

CAMPBELL, Robert Henry

Confederation in Nova Scotia to 1870.

Thesis submitted by Robert H. Campbell in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree from Dalhousie University.

Prepared under the direction of Professor D. C. Harvey.

Dalhousie University

April, 1939

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
HALIFAX, N.S.

Contents.

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter I - Some Early Proposals for Union 1783-1849.....	1
Chapter II - Advocacy 1849-1860.....	13
Chapter III - Maritime or General Union? 1860-1864.....	41
Chapter IV - The Struggle 1864-1867.....	84
Chapter V - Repeal Agitation in Nova Scotia 1867-1870....	188
Chapter VI - Conclusion.....	223
Appendices.....	229
Bibliography.....	253

Chapter I.

Some Early Proposals for Union.

1783-1849

Between the American Revolution and the first achievement of responsible government in the British North American Colonies little was accomplished in the way of consolidation. Indeed, after the American Revolution, the tendency in the British provinces was toward "devolution rather than amalgamation"¹. This reflected the practical necessities of the time, as well as the desire to prevent any repetition of the American experiment in the North American Colonies left to England. New Brunswick and Cape Breton Island were separated from Nova Scotia in 1784 and each was given its own government. In 1791, Upper Canada, an English speaking Province, was set apart from Lower Canada, which was chiefly French. However, proposals for the union of the British American Provinces were not lacking in this period. These proposals had common characteristics. All but two or three were from high Tory "Family Compact" members and all of them were addressed to the Imperial Government. The union to which they looked forward, a matter of Imperial arrangement, was a means of strengthening both the British connection and their own control, and of counteracting the influence of the United States. These

1. R. G. Trotter, Canadian Federation, p. 5.

proposals were thus the reverse of democratic; they were designed to prevent democracy and republicanism. They recognized the fact that it would be convenient to have public opinion in the provinces favourable to union but did not consider it a necessity.

The earliest suggestions for union came at the close of the American Revolutionary war. In 1784, Colonel Robert Morse of the Royal Engineers, reporting on the military defences required for Nova Scotia, wrote: "In the course of this report, my mind has been strongly impressed with the idea of uniting these provinces with Canada, to the advantage of both countries, and that by establishing the same laws, inducing a constant intercourse, and mutual interest, a great country may yet be raised up in North America¹". Presumably Morse's interest in union was primarily a question of defense.

Morse, at this time, was not alone in raising the question of union. In the previous year, William Smith, a New York Loyalist, had advocated the establishment of a "General Government for the Colonies". In 1786, Smith became Chief Justice of Quebec and, four years later, when the Constitutional Act of 1791 was being considered, he again advocated union as a means of preventing a repetition of the American Revolution. He attributed that disaster to

1. Quoted by R. G. Trotter, op. cit., p. 5.

the Empire "to a remoter cause, than those to which it is ordinarily ascribed. The Truth is that the Country had outgrown its Government, and wanted the true remedy for more than half a century before the Rupture commenced.....To expect wisdom and moderation from near a score of Petty Parliaments, consisting ineffect of only one of the three necessary branches of Parliament, must, after the light brought by experience, appear to have been a very extravagant expectation.....an American Assembly, quiet in the weakness of their Infancy, could not but discover in their Elevation to Prosperity, that themselves were the substance, and the Governor and Board of Council mere shadows in their political Frame".¹

He proposed several additions to the Constitutional Bill, then pending, which provided for a general legislature with an appointed Council and an assembly made up of representatives of the several provincial assemblies. The voting in the assembly was to be by provinces. His purpose was clearly that of so strengthening the hands of the recently created Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of all the North American Provinces that the British connection would be better preserved. Lord Dorchester, who held this new office, transmitted these proposals of the Chief Justice to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, but that official gave them scant attention. He

1. Short & Doughty; Documents relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759-1791, 2nd ed., part 2, p. 1018 ff.

wrote: "The formation of a general legislative Government for all the King's provinces in America, is a point which has been under consideration, but I think it liable to considerable objection".¹

The next proposal for union came from the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, Richard John Uniacke. In a memorandum submitted in 1806 to Mr. Windham, Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, Uniacke recommended the creation of two legislative unions, one for the Canadas, the other for the Maritimes. Uniacke was here concerned with many things other than union. The memorandum as a whole throws light upon the views of the official class of the time in Nova Scotia. Here is expressed their fear of the United States and of democracy and republicanism.² It was to strengthen the Imperial connection and to carry out their ideas of Imperial policy that this class, as represented by Uniacke, looked favourably on union.

Uniacke's proposals were followed within a year by one from the Chief Justice of Quebec, Jonathan Sewell. Sewell, who was William Smith's son-in-law, advocated first, the establishment of a federal system, secondly, in 1810, the reunion of the Canadas and, four years later, federal union again. In 1814 he also corresponded

1. Ibid., p. 1027.

2. D. C. Harvey, Uniacke's Memorandum on N. S., 1806, Can. Hist. Review, March, 1936.

with the Duke of Kent on the subject. The Duke showed real interest in Sewell's proposal, made some suggestions of his own, and expressed his intention of bringing the matter before the Secretary of the Colonies. Here the matter apparently dropped.

Early in the session of 1819, the Legislature of Nova Scotia appointed a joint committee of the Council and Assembly to consider the Convention recently concluded between Great Britain and the United States of America, and to determine what steps might be taken to obtain a relaxation of those commercial restrictions no longer applicable to the existing state of the British North American colonies. While mainly concerned with various phases of commercial rivalry with the United States, and advocating the co-operation of the other colonies to meet this economic rivalry, the report of this committee did suggest the union of Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton Island with Nova Scotia. Prince Edward Island was the only colony that paid the report serious attention; they found it unconstitutional and were, in addition, naturally against it. The other colonies were preoccupied or indifferent.¹

The next consideration of union was of a different sort. In 1822, the British Government introduced into Parliament a Bill for the legislative union of the two Canadas. Its main purpose seems to have been to submerge the French

1. D. C. Harvey: Nova Scotia and The Convention of 1818, Proceedings and Transactions, Royal Society of Canada, 1933 Section II, p. 57 ff.

Canadian majority in the Assembly of Lower Canada by the addition of representatives. There was to be a legislative union of the provinces, with separate governors and separate executive councils. The Bill was soon withdrawn and not again revived, although it remained as a threat in the minds of the French Canadians for many years to come.

The immediate occasion for the Bill was the quarrel in the Canadas over the distribution of customs duties on imports from overseas at Quebec and Montreal bound for Upper Canada. Both Upper and Lower Canada had representatives in London to guard their interests. Upper Canada was represented by John Beverly Robinson, a staunch Tory and an outstanding member of the "Family Compact". He raised strenuous objection to reunion of the Canadas, and advocated a general federal union of all the provinces. In this proposal he was supported by Jonathan Sewell, Attorney-General for Lower Canada, and Archdeacon Strachan. As we have noted, the Bill was withdrawn. On the other hand, the British Government did not believe that all the colonies would welcome the federal proposal. The economic section of the Bill was passed as the Canada Trade Act. In 1828, a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the Canadian situation. Its report referred to the union of the Canadas as a possible solution of Canadian difficulties, but rejected

the scheme as unlikely to prove valuable. It was to take rebellion to bring the subject again officially to the fore.

In 1825 the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, Brenton Halliburton, proposed a federal union of all the Provinces. In the following year, the old Attorney General of Nova Scotia, Richard John Uniacke, submitted a long memorandum to the Secretary for the Colonies in which he urged the necessity of a union of all the provinces if their annexation by the United States were to be prevented and their preservation as a part of the British Empire ensured. He proposed, in outline, a scheme for the federal union of the provinces. This communication was received courteously by the Colonial Secretary, but Uniacke "was told by His Lordship that, as things were then tranquil....he would not agitate the question, or bring it before the Cabinet".¹

The foregoing proposals were made by Tories and "Family Compact" members. Two other men at this time became interested in the question of union. As soon as the attempt of the Colonial Office in 1822 to unite the Canadas became known it received strenuous opposition from two outstanding radicals. Robert Gourlay, an erratic and persecuted reform agitator, took up arms for the federal proposal. His work culminated in 1826 in a plan for the

1. Trotter: op. cit. pp. 8-9, Quoted by,

confederation of the colonies, "each to be as free within itself as any of the United States and the whole to hold Congress at Quebec. Each also to send two members to the British Parliament to speak but not to vote"¹. The federal proposal also received support in 1824 from William Lyon MacKenzie, later the leader of the Rebellion in Upper Canada. MacKenzie wrote in 1824 to Canning, a leading member of the British Government, advocating federal union. MacKenzie, like Gourlay, was an outspoken radical. Their advocacy of union could hardly have added to the value of the scheme in the eyes of the Tory British Government of the day.

In all of the provinces, the 1830's were a period of increasingly bitter party struggles between the Reformers, demanding increased provincial autonomy, and the Tories, stressing the imperial connection and supporting the existing regime. Only in the Canadas did the struggle threaten to become civil war. After 1834 the moderate Reformers drew away from the radicals, but the radicals made up for this loss of numbers by increased agitation. This tended to concentrate British attention on the Canadian scene. At the same time, a long period of peace had diminished interest in the strategic value of the Maritimes, and trade with the Canadas was growing. Economically, the

1. Trotter: op. cit. p. 8, quoted by.

Canadas were going ahead faster than the Maritimes. Since the unsettled political conditions in the Canadas did not favour trade development, it was but natural that the British Government should turn its attention there, responsive as it was to the mercantile interests of the nation.

In the British parliamentary session of 1837, the Canadian situation received attention when Lord John Russell introduced a series of ten resolutions. Resolution five denied the application for responsible government. In the autumn of that year rebellion broke out in both of the Canadas. It was clear that more than military force was needed to cope with the uprising, and Lord Durham was accordingly appointed to study the Canadian problem. Durham was given the commissions of governor-in-chief of each of the provinces and, in addition, he was made governor general of the provinces as a whole. He was also made high commissioner, with ill defined emergency powers, for Upper and Lower Canada alone. In the time between his appointment and departure for North America, Durham turned his attention to British American affairs and tried to secure, from those best able to advise him, suggestions for the solution of the question. The idea of union of all the provinces naturally received attention. Knowing that J. A. Roebuck had been interested in Canadian affairs for many

years and had recently advocated a general federation, Durham consulted him, discussed the federal solution and secured from him a detailed proposal for federation. Durham took this memorandum with him to Canada and brought the project to the attention of the Lieutenant Governors of the three Maritime provinces who visited him at Quebec. None of them was enthusiastic, and all were dubious as to its reception in the Maritimes. On a short visit to Upper Canada Durham stopped at Montreal. In this city influential merchants attacked Durham's scheme and urged the political union of the two Canadas.

In the Assembly of Upper Canada, a committee on the political state of the provinces, under the chairmanship of Henry Sherwood, proposed in 1838 either the reunion of the two Canadas or the legislative union of all the British provinces as a device to remedy the existing evils by promoting British ascendancy without any change in existing constitutional principles. Durham recognized these two possibilities, but confederation seemed to him to be the best solution and he persisted in urging general federation until, just as he was about to discuss his plan in detail with delegates sent to him by the Lieutenant Governors of the Maritime provinces, he learned his ordinance banishing political prisoners to Bermuda had been rejected by the British Government. Thereupon, he decided to resign.

Durham finally became convinced that the only efficient form of union would be a legislative union in which there was one legislature for all the provinces and in which the provincial legislatures had been abolished. He would have preferred this form of union to the union of the two Canadas, but decided that it was not practicable at the time. Therefore he recommended legislative union of the Canadas, although he thought provision should be made for the admission of the other provinces if ever they desired it. In advocating general union Durham had no support from the British Government for the Colonial Office had set its heart on Canadian reunion. It is notable that the terms of the Act of Union of 1840 followed much more closely the abortive Union Bill of 1822 than the recommendations laid down in the Durham report.

After the union of the Canadas in 1840, the project of the larger union was abandoned for a time. In addition to the fact that the ^{smaller} union had dealt with the only problem of immediate urgency, the colonial statesmen were preoccupied with the problem of responsible government, and the project of larger union was not revived until the economic problems arising out of the dissolution of the system of Imperial Preference brought it into prominence again as an alternative to annexation.

Although the discussion of union, prior to 1848, was largely academic, it will be seen from later

chapters of this study that the seeds of the larger union were sown in this period. With the granting of Responsible Government, the movement for union entered another phase. The idea of union tended to escape from the smaller imperial cliques and to become a subject of discussion on the platform, in the press and in the legislatures, and at the same time the idea of a Canadian nationality, as conceived by Durham, tended to emerge.

Chapter II.

Advocacy

1849-1860.

The granting of Responsible Government in Canada in the late 'forties, together with a serious economic depression, caused grave unrest. The Conservatives, who had long prided themselves on being the only loyal element in the community, could with difficulty bear the sight of patronage and government passing into the hands of their enemies, the Reformers. The fact that this came about with the ready acquiescence of the Imperial Representative put a serious strain on their loyalty to the British connection. When Lord Elgin, on April 27, 1849, acting as a constitutional governor, signed the Rebellion Losses Bill passed by the new government and designed to indemnify Lower Canadian sufferers from the Rebellion of 1837-38, insult seemed added to injury. Perhaps the most critical factor in the unrest, however, was the severe economic depression under which the country was suffering. Fostered by a British preference, an extensive trade in American grain had flourished on the St. Lawrence and, in consequence of this, a costly canal system had been developed and the Canadian milling industry greatly expanded. When Britain abandoned her preferential policy in the 'forties, this artificial expansion collapsed and a serious depression ensued. These economic difficulties, coupled with Lord

Elgin's acceptance of the Reformers and with resentment at the victory of the Reform party, temporarily were too much for the loyalty of many.

In Montreal anger at the Governor General's endorsement of the Rebellion Losses Bill resulted in mob violence and the burning of the Parliament building. Another result was agitation for annexation to the United States. Much of this was probably designed to procure the recall of Lord Elgin and the restoration of the British preference. However, the annexation propaganda weakened the already disorganized Conservative party and strengthened the Reformers. In an effort to offset this, the British American League was formed.

Montreal shortly became the centre of the League's activities. From the League soon came a summons to a convention which was to consider the commercial crisis and discuss remedies in the form of constitutional change. The summons spoke out strongly for the maintenance of the British connection and the election of delegates showed a strong majority in favour of the connection, even from Montreal, the centre of annexation propaganda. The convention met at Kingston on the 26th of July, 1849. The chief bond of union in the Convention was opposition to the Reform administration.

One of the more interesting resolutions which the Convention adopted was the resolution in favour of a union of the British North American colonies. This resolution was unanimously agreed to. Loyalists saw in it the surest means of avoiding separation from the Empire. Orange members, because of their anti-Catholic sentiments, felt that it held promise of freeing the country from the danger of French domination. In addition to passing this resolution, the Convention appointed a Conference Committee to communicate with representative persons in the Maritime colonies on the subject of union.

At a second convention of the League in the same year, this Committee reported that Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland had made no attempts toward co-operation. They had communicated with the "Colonial Association of New Brunswick," which had responded by appointing two representatives to the convention but these had been empowered to confer only and not to act.

The attitude of the great Liberal leader of Nova Scotia, Joseph Howe, toward union was clearly shown in a letter of the 8th of May, 1849 to the President of the British American League. After sarcastically characterizing the disorders in Montreal, Howe discussed the proposal of union. He wrote: "a confederation of the colonies may be the desire of your convention. If so,

the object is legitimate, but it must be pursued by legitimate means. Believe me, it can only be wisely attained by and through the Provincial Legislatures, not by self elected societies acting independently and in defiance of them. Suppose tomorrow propositions were submitted to the Lower Colonies for a legislative union or a general confederation. If made by the Government and Parliament of Canada, they would be treated with deference and respect. If made by a party in opposition, they would not for a moment be entertained.....We are not indisposed to a union or a confederation, but we must know with whom we are dealing and have securities for the preservation of the blessings we enjoy.

