of trade were in 1750, compared with such men as Franklin, Washington and Adams. What these last were then, the Baldwins, Lafontaines, Candler and Wilmots of North America are now. I speak not of Nova Scotia, although I know that her sister Provinces accord to her the intellectual rank to which she is entitled. I know the men who sit around me here—already I can hear the heart beat of the generation which is springing up to take our places, and I do not hesitate to say that room must be made upon the floors of Parliament and within the Departmental offices of England, for the aspiring and energetic spirits of this Continent, or they will by and bye assert their superiority in the intellectual conflict which those who attempt

systematically to exclude them must provoke. Talk of annexation, Sir, what we want is annexation to our mother country. Talk of a union of the Provinces, which, if accompanied with other provisions, would lead to separation ; what we require is union with the Empire—an investiture with the rights and dignity of British Citizenship.

In the United States, every 40,000 people send a Member to Congress. North America has sixty-two times that number, and yet sends not one Member to the National Council which regulates her trade, controls her foreign relations, and may involve her at any moment in war. Mark the effects of the American system. The discovery of gold threw into California, in two or three years, a large heterogenous and comparatively lawless population. California was many thousands of miles away from Washington and from the old States of the Confederation. It was essentially a Colony, and under our system would have been so treated for a century. Our neighbours are wiser in their generation. Hardly were the rude communities of California formed, while women were sleeping under tents and men under waggons ; while Judge Lynch presided over the Judicatory, and the better classes hung theives in the market square ; the citizens met together, formed their Constitution, provided for education, and elected three or four men to represent California in the National Congress of the United States. Nova Scotia has been a loyal Province of

this empire, with all the securities of law, and the refinements of civilization, for an hundred years, and to this hour has no such privilege. What binds that rude Californian community to the Parent States? The presence of her four or five Representatives in the National Council. They may be negligent, incapable, corrupt, but they are *there*. Australia, not much further off—with richer treasures—with wider space, has no such privilege, and the wit of British Statesmen, with the example of Republican America before them, seems inadequate to a task which elsewhere is found so easy. Sir, this cannot last. England herself has a deep interest in this question, and the sooner that her statesmen begin to ponder the matter gravely the better it will be for us all.

The 30,000,000 who inhabit the British Islands must make some provision for the 230,000,000 who live beyond the narrow seas. They may rule the barbarous tribes who do not speak their language, or share their civilisation, by the sword, but they can only rule or retain such Provinces as are to be found in North America, by drawing their sympathies around a common centre—by giving them an interest in the Army, the Navy, the Diplomacy, the Administration, and the Legislation of the Empire.

While a foreign War is impending, this may appear an inappropriate time to discuss these questions, but the time will come, and is near at hand, when they will command the earnest attention of

every true British subject. We hear much, Sir, every day about the balance of power in Europe, and we all remember Canning's boast that he was going to call a new world into existence to redress the balance of power in the old. At this moment we are plunging into a foreign war—the fiercest and most bloody it will be that we have ever seen. What is the pretext on one side—some question about the Greek religion. What is supposed to warrant our expensive armaments on the other? The balance of power in Europe. But is the balance of power in America nothing, and have these Provinces no weight in the scale? God forbid, Sir, that at this moment a word of menace should escape my lips. I am incapable of such a meanness. England's hour of extremity should never be our opportunity, for any thing but words of cheer and the helping hand. But, Sir, come peace or war, it is the interest of England that the truth be told her. Is the balance of power in America an unimportant consideration, and how is it to be preserved except by preserving that half of the continent which still belongs to her, and that can only be done by elevating the inhabitants of these Provinces in their own opinion, and in that of the world at large. I know that it is fashionable in England to count upon the sympathies and cordial co-operation of the Republic. A year ago Cobden and other apostles of his school, were preaching and relying upon universal peace. Now

all Europe is arming. They preach, day by day, that colonies are a burthen to the mother country. The reign of peace, of universal brotherhood may come. Should it not, and should Republican America throw herself into the contest against England, when engaged with other Powers, as she did in 1812, what then would be England's position, should the noble Provinces of North America have been flung away, for want of a little forethought and common sense ?

The power of the Republic would be broken if our half of the continent maintained its allegiance. But if that were thrown into the other scale, what then ? Fancy the Stars and Stripes floating over our 6000 vessels—fancy 500,000 hardy North Americans with arms in their hands in a defiant attitude—fancy half a continent, with its noble harbours and 5000 miles of sea-coast with all its fisheries, coal-mines, and timber gone. Fancy the dockyards and depots and arsenals of the enemy advanced 1000 miles nearer to England. Oh ! Sir, I have turned with disgust from the eternal gabble about the balance of power in Europe, when I have thought how lightly British Statesmen seem to value the power that can alone balance their only commercial rival. One subsidy to some petty European potentate has often cost more than all our railroads would have cost, and yet they would have developed our resources in peace, and formed our best security in time of war. A single war with half this continent

added £120,000,000 to the National Debt of England. What would a war with the whole of it cost? And yet these Provinces are so lightly valued, that a loan for public improvements cannot be guaranteed, or a single seat in the National Councils yielded, to preserve them. Sir, whatever others may think, I pause in the presence of the great peril which I foresee. I pray to God that it may be averted.

Here, Sir, is work for the highest intellects—for the purest patriots on both sides of the Atlantic. Here is a subject worthy of the consideration of the largest minded British Statesmen now figuring on the stage of public life. In presence of this great theme, how our little squabbles sink into insignificance, as the witches' cauldron vanishes from the presence of Macbeth.—How insignificant are many of the topics which they debate in the Imperial Parliament compared with this. I have seen night after night wasted while both Houses discussed the grave question of whether or not a Jew should sit in the House of Commons, a question that it would not take five minutes to decide in any legislature from Canada to California. How often have I said to myself, I wonder if it ever enters into the heads of those noble Lords and erudite Commoners, who are so busy with this Jew, that there are two millions and a half of Christians in British America who have no representative in either House. A little consideration given to that subject I have thought

would not be a waste of time. When I have seen them quibbling with the great questions of a surplus population—mendicity and crime, I have asked myself, do these men know that there is, within the boundaries of the empire, within ten days' sail of England, employment for all—freehold estates for all, with scarcely a provocative to crime. I have often thought, Sir, how powerful this Empire might be made. How prosperous in peace, how invincible in war, if the Statesmen of England would set about its organization, and draw to a common centre the high intellects which it contains.

With our maritime positions in all parts of the globe—with every variety of soil and climate—with the industrial capacity and physical resources of 260,000,000 of people to rely on, what might not this Empire become, if its intellectual resources were combined for its government and preservation. If the whole population were united by common interests, no power on earth ever wielded means so vast, or influence so irresistible. But, Sir, let the statesmen of England slumber and sleep over the field of enterprise which lies around them—let them be deluded by economists who despise colonists, or by fanatics who preach peace at any price with foreign despots, while no provision is made to draw around the throne the hearts of millions predisposed to loyalty and affection, and the results we may surely calculate. Should the other half of this Continent be lost for the want and forethought and

sound knowledge, there will be trouble in the old homestead. "Shadows, clouds and darkness," will rest upon the abode of our Fathers; the free soil of England will not be long unprofaned, and the gratitude of Turks, and the friendship of Austrians or Republican Americans, will form but a poor substitute for the hearts and hands that have been flung away.

THE END.