We desire free trade among all the Provinces, under one national flag, with one coin, one measure, one tariff, one Post Office. We feel that the courts, the press, the educational institutions of North America, would be elevated by union; that intercommunication by railroads, telegraphs and steamboats would be promoted; and that, if such a combination of interests were achieved wisely and with proper guards, the foundations of a great nation, in friendly connection with the mother country, would be laid on an indestructible basis"¹. But Howe was not optimistic about these "proper guards".

1. Chisholm: Speeches and Public Letters of Joseph Howe, vol. II, p. 25, Howe to Moffat.

Just before the meeting of the second convention of the League, annexation propaganda had culminated in the famous Annexation Manifesto. With the idea of annexation the League took issue and passed a resolution stating that, whether protection or reciprocity was given or withheld, the British connection was essential to the welfare of the Colony. The resolution passed on to recommend a union of the British provinces with the concession from Great Britain of enlarged powers of self government.

In spite of its strong advocacy of union, the efforts of the League in this direction came to nothing. In May, 1850 its central committee issued a manifesto in which they called upon the members of the League to petition the Governor General and both Houses of Parliament in favour of a federal union. Neither the Governor nor the Legislature paid any attention, and by the end of the year the League had practically disappeared. A motion made in 1851 by W. H. Merritt in the Legislative Assembly of Canada, for an address requesting a conference to consider federal union, obtained the support of only seven members.

At this time, Confederation was regarded as an alternative to annexation. Thus the movement in its favour died down with the decrease in annexation sentiment which soon took place. Returning prosperity disposed of the thesis that the welfare of the country made separation

from England necessary. In 1854 the Reciprocity Treaty was signed with the United States, and the results of this Treaty convinced many people that close economic co-operation might be had with the United States without separation from England. On the other hand, reciprocity was regarded by some to be too much akin to annexation and these people advocated the creation of a nationality for the British North American, which would counteract the influence of the United States yet preserve the British connection.¹

The first important discussion of union in a colonial legislature took place in the Nova Scotia Assembly in 1854. On the 23rd of February, J. W. Johnston, leader of the Conservative opposition, introduced the following resolution:

Resolved,-That the Union or confederation of the British North American colonies on just principles - while calculated to perpetuate their connexion with the present state - will tend to their advancement and prosperity, to increase their strength and elevate their position.

Resolved,-That an humble address be presented to the Queen praying Her Majesty's gracious consideration of the subject and the adoption of measures bringing it

1. See particularly:- Sleigh, B. W. A., Pine Forests and Hackmatack Clearings, London, 1853. P. A. N. S.

under the attention of the Government and Legislatures of her North American provinces, and for effecting the union of Her Majesty's Loyal Colonies, in a way satisfactory to themselves, and adapted to secure their harmony, and to bring into exercise their consolidated strength.

Resolved,-That His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor by address be respectfully requested to transmit with his favourable recommendation, the Address of the House to the Queen, to be laid at the foot of the throne, and that His Excellency, when the Queen's sanction shall be obtained, will use his influence, to promote the object, by correspondence with the Imperial and Colonial Governments, and in such other ways as His Excellency may judge expedient.

Resolved,-That these resolutions be conveyed to the Legislative Council, with the request of this House that they would give this important subject their attention, and unite with this House in such manner as may best be suited for its mature consideration and ultimate adoption by the several provinces.¹

In his speech following the introduction of the proposals Johnstone portrayed the benefits which, in his opinion, would follow union. He felt that union would

1. British North American, Halifax, Monday, Feb. 27th, 1854.

would give the provinces a common system, that it would greatly strengthen them and counteract the influence of the United States, and that it "would give the North American colonies, in matters affecting themselves, a prospect of having weight proportioned to their rights in the councils of the Empire, and in the deliberation of foreign states"¹. In addition, it would give the colonials a nationality and therefore a wider field for ambition. The form of union Johnston favoured was a close legislative union but he felt that "with this there must be connected a mature and perfect system of municipal corporations"². The results of union would be concentrated strength, energy and progress, an enlarged and more wholesome public opinion, a greater opportunity for colonial talent and ambition.

On the following day, Joseph Howe, the real but not the nominal leader of the Government, discussed Johnston's motion. He said: "I do not hesitate to express the hope that from this day she (N. S.) will

1. Speech by J. W. Johnston in N. S. House of Assembly on Confederation Feb. 23, 1854, p. 28, printed by MacNab and Shaffer, Halifax, 1865. Johnston referred to Lord Durham's views on union.
2. Ibid., p. 33. In the same year Johnston introduced a Bill for the Municipal Incorporation of Counties (P.A.N.S. Journal 1854, Feb. 3rd, p. 407). In 1865 he explained his purpose to have been to clear the ground for legislative union. See: J. W. Johnston to P. S. Hamilton, March 2, 1865, p. 5. Printed with Speech by J. W. Johnston in N. S. House of Assembly, 1864, MacNab and Shaffer, Halifax, 1865.

aspire to consolidation as an integral portion of the realm¹ of England or assert her claims to a national existence". Howe felt that if there were to be a union that the federal form would be better than the legislative. He felt, however, that there were a number of serious obstacles to union. The two most important were the hostility of the French Canadians and the lack of railways between the colonies. The railways he regarded as a necessary preliminary to union. He expressed the fear that Maritime interests might be sacrificed by the Canadians, for, in the past, "Canada has been satisfied to sacrifice national and provincial interests for not very weighty or very worthy considerations."² In addition, he confessed: "For various reasons, I have but little desire to reopen colonial negotiations about anything just now"³.

Howe then turned to discuss what he felt was the most important question, the relations of the colonies with England. In this connection came the question of the fisheries, of the mines and minerals and of immigration. Other important matters were British diplomacy, which might involve the colonies in a war without their being consulted, and the lack of a field where colonials might achieve high honours. The solution of these problems .

1. Chisholm, op. cit. p. 269, Vol.II.
2. Ibid., p. 285.
3. Ibid.

Howe declared, lay in the Mother Country giving the colonies representation in the British Parliament and an interest in the army, the navy, the diplomacy, the administration and the legislation of the Empire.¹

On Saturday the subject of union was again discussed. Martin I. Wilkins and Mr. MacLellan were the chief speakers. The former felt that the British connection ought to be maintained but that the colonies should have the sole direction of their trade and not be dictated to by the merchants or manufacturers of Great Britain. The latter was not in favour of union but willing to try representation in the British Parliament, although he feared the expense would be greater than the benefits conferred.² It was then proposed that union be discussed again on Monday but on this day it was postponed again, and from then on it was postponed from time to time,³ due both to the pressure of public business and to indifference.

Finally, on the 29th day of March, J. W. Johnston introduced the following resolutions:

Whereas the pressure of public business has precluded this House from fully discussing and deciding upon the resolutions moved during this session in favour of the

1. Ibid., pages 285-295.
2. British North American, Halifax, Monday, Feb. 27, 1854.
3. P.A.N.S. Journal of Assembly, 1854. See index. Union was also discussed on March 11th.

union or confederation of the British North American colonies, and it is not possible now to devote the time requisite for the renewed debate on those resolutions

Resolved,-That the further consideration of this important subject be deferred during the present session, and be taken up at the next session of this House.

This resolution was agreed to by the House.¹

Here the matter rested until, on the last day of the session, Johnston introduced another resolution which read, in part, as follows:

Resolved,- That the Committee on reporting, appointed to act during the recess, be empowered to decide on the expediency of publishing 500 copies of the debate on the union of the colonies, in pamphlet form;²

It would appear that the main purpose of these discussions of union were designed to spread and popularize the idea.³ On the whole, colonial politicians were unwilling, as yet, to adopt a consistent advocacy of union.

Nevertheless, in 1854, Johnston assured both the Assembly and the Colonial Office that he would reintroduce his union resolutions⁴ but in the elections of 1855 his Conservative minority was further reduced. In 1857, after the Reform Government had been overthrown in the Assembly by the

1. P.A.N.S. Journal of Assembly, 1854, p. 526.
2. P.A.N.S. Journal of Assembly, April 3, 1854, p. 550.
3. Chisholm, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 320, Howe to Hincks.
4. W. M. Whitelaw: Canada and the Maritimes before Confederation, p. 116.

transfer of Catholic support to Johnston's party, he assumed the reins of Government and the subject of union was brought up again. Near the end of the session the Assembly was asked to authorize the appointment of a commission to negotiate with the Imperial Government and the General Mining Association of London for the return to Nova Scotia of its mining and mineral rights, and the Executive Council in making the appointments further authorized the commission:

"to solicit on behalf of this colony from Her Majesty's Government the reconsideration of the question of an Inter-Colonial Railway between Halifax and Quebec, by the combined agency of the Imperial Government and the Provinces of Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia"

and

"either in this connection or otherwise to confer with the Imperial Government or any other parties interested therein, on the subjects of immigration to this Colony, and a union of the British North American Provinces".

The Nova Scotian commission, consisting of Johnston, then Premier, and A. G. Archibald, soon proceeded to London. A month later it was joined by two delegates from Canada, John A. MacDonald and John Rose, sent over by the Canadian Executive Council in the interests of an inter-colonial railway. The primary object of the Nova Scotian commission was achieved without difficulty and Nova Scotia Minutes, Executive Council of Nova Scotia, 1851-60, pp.286-287.

obtained her mining rights and minerals. On the other hand, the project for an intercolonial railway was a complete failure. The outbreak of the Indian mutiny strained the resources of the British Exchequer and the Government pleaded that they felt unable to ask Parliament to vote money for the railway. Again in 1858 a delegation to bring up the railway problem went to England but was also fruitless. Meanwhile, on the subject of union the commission of 1857 was informed that the British Government did not feel warranted to deal with the subject unless there was a united request from all the colonies for union, but that if the colonies wanted union the government would not place any obstacles in its way.¹

In the meantime, a Nova Scotian had taken up the subject of union in the press and had issued pamphlets in its support. In 1853 P. S. Hamilton became associated with the Acadian Recorder, a prominent Halifax newspaper. As early as 1849 Hamilton had called for a union of the British Colonies, and in 1855 he began to agitate the question in a systematic way. In the latter year he issued a pamphlet² advocating union in which he mentioned the union schemes of Uniacke and Sewell. Hamilton, in this pamphlet, claimed that the idea of union had taken a firm hold on the British American mind. In the light of that judgment he gave the reasons for it. These reasons were: 1. The Colonial status of the people had made them yearn for a nationality which would make them respected

1. Journal of Assembly, 1858, Appendix 3, pages 48-50.
2. P.A.N.S., P. S. Hamilton, Observations upon a Union of the Colonies of British North America. Printed by English and Blackadar, Halifax, 1865.

abroad and give them a larger field for ambition at home.

2. The separation of the provinces had been unfavourable to the greatest development of commerce and to the construction of public works too great for the resources of individual colonies. Thus the general prosperity of the provinces had been retarded.

Hamilton then turned to a subject which he felt was of the greatest importance. This was the relation between the provinces, as parts of the Empire, and foreign countries, particularly the United States, of whose aggressiveness he was afraid. Union would, in his opinion, be a bulwark against foreign encroachment. If the colonies were united, absorption by the United States would be impossible. Moreover, the provinces would then have ample resources to become a great nation.

Hamilton's next consideration was the form which union should take. Two kinds of union had been proposed, federal and legislative. In the United States he saw an example of the former, and the more of it he saw the less he liked it. The weakness of this form the author perceived in the danger of a conflict between a state and the federal power or a state and another state. He concluded that a federal union would prove valueless for the British provinces. A legislative union, on the other hand, he felt would be free from these disadvantages. Under this latter system the machinery of government would be less cumbrous, since one legislature would

suffice for all the provinces and the provinces themselves would cease to exist. Under a legislative union, local affairs would be controlled by a system of municipal corporations. British America could then stand beside the Mother Country as a strong united nation and "become a member of another confederation upon the vast and widely scattered territories of which 'the sun never sets' - a confederation the grandest the world ever saw - the confederation of the British Empire".¹

In 1856 Hamilton wrote a series of editorials which appeared in the Recorder under the title "A Union of the Colonies of British North America considered nationally".² These appeared in the same year in pamphlet form.³ Hamilton had, in the meantime, lost some of his optimism. He pointed out that there were at this time sectional jealousies and party rivalries, but that union of the provinces had been proposed and at least had not met with opposition. He felt that the leading statesmen and the majority of the well informed classes were in favour of union but that it was important that the masses be instructed on the subject and that all classes be made to feel how imperative was the need for speedy action. This, he said, was the office of the Press.

The main theme of these editorials was their insistence that the colonies had reached a stage where they could, and should, enter upon a national life and attain the position they were entitled to, not only in the Empire, but in

1. P. S. Hamilton, *ibid.*, p. 51.
2. *Acadian Recorder*, Oct. 11, 18, 25; Nov. 8, 22, 1856.
3. P. S. Hamilton, "Union of The Colonies of British North America Considered Nationally", with two other papers on this subject printed by John Lovell, Montreal, 1864.

the world at large. Previously there had been natural barriers but these had been largely removed by the great improvement of communication, and only artificial ones remained. Hitherto provincial interests had been disregarded by the Imperial authorities because of the weakness and division of the provinces, but union would make a repetition of that impossible. British America had the resources and capabilities to become great.

In seeking to propagate his ideas, Hamilton did not confine himself to pamphlets and editorials in the press. In addition to issuing pamphlets, he placed them where he thought they would do the most good, in the hands of Cabinet Ministers and members of the British Parliament. He also wrote numerous letters to the Governor and the Colonial Office and persuaded others to write letters on the subject to various important people. In spite of his unremitting advocacy and in spite of the fact that he influenced D'Arcy McGee and Charles Tupper, his direct influence was slight. His advocacy assisted in bringing the subject of union to public attention in Great Britain and the colonies but, in the final analysis, union was brought about by other causes.

While the idea of a union of the British American colonies was gaining wider attention in Nova Scotia and Great Britain, it was also being discussed in Canada. There, constitutional difficulties of growing seriousness beset politics. The Act of Union of 1840 had given the two sections of the

Province equal representation in the Legislative Assembly. As long as the population of Upper Canada remained smaller than that of Lower Canada, this had prevented the French Canadians from controlling the Assembly. From 1850 on, however, the balance of population steadily increased in favour of Upper Canada and, for a time, a device known as the double majority had been accepted as a means of keeping either section from dominating the other. According to the principle of the double majority, a government, to pass any measure, had to have the support of a majority of the members of the Assembly from each section of the Province. However, even though it was also understood that measures affecting either section had to have the support of its representatives, the device became more and more unsatisfactory. In Upper Canada, which had gladly acquiesced in equal representation when its population had been smaller than Lower Canada, an agitation grew for representation by population. Its greatest advocate was George Brown, editor of the Toronto Globe and prophet and leader of the Clear Grits. Brown based his demand on Upper Canada's greater population and greater financial contributions to the provincial revenue. Soon other politicians adopted his views and Upper Canada became more and more united on the issue.

If Upper Canadians presented a united opposition to the existing situation, there was considerable divergence of opinion as to the best solution. Thus it was but natural that

a union of the Provinces was considered as a possible remedy. In 1851 Henry Sherwood published a pamphlet in which he gave a draft constitution for a federation of all the Colonies. In 1856 A. A. Dorion, a Lower Canadian politician, spoke in the Canadian Assembly suggesting a federal union of the two Canadas as a solution of the constitutional difficulties. In July of the following year, J. C. Taché of Quebec began a series of articles in LeCourrier du Canada advocating federation of all the Provinces and proposing a federal scheme of government based largely upon the American form. Thus, the subject of union, in one form or another, was gaining wider attention.

In the Canadian session of 1858, federation received more attention in Canada than ever before. The short-lived Brown-Dorion administration, which took office on the 1st of August, was formed on the understanding that either demand for federation of the Canadas or the principle of representation by population would be a government policy. This ministry did not live long enough to formulate its programme. When the Cartier-MacDonald ministry which followed it was being formed, A. T. Galt, member for Sherbrooke in the Eastern Townships of Lower Canada, entered the Cabinet but on condition that the ministry support confederation. Cartier now became a convert to federal union probably through the persuasion of Galt. On the 6th of July, 1858, Galt delivered a strong speech in the Canadian Parliament in favour of a

federal union of all the British provinces because without union he felt that they would drift into the United States. In regard to Cartier's conversion, Cartier declared that he had opposed representation by population because of the strife it would cause if put into effect, but that if representation by population was accompanied by a general federal union the result would probably be satisfactory to all. In the Government's programme announced on August 7th the following statement occurred:

"The expediency of a federal union of the British North American provinces will be anxiously considered, and communications with the Home Government and the Lower Provinces entered into forthwith on this subject".¹

When the Governor General prorogued Parliament in 1858 his speech contained word that communication was to be entered upon with the Imperial and Provincial governments in order to obtain a common discussion of the principles upon which union might be practicable. Soon after, Cartier, Galt and Ross went to England to urge the Government to instruct the appointment of delegates from each province to discuss the subject. They pointed out the constitutional difficulties in Canada and the danger of annexation to the United States, and presented a scheme of federation, the work of Galt. Of all the eastern provinces Newfoundland was the only one willing to appoint delegates. The other provinces were not opposed but did not

1. Quoted by Trotter, op. cit., p. 29.

feel that the subject had been sufficiently considered by the public to make action wise at that point. The Imperial government was indifferent, if not hostile, to the scheme, and the Colonial Secretary refused to authorize the meeting. In 1859 Galt again went to England and was authorized while there to bring the subject to the attention of the New Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle. Again he achieved no satisfactory result.

Outside the legislature in 1858 important discussion of union occurred. Alexander Morris had been an enthusiastic advocate of federation in the Kingston convention of the British American League. From that time on he often had contributed to the discussion of that idea, which was closely associated in his mind with the acquisition of the North West. His most notable contribution to the propaganda for union was a lecture on "Nova Britannia" delivered in Montreal in March 1858 and later issued in pamphlet form. An enthusiastic account of British America from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it foretold the day when the whole would be politically united.

In October of that year a letter on the subject of union by James Anderson appeared in the columns of the "Montreal Gazette". Anderson's ideas were very similar to those of Hamilton and other advocates of union. He recommended a legislative union of the colonies with also representation in the British Parliament, the people governing themselves in all matters where no Imperial interests were at stake. Anderson

was thus trying to combine union and representation in the British Parliament. Here he differed from Hamilton and others. In 1859 the letter was issued in pamphlet form.¹ The discussion of union brought forth in 1858 a plan of a different kind by Henry Taylor, who proposed "a Representative Union of all the British North American Provinces and the Parent State, by representatives chosen by the separate Legislatures of each Province, to sit in the Imperial Parliament, as an efficient means of securing the permanent Union of those Colonies with Great Britain and their ultimate advancement".² Thus Taylor's plan differed from Anderson's in that it did not contemplate a union of the provinces but representation in the British Parliament alone.

Meanwhile, George Brown was incessantly agitating for Representation by Population, but he soon became convinced that this proposal, by itself, would be bitterly opposed. Therefore he tried to find some policy which would be acceptable to Lower Canada, yet give Upper Canada satisfaction. Finally, on Sept. 23, 1859, Brown called a meeting of the Reform members of both Houses. At this meeting it was decided to summon a convention of the Liberal Party, the famous Reform Convention of 1859, which met at Toronto in November of the same year. This Convention finally adopted resolutions which declared the

1. J. Anderson, The Union of British North American Provinces considered in a Letter addressed to the Citizens of British North America, printed Oct., 1859.
2. On the Intention of the Imperial Government to Unite the Provinces of British North America, by Henry Taylor.

failure of the union of 1840 and the inadequacy of the principle of the double majority as a remedy, rejected the idea of a federal union of all the Colonies and proposed the federalization of the existing Canadian union. The Convention also declared that Upper Canada would accept no government not based on the principle of Representation by Population. At the same time the Liberal members of the House from Lower Canada met and issued a manifesto which advocated federalization of the Canadian union. Among the signers of this manifesto was D'Arcy McGee, later the most outstanding prophet of a Canadian nationality. Then, at the next session of Parliament, Brown introduced two of the resolutions of the Convention, which called for the dissolution of the existing union and the substitution of a federal one. These resolutions were defeated by a large majority, although Brown was supported by most of his followers.

At the end of this period opinion was divided in Canada. In general, the people were apathetic as far as the larger union was concerned. The more important Canadian politicians varied in their attitude to the project of general union. At this time Brown was insisting primarily on Representation by Population, but was willing to accept federalization of the Canadas although he had some doubts as to its value. J. Sandfield MacDonald still held to the principle of the double majority. Dorion was in favour of federalization of the Canadas. On the other hand, John A. MacDonald and Cartier seemed to regard the larger union as the most practical scheme,

but were not over-enthusiastic. A. T. Galt, however, was strongly in favour of the larger union. On the whole, however, one idea was common to most of these politicians, the idea of waiting until the constitutional issue should force their hands. It was one thing to discuss in large terms a union of all the British provinces, quite another to make it a political platform and bring it into practical politics.

In 1860 the subject of union received considerable attention in Nova Scotia. In July the Prince of Wales, later Edward VII, visited North America. Here was an opportunity for the supporters of colonial union to interest not only him, but his companion, the Duke of Newcastle, at that time Secretary of State for the Colonies. On the very day that the Prince landed at Halifax, the newly established Halifax "Reporter" contained a detailed editorial in favour of federal union. In addition, P. S. Hamilton addressed an open letter on union of the colonies to the Duke of Newcastle who, not long ago, had expressed indifference to Galt's overtures on the subject. Hamilton, in this letter, set forth the condition of colonial affairs which made some action imperative if the colonies were to develop fully and do so within the British Empire. He pointed out that there was in the colonies a craving for nationality, for a political status in the eyes of other nations and for a larger field for ambition. He felt that union would elevate the tone of politics, which was then very low, and bring commercial prosperity. Hamilton was sure that one result of union would

be the construction of a railway to Quebec, and he pointed out the utility of such a railway for defence. He went even further and envisaged a railway line from sea to sea which would ensure to Great Britain control of both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Union, he said, would provide a bulwark against the encroachments of the United States.

Most enlightening was Hamilton's appeal for Imperial action on the matter. He expressed the opinion that the Mother Country should take the lead and overcome party rivalry and pettiness. This would show, he said, the solicitude of Britain for the colonies and colonial gratitude would strengthen the British connection.¹ In regard to the form of union desirable Hamilton observed:

"a Federative Constitution similar to that accorded by Imperial Act to New Zealand,.....would seem to combine the greatest degree of security to local interests with the greatest unanimity upon all matters of importance affecting the whole United Colony. It would also probably satisfy the wishes and aspirations of the greatest number".²

Finally, he suggested that the Duke should enquire throughout the colonies as to the state/^{of} feeling in regard to union.

The idea of union received further discussion in Nova Scotia in the same year. On November 19th Dr. Charles Tupper lectured in St. John, New Brunswick at the opening of the

1. P. S. Hamilton, Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, contained in "Union of the Colonies of British North America, being Three Papers upon this Subject", printed by John Lovell, 1864, pp. 80-103.
2. Ibid., p. 102.

Mechanics Institute there. Tupper dwelt long on the relations of the colonies with the Mother Country and their impotency in such relations. He repudiated annexation or independence as a remedy and advocated the creation of a strong nation in British North America which should exist as an integral portion of the Empire. The benefits that he declared would follow union did not differ greatly from those portrayed by Hamilton. This lecture was repeated in other places and widely reported. On the following day Tupper lectured at Portland, across the St. John River, on Maritime union. The "Morning Chronicle" of St. John on November 22nd, commenting on the lecture, said that the larger union was not likely to take place for some time but that the smaller union was practicable. The other St. John papers varied in their opinions. Both the "Globe" and the "Courier" confined themselves to reports of the first lecture. Discussing the Portland lecture, the "Church Visitor" of November 22nd expressed its intention of publishing Tupper's manuscript and said, "It embraces subjects of the most vital political importance to these colonies requiring our profound consideration".¹ The "St. John Albion" said that there was no very pressing need at that time for a political union of British North America. The "St. John Morning News" characterized Dr. Tupper as "a fair type of the displeased, or disappointed Conservative", and doubted his sincerity. The "Freeman" declared that there was as much to be said against as for union. It was aware that the Provinces could not remain long in the position they were in but declared "The People have no particular anxiety to provide a large field

1. British Colonist, Halifax, Dec. 1, 1860.

for aspiring politicians"¹.

The Halifax Press was also divided on the subject of Tupper's lectures. The "British Colonist", which on September 4th of that year/^{had} contained an editorial in favour of union, confined itself mainly to reporting the opinions of the St. John Press in regard to the lectures but was favourable to Dr. Tupper. The "Morning Journal" made no comment on Tupper's lectures, but on November 28th contained an editorial on union of the provinces which took a moderate position, neither enthusing nor condemning the project. Its final conclusion was that union might become practicable in the future. Meanwhile it suggested that commercial committees be appointed to confer from time to time on measures to increase the trade and prosperity of the Provinces. The "Nova Scotian", a Liberal organ, roundly criticizing Tupper on November 26th, declared that his ideas were probably stolen from Joseph Howe and J. W. Johnston. On December 3rd this same paper printed the unfavourable comment of the "Morning News" of St. John, and an editorial of its own, the motto of which was "Let well enough alone". The "Acadian Recorder", staunch friend of union, noticed Tupper's lecture but did not make much comment. On December 15th, however, this paper printed an editorial favouring the larger union, and criticized those who proposed Maritime Union as being either timid or as wanting to distract attention from and prevent the larger union.

1. Ibid.

Thus in 1860 the subject of union was getting wide discussion in the press of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Nevertheless, most of their inhabitants were rather apathetic toward union. This can be seen from the admissions of Hamilton and others, from the fact that the correspondence columns of the press were singularly free from controversial letters on union and, above all, from Hamilton's appeal to the Duke of Newcastle that the British Government legislate the colonies into union. However, a considerable number of men were actively advocating union of some sort or another. Whatever the motives of these advocates, their ideas were strikingly similar. To overcome the objection that union would weaken the British connection, they declared that rather it would strengthen it. More important was their fear of the United States which, in their opinion, would soon swallow up the colonies if they remained separated. Union would thus prevent the expansion of the United States at the expense of the British Americans. Most of the advocates of consolidation pointed to the low state of political life at that time and declared that union would elevate politics to a higher plane. Finally they thought they found among British Americans a widespread craving for nationality and the political, economic and professional opportunities it would offer. These points were all set forth to justify their advocacy, but it is difficult to determine just what was justification and what was an attempt to interest

all classes in the subject. Probably the greater part of their arguments were designed to make as wide an appeal as possible and make union attractive to all.

Interesting as their proposals were and valuable as they may be for the light they shed, they did not bring about union in the period 1848-1861. Advocacy, to a certain extent, familiarized and popularized union, but far more important factors had to come into operation before union could take place. The fact that several movements toward union were unsuccessful was due to a number of causes; in the first place, the British Government was indifferent or opposed to union; in the second place, the economic situation in the Provinces, on the whole, was satisfactory; in the third place, constitutional difficulties in Canada were not then serious enough to make union imperative and the American Civil War had not yet broken out to create genuine fear of American aggression.

CHAPTER III

Maritime or General Union?

1860-64.

In Nova Scotia advocacy of Union continued in 1861, but it was not completely unanimous. Thus, on one hand, the "Acadian Recorder" on January 5th announced "the particulars of the policy" which it intended to "unceasingly advocate" in the future. Heading the list was the subject of the union of all the British North American Colonies, of which the paper said:

"This great measure we shall continue to advocate as of paramount importance among all those which now challenge public attention in any of the Colonies".

At the same time the "Morning Journal", several days later, in reference to the advocacy of union since the visit of the Prince of Wales in 1860, said:

"The greater part of the Colonial Press has expressed its views, and, so far as we have had an opportunity of judging, those in favour of the Union are largely in the majority of those who dissent, nearly all advocate a Union of the Lower Provinces, excluding Canada".

The "Journal" stated that all that now remained was for the people of Nova Scotia to indicate their sentiments in respect to union. This, they suggested, could be accomplished during the forthcoming census, and the paper promised to follow the wishes of the people in its policy on union. At the same time it pointed out that the advantages of union were many and the disadvantages few.¹

1. Morning Journal, January 7, 1861.

It is evident that the people of Nova Scotia had not shown as yet any strong partiality to union. Such was the opinion of the "Nova Scotian" of Jan. 21st, which said that the people of the Lower Provinces had only "the most general and even vague notions in favour of a union of the Lower Provinces even". The paper stated the people of the Maritimes were opposed to general union due to their distrust of Canadian politicians and their fear that union would both increase their burdens and deprive them of many rights they possessed.

Nonetheless, the editors of several papers continued their advocacy of union. The "Acadian Recorder" of Jan. 19th said that the course of events in the United States made general union more imperative than ever before. Again, on January 26th, in reference to Maritime union, it said that in the Maritime Provinces it had "no sincere supporters, but was advocated only by a handfull of small politicians who seek, by so doing, to defeat the union of the whole North American Colonies". On February 20th the "Morning Journal", referring to general union, said that it was a measure that was popular, universally upheld and very little mixed up with party politics; that the press of all parties in all of the Provinces had spoken in favour of it.

Similarly, the "Halifax Reporter" of April 2nd was in favour of general union. The paper said that England should devote more attention to her American colonies and

1. Acadian Recorder, January 26, 1861.

"take her nearest dependencies into an intimate partnership as it were, and so.....create within ten days' sail of her shores another mighty bulwark which should make alliance with alien powers less necessary". According to the "Reporter" the first step towards accomplishing this was to unite them into one well-ordered whole, and this could best be done by centralizing them by a great common highway.¹ Again, in its next issue, it advocated an Intercolonial Railway as a means to a great British American Federacy.²

In the spring of 1861 an interesting rumour was current in both Great Britain and the North American Colonies that the Duke of Newcastle was at work formulating a plan for the union of British North America. On January 12th, the "Acadian Recorder" devoted an editorial mainly to this subject. It stated that the rumour seemed to have originated in the London "Court Journal" and that it had since been repeated by the London "Daily News" and other English newspapers. In reference to an article by the "News" the "Recorder" said:

"The tone of this whole article forbids our entertaining any doubt that the colonial secretary has in hand, as already reported, a scheme for the union of these Colonies".³ Again, on February 16th, it discussed this rumour which a day previously had been referred to by the Morning Journal.⁴ Howe could hardly have been unaware of this rumour. Perhaps it was the cause of his introduction of a union resolution in the

1. Halifax Reporter, April 2, 1861 "An inter Oceanic Railway".
2. Halifax Reporter, April 4, 1861.
3. Acadian Recorder, February 16, 1861.
4. Morning Journal, February 15, 1861.

session of 1861.

On February 23rd the "Acadian Recorder" reported that Joseph Howe, leader of the Liberal Government, had intimated in the House one day the week before that a discussion on union of the colonies would take place during the session. The editor expressed the suspicion that "this intimation was not made with any view to advancing the proposed union" but promised support if Howe proved to be in earnest. He also expressed the hope that union might bring about the construction of an Intercolonial Railway. However, Howe's promised discussion of union did not take place until the last day of the session and was a dull affair. On Monday, April 15th, Howe moved the following resolution in the House of Assembly:

"Whereas, The subject of a union of the British North American Provinces or of the Maritime provinces of British America, has been from time to time, mooted and discussed in all the Colonies

And, Whereas, While many advantages may be secured by such a union, either of all these provinces or of a portion of them, many and serious obstacles are presented, which can only be overcome by the mutual consultation of the leading men of the Colonies and by free communication with the Imperial Government

Therefore resolved, That his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor be respectfully requested to put himself in communication with His Grace the Colonial Secretary, and his Excellency the Governor General, and the Lieutenant Governors

of the other North American provinces, in order to ascertain the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and the opinions of the other colonies, with a view to an enlightened consideration of a question involving the highest interests, and upon which the public mind in all the Provinces ought to be set at rest".¹

This resolution was agreed to by the House without any debate. The greater part of the Halifax Press ignored the resolution.

Howe's reasons for introducing this resolution are mysterious. He may, as stated before, have decided that Newcastle was formulating a plan for union and that he should prepare for it. On the other hand, he may have been trying simply to forestall a Conservative move in that direction. At the same time, however, it must be remembered that Howe was never against union. He had often expressed his view that an Intercolonial Railway was a necessary preliminary to such a measure, although his favourite scheme was representation in the British Parliament. At all events, the resolution was vaguely worded and was not taken seriously. In addition, Howe made no attempt to implement the resolution.

Meanwhile, the discussion of union continued desultorily in Nova Scotia, little affected by Howe's resolution. On April 19th Dr. Tupper gave a lecture on union at Acadia. The arguments he advanced differed but little from those summarized in the previous chapter. Indeed, the whole advocacy of union throughout this period showed little originality, similar

1. Journal, House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, 1861, p.128.

arguments being advanced from time to time. The summer of 1861 was marked by a lessening of advocacy, but in the autumn the subject received some attention. On Sept. 25th the "Morning Journal" stated that feeling in the Lower Provinces against a union with Canada had rather increased than diminished but that maritime union was a subject in which interest was steadily increasing. The Journal, at this time, advocated the smaller union mainly on economic grounds.

Similarly, on September 7th, the Acadian Recorder had stated, speaking with less assurance than at the beginning of the year, that without the construction of an Intercolonial Railway or without an agreement for its construction political union of all the colonies could never take place.

Partly because the Halifax Press was occupied mainly with the American Civil War, political controversies in Nova Scotia and affairs in Europe, the subject of union did not receive continued attention.

In 1862 interest in union revived somewhat in Nova Scotia. On January 22nd, Dr. Tupper lectured at Temperance Hall, Halifax, on "The Political Condition of the Provinces". During the course of the lecture he read the union resolution of 1861 and proceeded to discuss the subject of the resolution. There was little that was new in his remarks. He expressed himself in favour of uniting all the Provinces and against Imperial representation, Howe's pet scheme.¹ The "Evening Express" on the 24th

1. Halifax Reporter, January 23, 1862.

commented favourably on both the lecture and its subject. On January 30th the "Halifax Reporter" devoted an editorial to the discussion of the necessity for political change in British America. The editor confessed that Tupper's lecture had drawn his attention to the matter. One of the arguments advanced in favour of union by Tupper was that it would elevate the tone of political life. This, the editor said, could be done by the politicians themselves without any other change. Nevertheless, he was, on the whole, in favour of political consolidation.

On the other hand, the "Morning Journal" on January 6th had said that without an Intercolonial Railway the proposal of general union was an absurdity. The "Journal" had also stressed the military value of such a railway. However, on February 12th, it said: "The war upon this continent may ere long rivet closer bonds of union", and suggested that "as an initiatory step measures be undertaken by the several parliaments in concert to secure inter-provincial free trade and a uniformity of currency".¹ From February until May, union, either general or Maritime, received less attention from the Halifax newspapers. Similarly, the subject received little or no attention in the session of that year in the Nova Scotia Assembly.

There was some discussion of union in the Halifax Press in the summer of 1862, but it was mainly on the subject of maritime union. On May 1st the "Halifax Reporter" expressed

1. Morning Journal, February 12, 1862.

itself in favour of uniting the Maritimes. Again, on May 29th, referring to the remarks of the "Colonial Empire", a New Brunswick paper, on the subject, it said:

"We quite agree with the Empire that the union of the two provinces (New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) would be greatly to their interests; and there is little doubt that it would be most acceptable to a majority of their people. Such a union would be a precursor of a federation of all the British American Provinces"¹.

On July 28th the "Halifax Morning Sun" stated that it seemed as if there had always been a strong feeling in the Maritimes against uniting these provinces with Canada. It also said: "on the whole we view a union of all the colonies to be for beneficial purposes impracticable" but it was definitely in favour of Maritime union. On the other hand, the "Acadian Recorder" stated a month later² that general union was imperative because of the Civil war. The rest of the Halifax papers paid union very little attention. It is fairly clear from what has been said above that hope for the larger union had almost vanished and that some of the press turned to Maritime union either as an alternative in itself or as a step toward the larger project.

Meanwhile, action was being taken to implement Howe's Resolution of 1861. On May 21st Lieutenant Governor Mulgrave transmitted a copy of this resolution to Newcastle, the

1. Halifax Reporter, May 29, 1862.
2. Acadian Recorder, August 30, 1862.

Colonial Secretary. He explained that for various reasons his Government had felt it inexpedient to act upon it during the past year but that now they were anxious for the Colonial Secretary to

"sanction such consultation between the different provinces as will enable the important subject of a Union of the Colonies to be considered in all its different branches with a view of deciding upon its practicability and the character of the union which would be most conducive to the permanent advancement and prosperity of the North American colonies".

Mulgrave was of the opinion that "feeling in favour of a union¹ of some sort was decidedly on the increase in this Province".

Newcastle, in his reply of July 6th, referring to Maritime and general union, said:

"They areof a nature which renders it essentially fit, that if either of them be proposed for adoption, it should emanate in the first instance from the Provinces, and should be concurred in by all of them which it would affect. I should see no objection to any consultation on the subject amongst the leading members of the Governments concerned; but whatever the result of such consultation might be, the most satisfactory mode of testing the opinion of the people of British North America would probably be by means of resolution or address, proposed in the Legislature of each Province by its own Government.

Beyond this expression of the views of Her Majesty's Government as to the preliminary steps which might be taken toward

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 126, Mulgrave to Newcastle, May 21st, 1862.

the discussion of this great question, I am not prepared to announce any course of policy upon an invitation proceeding from one only of the British North American Provinces, and contained in a resolution of so general and vague a character as that which you have transmitted to me. But if a Union, either partial or complete, should hereafter be proposed with the concurrence of all the Provinces to be united, I am sure that the matter would be weighed in this country both by the Public, by Parliament, and by Her Majesty's Government, with no other feeling than an anxiety to discern and promote any course which might be the most conducive to the prosperity, the strength and the harmony of all the British communities in North America."¹

Taking this as authorization, on August 14th Howe, as Provincial Secretary, wrote to the Provincial Secretaries of Canada, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island enclosing both a copy of Newcastle's despatch and a copy of the resolution of 1861. He explained that due to the election of 1861 in New Brunswick and the controversy in Prince Edward Island in the same year he had not thought it expedient to bring the matter to their attention. Now he was charged to invite from each of the provincial governments prompt consideration of the subject of union. He requested them to advise him whether they were ready to discuss the matter and appoint delegates to meet at a central place about the middle² of September. The two Reform Governments of Canada and New

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 106, Newcastle to Mulgrave, July 6, 1862.
2. Journal of House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1863, App. 17, pp. 2-3, Howe to Dorion, Tilley and Pope, August 14, 1862.

1
Brunswick sent favourable replies to Howe's request. The Conservative Government of Prince Edward Island took no notice.

The Conference which met at Quebec in September, 1862 was not primarily concerned with union. The chief subjects of interest were the completion of an Intercolonial Railway and interprovincial free trade. In the spring of 1862, Newcastle, the Colonial Secretary, had sent despatches to the governors of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Canada announcing the offer of an imperial guarantee of interest but no financial contribution. He suggested that the provinces confer on the matter. 2 It was this offer which was discussed at Quebec and was accepted by the Conference. 3 Of the delegates chosen by Nova Scotia to represent her at Quebec, Howe and McCully had been selected to discuss the railway; and William Annand to discuss the matter of free trade with the Finance ministers of New Brunswick and Canada. 4 However, the discussions on both subjects were carried on by the whole group. As regards the railway it was decided to accept Newcastle's offer and to have delegates appointed to go to England to take up the matter. On the other hand, the Conference agreed that the question of free trade be deferred until the railway was completed. 5

1. F.A.N.S. Vol. 272, Reply of Canada, Aug. 21st and 23rd, Nos. 68 and 66; Reply of New Brunswick, August 22nd, No. 65.
2. Journal House of Assembly, 1863, App. 5, pp.1-3, Newcastle to Mulgrave, April 12, 1862.
3. Journal House of Assembly, 1863, App. 5, p. 5.
4. Minutes Executive Council, 1862, August 22.
5. Journal House of Assembly, 1863, App. 62.

The question of union was discussed in an atmosphere of doubt and hesitation. The Conference was distinctly a party gathering, for not a single Conservative from any province was present.¹ A change in government might render futile any agreement reached. Thus there was only informal and slight discussion of union and the matter was postponed indefinitely.² During a conference of the provincial governors held at Quebec at the same time the subject of a union of the provinces for defence was considered but came to nothing.³ Officially, union of any kind had been set at rest.

Halifax papers devoted some attention to the Quebec Conference. On September 13th the "Halifax Reporter", in reference to the subjects to be discussed at Quebec, said that "report and public feeling have caused three to stand out more prominently than others. These three are the Defense of the Colonies, the Inter-colonial Railway, and a Union of the Provinces". The "Reporter" was in favour of measures to accomplish all three. It expressed fear that the trouble in the American States made it probable that the Conference, if not forgotten, might not receive at least due attention at the hands of the Press. On September 30th it quoted reports on the Conference from other colonial newspapers.⁴ On November 1st the "Acadian Recorder" again expressed the opinion that an intercolonial railway was the first step toward general union. On November 22nd the "Halifax Reporter" gallantly predicted

1. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit, p. 180.
2. Debates and Proceedings, 1865, p.100, William Annand's speech.
3. W. M. Whitelaw, The Maritimes and Canada before Confederation, pp. 181-184.
4. Halifax Reporter, September 30, 1862.

that the British North American colonies would form a great confederation within fifty years.

In general, it does not appear that in Nova Scotia a great deal had been expected of the conference in regard to union. The results of the Conference dispelled any hopes for the time being, and press advocacy practically ceased for a time. Neither fear of the American States nor the benefits which would allegedly flow from unification were enough to cause any considerable public demand for either Maritime or general union. Although many of the newspapers enlarged on the danger from the Northern States, this had little effect on Nova Scotians. On the contrary, it was sometimes expressed in at least several of the Halifax papers that the United States' misfortune was Nova Scotia's opportunity.¹ Though the disturbances of ^{the} Civil War had an adverse effect on Nova Scotia's economy in 1861, markets grew better in 1862. Part of the lack of fear in Nova Scotia was due undoubtedly to her geographical position, which also militated against the growth of strong feeling for union. Another factor preventing the growth of sentiment was the distrust which Nova Scotians felt for Canada and particularly Canadian politicians. The rebellion of 1837, the troubles of 1849 in Canada, the negotiations of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854 among other things formed and reinforced this sentiment. Nova Scotians as a whole desired an intercolonial railway. Metaphysical speculation was not needed to discover the benefits which would come from such a railway.

1. Morning Chronicle, November 13, 1862, British Colonist, 1862, et al.

On the other hand, the benefits of union were speculative and Nova Scotians, it seemed, were unwilling to rely upon union to get them a railway.

Maritime union was an academic subject up to and including the greater part of 1863. It had a number of supporters in Nova Scotia, some of whom looked upon it as a step toward the unification of all the colonies, others who thought it would block the larger union. That all of its supporters belonged to either of these two classes is a priori unlikely. That the majority did so belong was certainly a fact. Unfortunately, there is no sure way of determining whether there were many who looked upon Maritime union as a good in itself and, if so, how many there were. One thing is certain, neither Maritime nor general union, up to this time, was an object of popular desire in Nova Scotia.

The early part of 1863 witnessed little agitation for any form of union. From 1860 to 1863 Nova Scotia was the scene of acrimonious political dispute. In various ways the Conservative Party, whose leader was Charles Tupper, tried to unseat the Liberal Government of Howe throughout the whole period. Despite their efforts, the Liberal Government survived the session of 1863. The elections, however, were scheduled for the summer of that year. Party controversy was the main subject which received the attention of the Nova Scotia press during the first half of the year. Calling themselves the Constitutional Party, because they claimed Howe's Government had usurped and kept power unconstitutionally, and with a policy of retrenchment, the Conservatives won the elections. They returned forty members

against fourteen Liberal members and one independent. It was this Conservative government which was in power when Confederation took place.¹ The first half of 1863 was also marked by the failure of intercolonial railway negotiations. The railway question, like the union question, had been set at rest for a time.

There was very little agitation for any kind of union in the Halifax Press during the summer of 1863.² The failure of the railway negotiations seemed to eliminate the prospect of general union, although the "Halifax Reporter" in an editorial in favour of confederation expressed the belief that the completion of the intercolonial railway would follow general union.³ It does not appear from a fairly close study of the press that this feeling was shared by many in Nova Scotia. In July, D'Arcy McGee visited Nova Scotia and while at Halifax was invited to give a lecture on the future of British America. McGee lectured on the intercolonial railway and union of the colonies, at Temperance Hall on July 21st. He advocated union on the following grounds: "the argument from association" - combined the colonies would be able to complete the intercolonial railway; "the commercial argument" - union would bring free trade among the provinces; "the immigration argument"; "the patriotic argument"; and "the argument of political necessity

1. See Appendix I for members elected in 1863 and in the bye-elections of 1865 and 1866; for the members of the Executive Council from 1863 to the summer of 1867.
2. The newspaper files in the P.A.N.S. are rather incomplete in a number of newspapers for the summer of 1863.
3. Halifax Reporter, June 30, 1863.

arising out of the state of our next neighbours".¹ At the conclusion of the lecture, while moving a vote of thanks, J.W. Johnston expressed himself in favour of general union. Joseph Howe, who seconded the motion, said in regard to union that he hoped sectional feeling would soon disappear and that "he was in favour of union, either before or after the construction of the Intercolonial Railway; but in his opinion the road ought to be first built, and union come after".² The Provincial Secretary of New Brunswick, S. L. Tilley, was present at the lecture and was invited by the chairman to make some remarks. According to the British Colonist,³ Tilley "was understood to say that whatever difficulties might beset the more comprehensive scheme, at least the Maritime Colonies could unite, and that at all events it was desirable that this lesser project should take place first as a preparatory step to the greater one". After commenting favourably on the lecture, the "Morning Chronicle" said:

"We do not wish to be thought as committed to his views in all things; but it will require a number of just such avant couriers as he, a good while in the field, to rouse the sleepy foggism of all the Provinces into a state of active thought as regards the future, and energetic interest as regards the present. We want more men of Mr. McGee's turn of mind in

1. Acadian Recorder, July 25, 1863, see also Morning Chronicle and British Colonist, July 23, 1863.
2. Morning Chronicle, July 23, 1863.
3. British Colonist, July 23, 1863.

these Provinces; and although we think he committed a sad mistake in not rushing away from Sandfield MacDonald's cabinet before it was overthrown, still we are not disposed to visit the error too harshly, nor obstruct his usefulness in reference to the future of British America".¹

On the same day that McGee delivered his lecture, the "Chronicle" had stated there could be no British American nation without an intercolonial railway.² The "British Colonist", referring to the "Chronicle's" editorial of the 21st, stated it was designed to "damage Mr. McGee in the estimation of a Halifax audience" and said:

"Indeed we are not sure that the unmannerly, snarling editorial of the Chronicle did not materially contribute to the success of the lecture. Still we wish to believe that the assembling of so large a number of the most intelligent and respectable citizens of Halifax to listen to a lecture upon a 'Union of the North American Colonies' was owing solely to the greatly increasing interest which is every day being taken in the subject; and our only reason for wishing that the Chronicle had said nothing about it is that, in such an event, we should have been quite sure of this being the case".³

The "Acadian Recorder" commented favourably on the lecture without, however, strongly advocating union, and confined itself mainly to giving extracts.⁴

1. Morning Chronicle, July 23, 1863.
2. Ibid. July 21, 1863.
3. British Colonist, July 23, 1863.
4. Acadian Recorder, July 25, 1863.

Soon after McGee's lecture, some hopes for an intercolonial railway were revived.¹ These were largely set at rest, however, when the Canadian Legislature closed in October without any tangible result in that direction.² It was not long before Maritime union began to be advocated again in Nova Scotia. This had been foreshadowed on February 2, 1863, by the "Halifax Morning Sun" which predicted that if the intercolonial railway negotiations fell through because of the Canadians, the Lower Colonies would be forced to consider the question of Maritime union seriously. On October 27th the "Morning Chronicle", a Liberal newspaper, devoted an editorial to the subject of Maritime union. It said that now that the Canadians had prevented the construction of the intercolonial railway and the prospect of general union had been postponed for at least a generation, the next best thing was for the public men of the Maritimes to "devote their serious attention to the practicability of consolidation on a smaller scale". According to the "Chronicle", Maritime union primarily would give military strength. It would also bring internal improvements. This editorial drew very favourable comment from the "British Colonist", a Conservative organ.³ Similarly, on October 30th, the "Halifax Morning Sun" again expressed itself in favour of Maritime union. It said that it presumed that this project had been in abeyance while the intercolonial railway negotiations were in process but

1. Morning Chronicle, July 30, 1863.
2. Morning Chronicle, Sept. 22nd, October 8th, October 24th, 1863.
3. British Colonist, October 31, 1863.

"Now that the fast and loose policy of the Canadian Ministers has been made manifest, and the railway, at any rate for a time, got its quietus, we are glad to see the Union question again brought up."

It quoted the "Chronicle's" remarks on the subject. Again on November 5th the "Chronicle" advocated Maritime union. It stated that now since Canada had "violated her public pledges" the Maritime colonies would never consent to a union with Canada. It was of the opinion that Maritime union would reduce the expenses of government, promote economic prosperity, strengthen the Maritimes for defence and give them uniformity of currency, laws and institutions.

On the other hand, the "Acadian Recorder" on November 7th stated that there was less hope for Maritime union at that time than ever before; that the colonies were going in different political directions and that unity was needed in each province before the Maritimes could be unified. It said that the differences in constitutions, institutions and practices would have to be assimilated before union could take place. The editorial, however, did not go unchallenged. On November 19th the "British Colonist" again expressed itself in favour of Maritime Union and criticized the assertions of the "Recorder". It conceded the existence of wide differences in the Maritimes but claimed that was an additional argument for union. According to the "Colonist", unification of the Maritimes would be valuable to prevent the colonies from going any farther "in different political directions" and would cure the

evils already brought about by this diversity. It maintained that nothing short of union could effect either the one or the other. On November 21st the "Recorder" replied to the "Colonist", reiterating its previous arguments and stated that a little more unanimity of thought and feeling was needed in the Maritimes before such an important step as their union was undertaken. It also said that the only solution for Canadian difficulties lay in a general union.

Despite the criticism, the "Chronicle" continued its advocacy in three editorials.¹ The first referred to the failure of the railway negotiations as due to Canada, and said that this had made general union impossible. The arguments advanced in favour were similar to those previously given in this study. The editor also quoted extracts in favour of Maritime union from various colonial papers.² The second editorial contained extracts from the "Toronto Globe", the "Quebec Mercury" and the "Quebec Daily News". The "Chronicle" claimed credit for starting the recent movement toward Maritime union in the autumn, and said: "The magnitude of the proposition we are by no means disposed to underrate. It involves considerations of the highest moment".³ The third editorial was devoted chiefly to pleased comments at the way the idea of Maritime union was being received in Canada and Prince Edward Island.⁴ Early in December, however, news of the

1. Morning Chronicle, Nov. 21st, Dec. 1st and Dec. 3rd, 1863.
2. Morning Chronicle, Nov. 21, 1863.
3. Ibid., Dec. 1, 1863.
4. Ibid., Dec. 3, 1863.

Chesapeake affair reached the Maritimes and the attention of the press became diverted from the subject of consolidation.

Meanwhile, the Administrator of the Province, Charles Hastings Doyle, had become interested in Maritime union.¹ On October 29th Doyle wrote a private letter to Newcastle favouring the scheme.² In November Doyle sent a "separate" despatch to Newcastle on the same subject. He stated that when he had written his previous letter he had not been aware that the subject had been discussed so thoroughly by the previous Governor and the Colonial office. Since then he had read the correspondence on the subject and now felt that further remarks were superfluous. But, he added:

"I would wish nevertheless to assure Your Lordship that not only in a civil but in a military point of view (sic) I consider the benefit that would be derived from the junction of these Lower Provinces can scarcely be overestimated, and I now transmit extracts from the different Halifax newspapers, to enable your Grace to perceive that in this Province at any rate,³ all parties are apparently unanimous in favour of such a step". On December 10th Doyle sent further extracts from "Halifax Newspapers of different politics" on the subject of Maritime union and said that enthusiasm for the project was rising in Nova Scotia.⁴ Here the matter rested.

1. Lt. Gov. Mulgrave left for England on leave of absence on Sept. 17, 1863. On the 18th the Commander of Her Majesty's Forces in the Maritimes had assumed the Administratorship.
2. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit., p.199, ref.3.
3. P.A.N.S. Vol. 127, Doyle to Newcastle Nov. 12, 1863. Acknowledged by Newcastle, on Dec. 19th, P.A.N.S. Vol. 107.
4. Ibid., Dec. 10th, acknowledged Dec. 31st, P.A.N.S. Vol. 107.

On January 21, 1864, the "British Colonist" called attention again to general and Maritime union. It said:

"The Union of all the British North American Provinces is not likely to be brought about by any human advocacy, we imagine, for many years, although it might be precipitated by events which may not be so very remote. The Union of the Maritime Provinces we believe to be practicable now, and not in the least degree antagonistic to the larger question".

On February 3rd the "Morning Journal" expressed the hope that Maritime union would get some attention during the session. It stressed the connection between union and defense, and drew attention to the "Little England" feeling in Britain.

This hope was partially fulfilled on the following day when Administrator Doyle opened the Legislature of Nova Scotia. In the Speech from the Throne, Doyle referred to the subject in the following words:

"The importance of consolidating the influence and advancing the common progress of the three Maritime Provinces, whose interests are so closely identified, has for some time attracted a large share of public attention, and I propose to submit, for your consideration, a proposition in which the co-operation of the Governments of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island will be invited, with a view to the union of the three Provinces under one Government and Legislature".¹

The Halifax papers greeted Doyle's statement of

1. Journal House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1864, p. 10.

policy favourably. The "Acadian Recorder", previously hostile, said that this proposal involved a question "of the greatest magnitude" and that it would induce little difference of opinion. It stated that as far as parties were concerned there was a unanimity of sentiment. It said that it would wait for more details before expressing any further opinions. ¹ On February 8th the "Nova Scotian" commented favourably on Doyle's statement. In regard to the same matter, the "British Colonist" said:

"The proposal for the Union of the Colonies meets, we believe with universal approbation, a fact which gives continued assurance that that great question is to be kept in the future, as it has been in the past, free from the complications of party strife". ²

On February 15th, the "Nova Scotian" in reference to union stated:

"The union of the Provinces, we advocate, is not a mere speculative union, nor a union on paper. It is a union adapted to strengthen our military and defensive condition in case of war; to concentrate our counsels, to inspire self confidence in times of war or of peace; to unshackle trade and commerce; to dispense as far as possible with that class of public servants who collect duties and consume a large proportion of them in the collection".

The paper mentioned the proposed St. John to Portland Railway and stated that if this was achieved Halifax should have rail connection with St. John whether the Maritimes were united or not.

1. Acadian Recorder, February 6, 1864.
2. British Colonist, February 9, 1864.

It ~~cautioned~~^{warned} the Government to proceed cautiously in its railway policy lest it prejudice the proposed Maritime union.

A week before, Doyle had drawn the attention of the Lieutenant Governors of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to his reference to Maritime union in his speech from the Throne. He informed them that his Government intended to introduce a resolution into the House during the session, authorizing the appointment of ~~the~~ delegates to confer with delegates from New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the subject of maritime consolidation.¹ Correspondence then ensued between the governors in an attempt to fix upon a similar form for each of the resolutions to be submitted in the three Provincial Assemblies.² A fairly similar form of resolution having been agreed on, Provincial Secretary Tupper on March 21st, by command of Administrator Doyle presented to the House the correspondence between Doyle and the Lieutenant Governors of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the subject of Maritime union. The House then decided to consider the matter on March 28th.³ Consequently, on this date the Provincial Secretary, after delivering a lengthy speech in favour of the smaller union, moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That an humble address be presented to his Excellency the Administrator of the Government, requesting him to appoint delegates (not to exceed five) to confer with delegates who may be appointed by the governments of New Brunswick

1. Journal, 1864, App. 24, p. 1.
2. Ibid., App. 24, pp. 2-3.
3. Journal, 1864, p. 74.

and Prince Edward Island for the purpose of considering the subject of the union of the three Provinces under one Government and Legislature, such union to take effect when confirmed by the Legislative enactments of the various Provinces interested, and approved by her Majesty the Queen.¹

The debate which followed the introduction of the resolution was in no way heated. When recommending the resolution, Tupper had advanced arguments which were by no means novel, but it should be noted that he expressed the opinion that maritime union would be a step toward the larger union.² This attitude was also expressed by A. G. Archibald, the leader of the Liberal Opposition, who seconded the motion. Similarly, both Archibald and Tupper pointed out the danger which the condition of affairs to the south made probable and claimed that the Provinces would be driven into union. Mr. Tobin (C) declared that he was in favour of the larger union but since it was at present impossible he favoured the smaller one. Hon. J. W. Johnstone (C) expressed himself in favour of Maritime union as a step towards the larger one. Ezra Churchill (C) opposed Maritime union because he felt that there were too many obstacles in the way and that there was no need to fear the Americans. Thomas Killam (C) was more interested in the relation between the colonies and the Mother country and the fact that Britain might involve them in a war at any time without their having any choice in the matter. S. L. Shannon (C) said

1. Journal, 1864, p. 87.

2. British Colonist, April 9, 1864; also Nova Scotian, April 11, 1864.

that the probability of war was one of the strongest arguments in favour of union; the larger union was not practicable now but the smaller was. He declared that Great Britain was anxious for the colonies to consolidate their strength. He looked upon the smaller union as a step to the greater. Mr. Miller (Independent) asked whether it was intended to submit the question to the people. When Tupper replied that it was not, Miller cautioned against too much haste. He was in favour of the larger union but he could not see the utility of Maritime union for defence and he felt that it would retard the unification of all the British North American Colonies. He felt that the House should move "only on the most unequivocal expression of popular feeling". Avarad Longley (C) declared that he had no fear of American aggression and that he felt the House should be very cautious. If there were to be any union it should be a general union because Maritime union, instead of allaying trouble, would generate it. Alexander McParlane (C) was in favour of appointing delegates but reserved judgment on any scheme they might mature. C. J. Campbell (C) stated that Maritime union was a step in the right direction and that the Maritimes should unite for protection.¹ Dr. Hamilton (C) also felt that it was a step toward general union. He said that in the meantime he would consult his constituents and ascertain their opinion on the matter. He approved the resolution and said that he hoped the delegates would bring back a scheme of union which could be approved. James MacDonald (C) also approved the resolution and

1. British Colonist, April 12, 1864; see also Morning Chronicle, March 29, 1864.

regarded it as a step toward a union of all the Provinces. At this point the question was put and the resolution was passed without a dissentient vote. However, when Dr. Tupper moved that the fact that the resolution had passed unanimously be stated in the Journals, Mr. Longley objected. Finally it was agreed that the word "unanimously" should not be inserted.¹ On April 7th it was moved that the resolution be sent to the Legislative Council for concurrence² and on April 15th the Assembly was informed that the Council agreed unanimously to the resolution.³

Maritime union was not at this time a party measure in Nova Scotia. Of the twelve members of the Assembly (excepting Tupper who introduced the resolution) who spoke on the subject on March 28th four (three Conservatives and one Independent) were opposed or not interested, and eight (seven Conservatives and one Liberal) were in favour. Of the members who did not take part in the debate we have no information. Since they did not vote, however, they must have been either in favour of the resolution or convinced that it would do no harm and come to nothing. Whatever their opinion, Maritime union did not become a burning question in the House.

In New Brunswick the resolution passed without difficulty on April 9th.⁴ The debate in the House was desultory and the prevailing sentiment expressed was that of approval of the

1. British Colonist, April 14, 1864; see also Morning Chronicle, March 29, 1864.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1864, p. 103.
3. Ibid., p. 116.
4. Journal, House of Assembly, New Brunswick, 1864.

conference. There was no essential difference in the wording of the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick resolutions. In Prince Edward Island the proposal for a conference met with opposition. Even its nominal supporters were lukewarm. The resolution passed but only after its wording had been significantly changed, following considerable debate.¹ The resolution, which should be compared with that of Nova Scotia, read:

Resolved, That His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor be authorized to appoint delegates (not to exceed five) to confer with delegates who may be appointed by the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for the purpose of discussing the expediency of a union of the three Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, under one Government and Legislature; the report of said delegates to be laid before the Legislature of this colony before any further action shall be taken in regard to the proposed question.²

Prince Edward Island was already out of step with the other Maritime Provinces.

The idea of Maritime union exercised the imagination of several Nova Scotians. On April 16th, the "Acadian Recorder" commented on a letter in favour of Maritime union which it had received and printed about a week before. The paper stressed the control of the fisheries, mentioned in the letter as an argument for Maritime consolidation, and said that the Maritimes should try to include Newfoundland, the Labrador shores and Gaspe peninsula

1. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit, p. 205.

2. Journal, 1864, App. 24, p. 4. Resolution passed April 18, 1864.

in the proposed union. This idea had been advanced in the letter. If that could be accomplished the Maritimes could then control the fisheries of North America and strongly influence the fish markets of the world. On the 23rd the "Recorder" said that part of New England might join the Maritimes, and again emphasized control of the fisheries. It stated that if this happened, the Maritimes would be able to dictate to Canada. Canada, however, could prevent such an eventuality by securing the construction of an inter-colonial railway.

Meanwhile, on March 30th Doyle had informed Newcastle of the union resolution passed in Nova Scotia. He told the Colonial Secretary that the matter was being considered in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, but that it was too early to report fully. This despatch was replied to on April 25th by the New Colonial Secretary, Edward Cardwell, but no comment was made. At the same time the union movement was losing way. On April 11th the Lieutenant Governor Gordon of New Brunswick forwarded the New Brunswick resolution to Administrator Doyle and Lieutenant Governor Dundas of Prince Edward Island. He suggested that the conference be held late in July or in early August, and said that he would appoint delegates immediately. In a despatch to the Colonial Secretary to acquaint him with the progress of the negotiations, Gordon expressed the hope that the project might "be accomplished at no very distant period". However, Dundas replied to Gordon as follows: "There does not appear to be any objection to the time

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, March 30, 1864, Doyle to Newcastle.
2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 108, April 25, 1864, Cardwell to Doyle.
3. Journal House of Assembly, New Brunswick, 1865, App.10, pp.5-6.
4. Ibid., p. 6, April 12, 1864.

you propose for the meeting of the Delegates. This will, however, in a measure depend upon the place decided upon for the meeting of the Delegates".¹ Before this letter arrived in New Brunswick, Gordon had sailed for England without appointing delegates. Maritime union was set at rest until the new Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia arrived on the scene.

In April, the Earl of Mulgrave (recently become the Marquis of Normanby) resigned as Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia and Richard Graves MacDonnell was appointed as his successor. The new governor did not arrive in Nova Scotia until June 22nd, but he came with confidential instructions to further the Maritime union movement as much as possible.² When he arrived he found the project in the doldrums and he made no attempt to revive the subject for several weeks. Early in July, however, he received a letter from Governor General Monck which started him into activity.³ Monck informed him that the Canadian Government wished to send a delegation to attend the proposed conference of Maritime union with a view "to ascertain whether the proposed union" might not "be made to embrace the whole of the British North American Provinces." Monck asked for information of date and place of the projected conference.⁴ MacDonell, in his reply of July 9th, informed Monck that since the passing of the union resolutions no action had been taken, but that he would take his enquiry

1. Quoted by Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 211.
2. Minutes Executive Council Nova Scotia, March 9, 1865.
3. The letter was addressed to Doyle but MacDonnell had assumed office.
4. Journal, 1865, App. 3, page 2, June 30, 1864.

as an occasion to revive the subject and would keep Monck informed. In regard to Canadian delegates conferring with Maritime delegates, he said:

"In the meantime I can assure your Lordship of the extreme pleasure which it will afford this Government, to confer unofficially with any delegates sent from Canada. It is, however, necessary to remind your Lordship that no Resolution has yet been passed by any of the Legislatures of the Maritime Provinces, authorizing the appointment of delegates for any purpose but that of considering some plan for the union of the three Provinces. Therefore, neither I nor my ministry have the power to go beyond the exact powers conferred by that Resolution".¹

Several days later MacDonnell wrote to the Lieutenant Governors of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, informing them of Monck's communication. He stated that he was ready to nominate five delegates, three to represent the government and two the opposition, and that he left to them the choice of time and place for the meeting, although he suggested that Charlottetown might be the most suitable place. He said: "Beyond a desire that no further delay, which can be avoided, should take place, neither I nor my ministry have anything to suggest".² On July 28th the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island informed MacDonnell that his Government would welcome the delegates to Charlottetown and that they suggested the first of September as a suitable date.³ This was agreed to by both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

1. P.A.N.S., Journal, 1865, App. 3, pp. 2-3.

2. Ibid., pp. 3-4

3. Ibid., pp. 4

Canadian interest in the conference to discuss Maritime union apparently came as a surprise to MacDonnell. He had been told to further Maritime union as much as possible ¹ but had been given no instructions as regards the larger union, and he subsequently said that the Colonial Office had given him no idea of its attitude towards the larger question. ² His doubts are shown in his despatch of July 18th to the Colonial Secretary. He reported Lord Monck's enquiry and what had been done up to that time in regard to Maritime union, as well as what he intended to do in the future, subject always to the Home Government's approval. As regards the Canadian request to be present at the Conference, he informed Cardwell that both he and his executive council had felt that the Resolution conferred no power to discuss a larger union at the Conference, and that he had informed Monck of that fact but had said that the question could be discussed informally by the Canadian and Maritime delegates. He called Cardwell's attention to a confidential despatch of January 27, 1860, addressed to Mulgrave by the Duke of Newcastle, in which the latter had said:

"Previous to sending delegates to Quebec or elsewhere, such a proposal should not be authorized by yourself without previous communication with the Secretary of State, in order that the question of the Delegates, and the instructions to be given them may be known beforehand to Her Majesty's Government".

Apparently he was unaware of the despatch of July 6, 1862, which

1. P.A.N.S. Minutes Executive Council, March 9, 1865.
2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, August 31, 1864, sec. 4. MacDonnell to Cardwell. This section was deleted from the despatch when printed in the Journal of Assembly, 1865, App. 3, but with no indication of that fact.

gave permission for the convocation of a conference. MacDonnell felt that he had not violated either the letter or spirit of the first despatch, but he said:

"If, however, you should be of the opinion there is any reason either to withhold my sanction to the appointment of Delegates, or require any special guarantee, there is still time to furnish me with the necessary instructions, as probably the 1st of September will be the earliest day named for the Conference.

In the meantime I venture to add, in reference to the suggestion of Lord Monck, that it seems premature to discuss the larger question of a union of the five Provinces before it be ascertained whether the three smaller, whose interests are more immediately and more evidently connected, can be induced to combine in closer connection. I apprehend that the more limited project, if practicable at all, as I hope it is, is all that can be managed for some time to come, whilst if the larger proposal be attainable, and be desirable, its adoption will eventually be in this way much facilitated. I think so because a Union between two communities, which would be all that would then remain to be accomplished, will assuredly be a simpler question to arrange than a Union between five as at present".¹

MacDonnell's despatch was answered on August 9th. Cardwell approved the course that the Lieutenant Governor had taken. He was of the opinion that "the official mission of the delegates should be confined to the Union of the Lower Provinces"

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, July 18, 1864, MacDonnell to Cardwell.

and that "by proceeding with the consideration of the Union of the Lower Provinces, you will be throwing no impediment in the way of a wider scheme if hereafter such a scheme should appear to be desirable"¹. This answer did not reach Nova Scotia until a few days before the meeting at Charlottetown. Thus, not until August 27th did MacDonnell appoint delegates. In the beginning he had intended to appoint Dr. Tupper, W. A. Henry, K. B. Dickey, Joseph Howe and A. G. Archibald, with the knowledge that Howe's duties as Fishery Commissioner might prevent him from accepting. In that event he was prepared to appoint some one else.² It was, therefore, no great surprise when Howe refused to serve,³ and John Locke was asked to take his place. Locke accepted but soon resigned and Jonathan McCulley was appointed to succeed him.⁴ The actual delegation comprised Dr. Tupper, provincial secretary; W. A. Henry, Attorney General; K. B. Dickey, Member Legislative Council; A. G. Archibald, Liberal; Jonathan McCully, Liberal.⁵ Of these five delegates, three came from Cumberland and one from Colchester. It was this region which might be expected to benefit most from Maritime union. The New Brunswick delegation was similarly constituted. Nevertheless they did not, unlike the Canadians, present a united front at the Charlottetown conference.⁶

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 108, Aug. 9, 1864, Cardwell to MacDonnell.
2. Journal House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1865, App. 3, p. 7
3. Chisholm, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 434. Howe declined Aug. 16, 1864.
4. Journal House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1865, App. 3, p. 8.
5. Ibid., p. 8.
6. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 231.

The revival of union sentiment in Canada had not gone unnoticed in the Halifax press. On May 28th the "Acadian Recorder" noted with interest the movement toward union shown by the debates of May 19th in the Canadian Legislature. Again, on June 25th, it said that George Brown's acceptance of office in the Canadian Government and his well known sentiments in favour of union made it probable that general union might not be far away. On July 30th the paper said that a federal union of all the provinces would be bad practice in view of what had befallen the American Republic. It was of the opinion that there should be a legislative union of the Maritimes. Thus: "We must have our Maritime Union first. The larger union will come at the proper time". Some what similarly, the "Nova Scotian", a Liberal weekly, said in reference to Canadian participation in the proposed conference:

"If there is to be a federation conference, let it stand upon its own merits, and take place at some other time, and at some other place, and not simultaneously with the conference authorized for another and very different purpose".

Until an intercolonial railway had been constructed, general union, in its opinion, was not desirable.¹

The reflections of the Halifax press on Maritime and general union in August were due partly to a visit of nearly one hundred Canadians to Nova Scotia. The greater number of these were members of the Canadian Legislature, although there were some members of the Canadian press and some Canadian business

1. Nova Scotian, August 8, 1864.

and commercial men as well as some people from New Brunswick with them. On August 2nd the "Morning Chronicle" extended a welcome to the Canadian visitors on their way to Nova Scotia because it felt that a better chance for general union might be opened up. However, on August 4th it looked with some misgivings on Canadian participation in the Conference.¹ On August 6th the "British Colonist" reassured the "Chronicle" that the governments of the Maritimes had "a policy from which they"would "not easily be turned aside". On Wednesday, August 10th, the ~~Halifax~~ visitors arrived. They were extensively entertained and shown points of interest in the vicinity of Halifax. At a picnic on Friday D'Arcy McGee spoke on union. Again on Tuesday he gave a lecture at Temperance Hall on the same subject. He also spoke on union at a public dinner held on Saturday, August 13th. It was at this banquet that Joseph Howe made a speech in favour of union, which was used later to brand him as inconsistent. Howe explained subsequently that words spoken at a convivial dinner ought not to be taken too literally. On August 17th the Canadians left for home.²

Discussion of Maritime and general union continued during and after the visit of the Canadians. On August 13th the "British Colonist" stated that it was not optimistic about the chances for a general union but it hoped that discussion of the question might result in some intercolonial arrangements which

1. Both the "Morning Chronicle" and the "Nova Scotian" were owned by Wm. Annand. The former paper was a tri-weekly at this time, the latter a weekly. This editorial appeared in the "Nova Scotian" on August 8th. See above.
2. For reports on visit see "Acadian Recorder", Aug. 13th & 20th and "Morning Chronicle" August 16th, 1864.

would unite British America more closely and at least extend social relations and commercial intercourse. On August 15th, the "Morning Journal", referring to the discussion of union among the visitors and Nova Scotians, said:

"We trust much good to both projects (union and the intercolonial railway) may result from the interchange of ideas among the representatives of the three provinces".

On August 16th the "Colonist" stated that Maritime union and general union should be kept apart from each other. The paper seemed to want the Maritimes to enter a general union as a unit. On August 18th it expressed the hope that a legislative union of the Maritimes would be achieved. It said that the question of general union could be dealt with better if the Maritimes were united. On August 23rd it published a rather hesitant editorial which, although it did not offer unqualified support of general union, favoured it in the abstract. The "Acadian Recorder" on August 20th devoted an editorial to "Constitution making" with the motto "let us go slowly". It was not in favour of general union at that stage but felt that if larger union came later all might be well. For the present, Maritime union was a good in itself and if general union did not materialize at least future generations in the Maritimes would have "a brave, little 'kingdom by the sea'".

The reaction of MacDonnell to the visit of the Canadians was shown in a despatch to the Colonial Office, informing that department of the progress of negotiations between

the Governor General and the various Lieutenant Governors and between the Lieutenant Governors themselves. As regards his own attitude and that of his Executive Council toward Canadian participation in the conference, he reported that they felt that ^{the} delegates were empowered officially only to discuss maritime union ^{but} that there could be informal discussion of the larger union at Charlottetown. Referring to the visit of the Canadians, he told Cardwell that general union would be more extensively supported than was at all possible six months before. This he attributed to the Canadians' visit, and expressed the opinion this result had been designed in making the visit. However, he was of the opinion that many difficulties of detail would have to be surmounted before general union could take place. He also said that he had kept himself as completely as possible from seeming to support the larger project.¹ Cardwell's answer of September 12th did not reach Nova Scotia until after the Charlottetown meeting. The Colonial Secretary stated that he was pleased that the visit of members of the Canadian Legislature appeared "to pass off in a spirit of friendship calculated to confirm and improve the good relations which already ² subsisted among the several provinces of British North America." This was vague, to say the least. On August 31st, MacDonnell reported the names of the Nova Scotian delegates to Charlottetown. He said that the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island had invited him to be present but that he had refused because

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, August 18, 1864, MacDonnell to Cardwell.

2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 108, Sept. 12, 1864, Cardwell to MacDonnell.

~~because~~ he felt that he might prejudice the harmonious interchange of opinion, and because he was not sufficiently acquainted with the views of the Imperial Government to take the chance of committing himself to some policy which might be received subsequently with disfavour by either the Home Government or the Legislature of Nova Scotia.¹ The tenor of these despatches would seem to indicate that Secretary Cardwell had not devoted a great deal of attention to either Maritime union or the possibility of general union. As regards the larger project, MacDonnell had not indicated emphatically the extent which it had gained ground in Canada. It is quite possible that he did not read the signs correctly. At any rate, he did not show excessive alarm that the larger union might engulf the smaller. Similarly, Governor General Monck could not have stressed the likelihood that general union was not far off.

During the Conference, newspaper comment in Nova Scotia noticeably slackened. Probably some of the editors hoped that general union might result from the Conference and did not wish to advertise that fact too conspicuously lest the larger scheme be imperilled. Others, perhaps, felt that there was no danger that the Maritime union scheme might be discarded. This is mere conjecture. Whatever the reasons, the attitude of the Halifax Press was one of waiting. There was little conjecture in the papers and little news since the press was excluded from every session.² One Halifax newspaper devoted considerable attention

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, August 31, 1864, MacDonnell to Cardwell.

2. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 221.

to the Charlottetown Conference and Maritime union. The "Acadian Recorder" on September 7th expressed itself in favour of Maritime union and said that it believed, from what its correspondents had been told by the Canadian representatives, that the proposals of the Canadians would not interfere with Maritime union. The "Recorder" stated: "We rejoice that this is the case". On September 9th, it supported "Acadian Union" as an end in itself. It stated that Maritime union, in addition, would give strength to the Maritimes in international or confederation negotiations. On September 12th the "Recorder" said that if the Maritime delegates were hoodwinked by the Canadians, they would ask the people of Nova Scotia to reject their scheme.

The question of whether there was much popular sentiment in Nova Scotia for either Maritime or general union is an important one. Unfortunately, no impartial observer was present who has left evidence on this point. There are, however, indications that there was little if any popular feeling in favour of either project. In an editorial on September 9th the

1. Acadian Recorder, Sept. 12, 1864. In reference to the Charlottetown Conference: "All is going well so far good friends. Don't our anxious readers know that even if we could not expose the delegates, still these servants of the public would, some time or another, have to let the cat out of the bag. And if the cat did not turn out to be a real, sleek, constitutional, monarchical, unrepubli- can, aristocratic cat what would we say about the bag do you think. We give Messieur Delegates warning. We belong to no party. We are tramelled by no ties, and if the cat is singed, or the wrong colour, or has dangerous claws, or is clawless, then we shall ask our friends the people to drown it at once-yes to drown it.Our delegates especially shall have a fair chance, but if they allow themselves to be hoodwinked by the Canadians, let them look out."

"Acadian Recorder" said that it believed the people of the Maritimes had "no objection to offer to an almost immediate, complete and absolute legislative union", and challenged anyone to discussion on the subject. In the same paper, on September 14th, a letter, written under the pen name "Skeptic", appeared which said that the people of Nova Scotia had not called for, and were not in favour of, Maritime union. In this issue the Recorder examined this letter and discussed its previous statement. It said that it may have stated not long before "that the people would not object to union", and that it felt that it had been justified in making this statement. However, even if the people of Nova Scotia had not yet been educated up to union, they should be brought to the truth and led into a political unity with New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The paper, however, was convinced that the people were not against such a consolidation. On September 19th "Skeptic" criticized some of the arguments of the editorial of September 14th. The statement of the "Recorder", an advocate of the smaller project, that the people of Nova Scotia were not against the idea is significant. Other indications take the form of negative evidence. The lack of positive evidence is itself of value. In Nova Scotia, the period 1860-64 was a time in which numerous letters were written to the press on various subjects of interest. There were very few letters advocating Maritime union written to Halifax newspapers previous to or during this time. The fact that Maritime union never became either a plank in a party platform or the occasion for a coalition to carry it through is partial evidence

of a lack of popular desire for the measure in Nova Scotia. In addition, Tupper's intention not to submit the question to the people,¹ while it might be interpreted as evidence that Tupper was confident of its popularity in Nova Scotia, in the light of the other evidence, indicates the indifference of the people to Maritime union. Somewhat similarly, general union never was popular in Nova Scotia during the period. The advocates of either union had done little beyond convincing themselves.

Some of the reasons for the lack of popular interest in this subject may be found by considering some of the arguments advanced in favour of union. As regards the smaller project, the argument that there was danger of aggression from the United States did not affect the Nova Scotians a great deal. This was partly due to their geographical position, partly to their faith that Great Britain would not allow them to be conquered by the Americans. They felt that Nova Scotia was too important to England for this to happen. They trusted in the protection of the British Navy. The growth of "Little England" sentiment in the British Isles did not go unnoticed in Nova Scotia,² but does not seem to have had any widespread efficacy as an argument for consolidation. The argument that Maritime union would effect economy did not of itself possess popular appeal. Similarly, the statement that it would elevate the tone of politics and remedy bad government of necessity had little force, when Nova Scotians did not notice

1. British Colonist, April 12, 1864.
2. Halifax Reporter, May 24, 1862; Acadian Recorder, Oct. 12, 1861; ibid., April 19, 1862; ibid., July 11, 1863; et al.

any considerable defects in their political life and were on the whole well satisfied with themselves and their condition. Lastly, the argument that the Canadians had deprived Nova Scotia of the benefits of an intercolonial railway, while it played upon the sentiment of Canadian distrust already present in the hearts of Nova Scotians, was not sufficient in itself to call forth a popular demand for Maritime union. On the other hand, it was effective in preventing any strong desire for general union. In addition, Nova Scotians in general did not believe that general union would bring them a railway. Appeals to self interest were not strong enough and abstract appeals had little force. On the whole, there were no strong forces driving Nova Scotia to consider union of any kind a necessity. In Canada, during the period 1860-64, real forces were at work, finally bringing about in that province a strong desire for a union of all British America.

Chapter IV.
The Struggle
1864-1867.

Canada from 1860 to 1864 saw no such calm and prosperity as Nova Scotia. These years were years of increasing pressure both internal and external. The first and perhaps the most important pressure was in the political sphere. Political troubles originating largely from the Act of Union of 1840 grew more and more serious in the period. This union at best had never worked very well and sectional strife between Upper and Lower Canada had grown. The main sources of discord were the apportionment of public money for local purposes, and Upper Canadian jealousy of Lower Canada's retention of equal strength in the Provincial Legislature. Upper Canadians alleged that Upper Canada's financial contribution was greater and her population was becoming far greater than Lower Canada's. It was plain to the Upper Canadian that under these circumstances he should be at the wheel more than the Lower Canadian. The principle of the double majority which was evoked to end the difficulty failed to be the sovereign remedy. Representation by population gained strong support in Upper Canada but was abhorrent to the French Canadian. Sooner or later some scheme had to be devised which would satisfy both Upper and Lower Canada, but Canadian politicians were unwilling to try any far reaching constitutional change until compelled to by the force of events. In this period, however, events were more and more tending toward this consummation.

Between 1862 and 1864 four ministries fell from power despite the fact that two general elections were held. When the last of these ministries, the Tache-MacDonald ministry, fell in July, 1864, political deadlock ensued. Necessity was now the driving force in Canadian politics.

Political deadlock at any time entails serious difficulties for the government of a country. It was especially serious for Canada in 1864 since the country faced critical problems which had to be solved and which could only be managed by a strong government. Due to the American Civil War and the international politics connected with it, hostility towards the people of Canada had arisen in the Northern States. Strong fear that attack from these states would result, joined with pressure from Great Britain for Canada to undertake a larger share of the burden of defence, made the issue particularly pressing. At the same time Canadian fear that access to the sea via American railroads would be denied them added both military and commercial pressure to that already present. On the other hand, the people of Canada had shown their aversion to increased expenditure for defence. Some remedy had to be found that would solve the difficulty, and satisfy both Upper and Lower Canada. It was here that the idea of federal union of all the British North American Provinces received more careful scrutiny than heretofore. The early history of union advocacy has been traced in this study. It was this advocacy which had brought the idea of union before the public mind but it required a strong necessity to

bring the matter into practical politics. The above forces, while not the only ones, seem to have played the major part in bringing federal union to the fore.

It was as a result of the conjunction of these forces that it proved possible in the latter part of July, 1864 to form a coalition government which took as its policy federal union of either all the British North American provinces or of the Canadas alone if the former proved impossible.¹ It was in pursuance of this policy that Lord Monck wrote to Lieutenant Governor MacDonnell of Nova Scotia to ask for information about the proposed conference on Maritime union and to ask whether Canadian delegates could attend the conference to discuss the larger union. As has been shown, Monck was finally informed that Canada could send representatives but these would have no official status and could only discuss the larger union with Maritime delegates informally. Finally Charlottetown was selected as the place of meeting by the Maritimes and the date was set at September 1st.

The proceedings of the Charlottetown conference have been fully described elsewhere and only an outline need be given here. The opening day was occupied with the formalities necessary to clear the ground for discussion. In the midst of this a telegram was read announcing the imminent arrival of the Canadians and it was decided that the discussion of Maritime

1. R. G. Trotter, op. cit., pp. 50-82.

union should be postponed until after the Canadians had presented their views on the larger union. On the second day a regular routine of sessions held from ten to three commenced. The procedure was for the Canadians to present their views in more or less formal addresses on special aspects of the larger union. At the close of each address informal discussion took place which consisted mainly of interrogation by the Maritime delegates. The principal Canadian speakers were Cartier, Brown, John A. MacDonald and A. T. Galt. Finally, on the 6th of September, the Canadian delegation proposed a subsequent conference for the formal discussion of the larger scheme. It was not until September 7th that the Maritime delegates met alone and discussed Maritime union thoroughly. They had been appointed exclusively to discuss this project but what little consideration they had given the matter had made them doubt the possibility of Maritime union. The question whether the Maritimes should enter a larger union separately or as a unit was discussed but no decision could be reached. The Maritime delegates thereupon adjourned the Conference to meet at Halifax on September 10th. So far as Maritime union was concerned, the only progress the delegates had made was to realize that the possibility of Maritime union was remote.

On Saturday, the 10th day of September, the Conference resumed its sittings in Halifax, the Canadians participating in the plans for future discussion. After a brief

session the Conference was adjourned until Monday at ten o'clock. On Monday between ten and eleven the Maritime delegates sat alone discussing the bearings of the Maritime scheme upon the larger plan but they came to no conclusion and the Canadians were admitted. After a session of about three hours it was decided that the Canadian proposal for a formal conference on the larger union be accepted. That evening a banquet was held for the delegates at which Lieutenant Governor MacDonnell spoke of the value of closer relations between the Maritime Provinces. If this were accomplished and the Atlantic provinces became rich and populous a subsequent union with them would be hardly less desirable to so disinterested a people as the Canadians. However, his remarks were hardly heeded as speaker after speaker extolled the virtues of federal union of all the provinces. On Wednesday the 14th the delegates left Halifax for New Brunswick and on Friday the Canadians left there for home. After the Canadians had gone, the Maritime delegates again met to discuss the smaller union. The only decision reached was to hold another meeting¹ after the conclusion of the projected conference at Quebec.

Since the Legislature of Nova Scotia had not authorized the Nova Scotian delegates to Charlottetown to discuss the larger union and since MacDonnell did not know what the Imperial Government felt about the matter, the Lieutenant Governor felt that he should get permission from the Home Government to appoint delegates to Quebec. On September 15th he

1. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit., pp. 220-229.

reported to Cardwell that as far as he could learn all the delegates were in favour of general union provided no province be the loser when the details of the scheme were adjusted; that he understood Prince Edward Island probably would not be averse to the larger union but that there was no probability that it would agree to merge its Legislature in a larger body. Referring to the projected conference he mentioned Newcastle's despatch of January 27, 1860 as making it necessary to ask permission to appoint delegates to the conference which was scheduled to meet at Quebec on October 10th. He told Cardwell that there was just enough time for him to give or withhold permission.¹ On September 29th, having received no answer, he reported to Cardwell that his ministry were exceedingly anxious to have delegates appointed; that it would be impossible for delegates to reach Quebec if he waited much longer for permission to appoint them; and that he had agreed in Council the day previous to nominate delegates without waiting any further. MacDonnell, however, still hesitated since he did not wish to put himself in wrong with the Colonial Office. Thus in the same despatch he said that since no official invitation for Nova Scotian delegates to attend the conference had reached him he had telegraphed Lord Monck on the matter.² Four days later he reported that he had received a formal invitation from Lord Monck. Since Monck was Governor in Chief of Nova Scotia and presumably in

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Sept. 15, 1864.

2. Ibid., Sept. 29, 1864.

possession of the views of Her Majesty's Government he had felt justified in appointing the delegates who had represented Nova Scotia at Charlottetown to go to Quebec. He felt that the discussion of the larger question would evoke much difference of opinion and distract from "the more limited and practicable proposal of a Union of the three contiguous Maritime Provinces". He said:

"I also feel that in appointing delegates to discuss the former question at Quebec I am putting in motion machinery to effect an object which unlike a union of the Maritime Provinces has not ever been discussed much less sanctioned by the Legislature".

He hoped that his course would meet with approval since the conference, however it may have originated, might "possibly affect seriously the future interests" of Nova Scotia.¹ On the same day the Lieutenant Governor appointed the Nova Scotian delegates to Charlottetown as delegates to Quebec.² It was not until October 1st that Cardwell answered MacDonnell's despatch of September 15th and gave him permission to appoint delegates.³ As yet the Colonial Office was not seriously interested in the union of all of British North America.

In Nova Scotia the general attitude until the details of the Quebec scheme became known was one of waiting. Little or no opposition was evoked by the sending of delegates

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Oct. 3, 1864.
2. Minutes of Executive Council, 1860-67, Part II, pp.104-105.
3. P.A.N.S., Vol. 108, Cardwell to MacDonnell, Oct. 1, 1864.

to Quebec. The "Morning Chronicle", edited by Jonathan McCully one of the delegates, of course said on September 13th that it would give fair consideration to the scheme for general union when it was sufficiently matured. Several days later it expressed general approval of the conference to be held at Quebec.¹ On Sept. 22nd, with more vigour, it stated the present state of Nova Scotia represented only a transition stage and that it would not be long before changes would take place. It pointed out the danger to the British provinces from American aggressiveness and the value of union for defence. The paper repeated other arguments already familiar, such as the argument of its value for strengthening the British connection and the argument of nationality. It had been previously in favour of a legislative union of the Maritime provinces but this scheme seemed impossible of realization. The terms upon which Canada proposed to unite were given as the building of an intercolonial railway, ten-twelfths of the cost to be assumed by the Canadians, free trade with all the Colonies, Nova Scotia's debt to be assumed by the Federal Government and Nova Scotia's mines, minerals and other resources reserved for purely local purposes. The "Chronicle" said the proposition was worthy of serious consideration. From then on it confined itself mainly to reporting what it could learn of the Quebec Conference.

The "British Colonist" took a similar position. On Sept. 20th this paper welcomed the Quebec Conference. It stated that there had existed a strong feeling in Nova Scotia and New

1. Morning Chronicle, September 15, 1864.

Brunswick against union with Canada but that the recent visit of the Canadians had helped to dispel much of this sentiment. It was of the opinion that the scheme proposed would be federal rather than legislative, with the general government probably possessing all powers not delegated to the local governments. It said that the public debt of Canada viewed in relation to her resources, area, population, and revenue was not formidable, and stated that the surplus predicted by A. T. Galt for that year would materially improve her position. The tariff of all the provinces could be arranged to provide the necessary revenue for the new government without increasing the burdens of the people of the various provinces. Intercolonial free trade, with one currency, one coinage, one system of banking, one postal system and rapid and free inter-communication would be of great value to the Provinces. On September 22nd the same paper said that union was in good hands and mentioned an intercolonial railroad improvement of defence and extension of trade as arguments for union. Nearly a month later the "Colonist" said that union should be regarded not from the standpoint of local interests but as a British North American question. It pointed to unsettled conditions to the south and predicted that if union did not come then parts of the British Provinces might be absorbed by parts of the United States. This would mean farewell to their dream of a "great British American¹ monarchical power." On November 4th the "Colonist" published an editorial on "Our New Confederacy", pointing to the possibilities of developing the west and its resources

1. British Colonist, October 20, 1864.

and to the likelihood that Newfoundland would join the union. On November 15th the paper devoted an editorial to pointing out that the British North American Colonies were growing out of their pupillage and into nationhood.

The "Acadian Recorder" at first differed from the "Colonist" and "Chronicle". On October 14th the "Recorder" said that Maritime union was all that was necessary for the time being. However, on October 31st the paper said that if a fair scheme of union was evolved there was no danger of the British connection being broken. Four days later the "Recorder" stated that if general union took place the Maritimes should enter as a unit.

The results of the Quebec Conference were printed in the "British Colonist" for November 17th from a Prince Edward Island paper where they had first been printed. In the same issue the "Colonist" said that the men who had framed the scheme had reason to be proud of their work. The paper hoped that the Nova Scotian delegates would take an early opportunity "of placing their views and sentiments fully before the country, by discussing the question in all its bearings, at a public meeting" and stated that it had been informed that such was their purpose. In another editorial of the same issue the "Colonist" said that union was important chiefly on account of the opportunities for trade which would develop. Union would also open up opportunities for the ambitions of the young men of the

provinces and would secure the Colonies from aggression, chiefly American. Furthermore, the wishes of the Mother Country for some change in the position of the British North American Colonies should be heeded. On the other hand, the "Acadian Recorder" on the following day said that many features of the Quebec scheme needed elucidation; that the scheme should remain under discussion for a long time; that it had been so hastily prepared that probably it had many defects; and that it had not been modelled closely enough after the English system. The paper was anxious to learn whether the Maritime Provinces were to enter separately or as a unit. It reiterated that the scheme should be given full deliberation before it was opposed or approved. The "Morning Chronicle" of November 19th said that it had soon become evident at Charlottetown that Maritime union was impossible and the question before Nova Scotia was then whether she would consider general union. Many people had favoured legislative union but such a form had been impossible for the new country because of the lack of municipal institutions in the Maritimes and the attitude of Lower Canada. Danger from the United States made some action imperative and the desire of Great Britain for the British North American Colonies to share a greater part than formerly of the burden of defence also demanded action. Union would serve both purposes.

Just when opposition to the Quebec scheme arose it is impossible to determine. Of course there had been always latent disapproval of union with Canada. It is instructive to

note that the arguments against the Quebec Scheme which soon arose contained elements characteristic of Nova Scotian history for a considerable period. When some of the Nova Scotian papers started to oppose the Quebec scheme they appealed to sentiments and ideas already present in the minds of many Nova Scotians. Lack of time and other reasons have prevented the exhaustive examination of all the Nova Scotian papers which might indicate the beginning of the storm which arose and was to vex Nova Scotia for a considerable time. Nevertheless the papers in favour of union shed a light, if an unfavourable one, on the matter. On November 19th the "British Colonist" made a sarcastic attack on newspaper opposition to union. It said that when no attack could be made on the Quebec Conference itself resort was had to abuse of the men participating but that there was more of this kind of attack in St. John than in Halifax. On November 23rd the "Morning Journal" said that until the opponents of the Quebec scheme proved that it was bad it had to be regarded as good. It was of the opinion that the opposition springing up in various quarters was a healthy sign and that a selfish conservative party of men were a useful counteractive to radicals. On November 24th the "Morning Chronicle" denied the allegation that the Quebec scheme was a Canadian scheme framed for Canadian interests. It said that faction, fegeyism and that party of men who if war came to North America could gather up their wealth in a week and leave Nova Scotia would oppose union. In this editorial the views of Howe and Johnstone on union in 1854 were quoted. Several days later the "Chronicle" denied the charge of the "Halifax Citizen" and

other papers that it had misrepresented Howe's and Johnston's views.¹ On December 1st the "Chronicle" reviewed a pamphlet by "A Nova Scotian" against union. According to the author of this pamphlet, the present position of Nova Scotia was one of increasing prosperity at home and good credit abroad; for this reason Nova Scotia should go carefully. The "Chronicle" claimed that Nova Scotia's credit abroad had been steadily declining and that the announcement of the proposed union had had a good effect in reversing this trend suddenly in spite of the fact that the American Civil War was being waged as fiercely as ever. The paper declared that the argument of the author that union would not increase a great deal the provinces' ability to defend themselves as "weak and watery". The other arguments were dismissed in like fashion.

Meanwhile the "Acadian Recorder", though favourable in general to the larger union, wished to learn more about the Quebec scheme before committing itself. Thus on November 23rd it asked whether the tendency of the new constitution was monarchical or republican. It awaited eagerly the projected public meeting. A few days later the "Recorder" said that whether the larger union was effected or not Maritime union should take place.² On December 2nd, reviewing the pamphlet the "Chronicle" had reviewed the day before, the "Recorder" said that the author had not denied the danger to the Colonies but had denied the efficacy of political union for defence. The paper thought that union of the Provinces would foster immigration

1. Morning Chronicle, November 29, 1864.
2. Acadian Recorder, November 28, 1864.

and thus indirectly foster defence. In addition union would give centralized control of defence. The allegation that the commerce of Nova Scotia would suffer under a higher tariff was denied. According to the "Recorder" it did not follow that because Nova Scotia had only nineteen representatives in the central government that they would not hold the balance of power in the Maritime colonies and make the duties according to Nova Scotia's desire. The paper dismissed the matter of an intercolonial railway as irrelevant to the virtues or vices of the Quebec scheme. It also could not accept the argument that there were no materials to form a new nationality. The "Recorder" stated that it was not arguing in favour of the Quebec scheme but simply saying that no real arguments had yet been offered against the project. On December 7th the "Recorder" said that as far as the great mass of the people of Nova Scotia were concerned they were apathetic on the question of union. The paper said that since union would bring change in every direction the people should awake to its importance and consider the matter carefully. It looked forward to discussion of the subject by practical men in the Legislature.

Both the "Morning Chronicle" and the "British Colonist" were in essential agreement on union although the "Chronicle" did not hesitate to attack Tupper's government. One of these attacks deserves mention here. On December 6th it charged Tupper was using confederation as political capital, in relation to the proposed extension of the railway to Annapolis, to gain a seat or two there. The paper declared that Tupper

if not careful would jeopardize both confederation and the Annapolis election. Meanwhile both papers had run a series of editorials on the subject of government. The "Chronicle" in its series mainly devoted its attention to clearing the ground for discussing general union in relation to the Quebec scheme.¹ The first editorial of the "Colonist's" series discussed the problems facing the delegates to Quebec. Something had to be done; the British connection had to be maintained and the fundamental principles of the British constitution had to be retained. The delegates had to provide a strong central government without impairing the powers of local governments so greatly that local matters would be neglected due to the lack of municipal institutions. At the same time they had to provide lest the local governments should have the power to break the union. Under the Quebec scheme the local governments would be essentially municipal. Nova Scotia had no complaint since the House of Commons was based on representation by population and the Upper House would give Nova Scotia more than her share of members than if representation by population was the rule. According to the "Colonist" the scheme was very nearly perfect. The other editorials dealt with the government of New Zealand.²

In other editorials the "Colonist" expatiated on the values of union. In one of these the paper said that Halifax would be a great port, rivalling Boston and Portland in the import and export trade, if union was effected. If the Colonies were united all other blessings would follow. Great trade and

1. Morning Chronicle, Beginning November 10, 1864.
2. British Colonist, November 22, 24, 26, 29, 1864.

great strength would be the result but political union had to take place before commercial union could.¹ On December 3rd the "Colonist" answering criticism of federal union said that this form, if properly constructed, could be one of the strongest forms of government.²

Meanwhile the Governor of Nova Scotia had grave doubts as to the value of the Quebec scheme. On November 22nd MacDonnell informed Cardwell that he had received a set of the Quebec resolutions the day before from Monck who had stated that he had also forwarded copies to the Colonial Office. MacDonnell commended the spirit in which the conference had been carried on but he saw many defects in the Quebec scheme. He was in favour of the "most simple and efficacious mode of union" and saw much that was good in the system in force thrown away. Thus he was against the separation of the provinces of Canada because it would not erase racial differences but would perpetuate them and grave deeper lines of demarcation. He felt that the local legislatures would deteriorate under the Quebec scheme of government and that the powers given them would give rise to dispute over what were local and what were general powers. He said that the promise to construct an intercolonial railway was intended as a sop to the Maritimes, while the intended offer of some millions of dollars to complete some of the permanent defences of Canada, though it was an immediate inducement to the British Parliament, "would scarcely propitiate the people of Nova

1. British Colonist, December 1, 1864.

2. Ibid., December 3, 1864.

Scotia, if aware of such intended generous outlay of the common funds in a remote part of the Confederation". MacDonnell was critical of the method of appointing the Lieutenant Governors of the provinces; he felt that it would be more consistent to make the office elective than to hand over the power of appointment to the general government. However he said that he felt that the office should be abolished. He also criticized the provision that the senate should be chosen from the existing Legislative Councils and stated that this was an inducement for them to vote for union.¹

MacDonnell next considered the method by which the scheme might be carried. In reference to this he said:

"Moreover as the Delegates were chosen as prominent political leaders - not merely of existing ministries but also of the opposition in each Province and as many of them are Editors of the leading journals, by which the explanations of the advantages to be derived from the proposed confederation must reach the country, they no doubt calculated on their influence to carry the measure. Under the circumstances however, and considering that no local Legislature was elected in reference to the very grave question now so suddenly raised - the carrying of so extensive a plan without an appeal to the country would savour somewhat of a "Coup de Main", and probably would not be permitted by any Representative of the Queen in these

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, November 22, 1864, "Separate" Sections 1-18.

Provinces, unless English interests were greatly concerned in the immediate establishment of such a Confederation¹".

But MacDonnell could see no advantage to England from Confederation. As long as the old provincial boundaries remained he contended that there would be little national feeling and little national military spirit and self reliance. He was disappointed that so many sectional differences were allowed to remain by the new scheme which would give rise to disputes between the central and local governments. He was himself in favour of a zollverein until some less objectionable scheme could be devised but if the Quebec scheme had to be accepted he thought some provision should be made "after a certain notice, say of one or two years" in the Imperial Act which ratified the scheme giving the general government power to abrogate the local governors and legislatures and to enlarge or alter existing boundaries. The union MacDonnell looked forward to was legislative.

As regards Nova Scotian sentiment toward the Quebec scheme, MacDonnell said:

"I find however amongst many of the most respectable members of this community so strong a feeling of opposition to the proposed scheme that I doubt the probability of its being carried in Nova Scotia".

However he had no reliable information on the matter up to that time but he told Cardwell that Nova Scotia was not impelled by the same considerations affecting Canada. MacDonnell recommended the more intimate union of Nova Scotia and England. The Confederacy might drift away from England and Nova Scotia would then go with

1. Ibid., Section 18.

her. Nova Scotia was the "only American Province which" could "be supposed likely to give direct support and aid to mere British interests". For this reason he claimed that at times he had considered union with New Brunswick on account of her long frontier of little value. He felt that great care should be exercised.

The Lieutenant Governor, while approving the general organization of government, objected to the details of the intended local governments since this part of the scheme would lower the tone of political life. He objected also that the scheme did not solve ^{the} difficult question of how to free England on the one hand and her American possessions on the other from the dangers an English war anywhere might entail on both. He claimed that the tendency of the new country would be to drift toward republicanism and the United States and then Nova Scotia, preeminently valuable to England would be lost to her. He hoped for a better plan of union which would create in the Western World "a centre and example of as well regulated freedom and social happiness as probably can be managed or enjoyed by any community".¹

At this time MacDonnell was still unaware of the Imperial Government's attitude toward general union. On October 6th he had informed Cardwell that Monck wished to see him and that since he also wished to see Monck he intended to go to Canada.² On the same day Colonel J. H. Francklyn, Senior Officer in Command of the Troops, assumed the Administratorship and MacDonnell left for Canada. On November 10th he informed Cardwell of his return but made no comment on the conference.³ However on November 24th he

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Nov. 22, 1864.
2. Ibid., MacDonnell to Cardwell, October 6, 1864.
3. Ibid., November 10, 1864.

told Cardwell that he had declined to meet the delegates at Quebec in order to avoid appearing to commit the British Government to a definite line of action. Similarly, when returning to Nova Scotia via Montreal, although he thought it unwise to refuse again to meet the delegates, notwithstanding reports in the press (Morning Chronicle, November 24th), he had recommended caution to the delegates and had tried not to seem to pledge himself to follow out the results of the Conference.

On December 8th MacDonnell repeated his objections to the Quebec scheme. He reported that on December 6th he had received the official report of the Nova Scotian delegates on the Quebec Conference. In this despatch he reiterated his opinions in regard to the appointment of Lieutenant Governors and said that he thought it unwise to appoint men to that office from political parties unfit because of that to be unbiased and unprejudiced. Such a man if presiding over an Executive Council composed of his party foes would not induce harmony. Similarly he mentioned the disadvantages which would result if one political party was in power in the general government while the other party controlled one or more of the local governments. He complained that the local governments had been retained in order to obtain the support of small politicians for the scheme. His main objections as before were to the provisions for local government.

In regard to the Quebec scheme as a whole he said that if, as some claimed, legislative union was impracticable and if the Quebec Resolutions had to be accepted or rejected en masse it might be better to reject them and wait for some simpler arrangement

which would be practicable as far as Nova Scotia was concerned. It had not been proved that the Quebec scheme was practicable and even if it were it had not been proved better than the existing state of things. He felt that if the Imperial Government made provision for a change to a legislative union after a term of years union might gain greater support but that it was very probable that the Quebec scheme might be rejected as it stood.

MacDonnell was more than dubious about the future of the Quebec scheme in Nova Scotia. He said:

"At present there is a strong feeling that the general interests of this and the other maritime Provinces are sacrificed to facilitate the working of the Canadian Government; and that this sacrifice is offered to the unreasonable prejudices of the Lower Canadians. Now as even Nova Scotia has less need of the proposed intercolonial Railway than Canada and as the general population cares little for the other immediate inducements to her public men for which she is expected to barter the future interests of this Province at large, she may not see any overwhelming immediate necessity for acceding to the exclusive requirements of Her Majesty's Canadian subjects."¹

Furthermore he felt that Nova Scotia must see before her an increase in taxation and he dismissed the argument that a higher tariff would nourish Nova Scotian manufacturers as exceedingly weak. He pointed out the inconsistency of taxing British manufacturers and relying upon Great Britain for defence. Since the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Dec. 8, 1864, "Separate," Section 24.

delegates were leaders of both the Government and Opposition and moreover connected with the leading newspapers of the province he said that the press was a poor indication of the Nova Scotian attitude to the Quebec scheme. MacDonnell declared that the people of Nova Scotia were waiting to learn what the British Government thought upon the matter and was of the opinion that the policy of England would probably have more weight in Nova Scotia than elsewhere. Nova Scotia, particularly on account of her coal mines and harbours so valuable to the British fleet, was of great importance to Great Britain and he was confident that the British Government would consider the whole matter carefully especially with regard to Nova Scotia's entering the proposed confederation.¹

On the same day MacDonnell sent another despatch to Cardwell containing a copy of the Quebec Resolutions. He reported that the Nova Scotian delegates felt no explanations were needed and he was sure that Lord Monck had already forwarded a report of the proceedings of the conference to the Imperial Government. He declared that both he and the Nova Scotian delegates would await the Imperial Government's opinion. According to him, there was a very general disposition on the part of the Nova Scotian public to show this opinion "all due deference."² Apparently the other, "separate", despatch was transmitted without the knowledge of his Executive Council. The regular despatch was acknowledged on January 1, 1865 but no comment was made. The Colonial Office had already made known its views to MacDonnell.

1. Ibid., December 8, 1864.
2. Ibid., No. 41, December 8, 1864.

On December 8th Cardwell replied to MacDonnell's "separate" despatch of November 22nd. He said that MacDonnell would not^{be} justified in opposing the introduction of resolutions in favour of Confederation in the Nova Scotian Legislature by his Ministry. He might find it difficult to obtain another ministry and his opinions of Nova Scotian sentiment might not be correct. Cardwell felt that action should be undertaken immediately since a year's delay might have evil consequences. Union was designed to secure provincial interests, not British interests. With this despatch Cardwell enclosed a copy of a despatch to Monck of December 3rd. He told MacDonnell that he would be able to see from that despatch that the British Government cordially accepted as a whole the proposed central organization and left for consideration when the intended Imperial Act was under review the details of the arrangements by which the control of that central organization over the local governments was to be secured. The Imperial Government on its own part was anxious to give all the assistance in its power "towards the successful completion of the work."¹

Cardwell's despatch to Monck which accompanied the above discussed the Quebec Resolutions in more detail. It approved the Quebec scheme in general and expressed the hope that the arrangements for defraying the expense of working the central and local governments would not increase the whole expenditure

1. Lieutenant Governor's Correspondence, Miscellaneous 1864 Vol. II. Cardwell to MacDonnell, December 8, 1864. No. 26. Received December 22, 1864. This despatch was later removed from the regular series and another despatch substituted at Cardwell's request which omitted all reference to MacDonnell's despatch of November 22nd. For the substituted despatch see P.A.N.S. Vol. 108, No. 26, December 8, 1864.

greatly or make any "material addition to the taxation and thereby retard the internal industry, or tend to impose new burdens on the commerce of the country". The Imperial Government regarded two provisions of great importance as the only ones which needed considerable revision. These were with respect to the prerogative of pardon and to the constitution of the Legislative Council. Other minor matters could be adjusted when the Imperial Act embodying the Quebec Resolutions was being prepared. The Imperial Government suggested that Monck and the Lieutenant Governors of the other provinces take steps for submitting the project to the various legislatures. If these bodies sanctioned and adopted the scheme the Home Government promised to render all the assistance in its power to carry it into effect. The despatch also suggested the most convenient course probably would be for a delegation to proceed to England to give advice to the Imperial Government, while the Imperial Act was being prepared and while it was being passed through the British Parliament.¹

On December 23rd MacDonnell acknowledged the receipt of the above communication. He reported that since he had thought it advisable to give the despatch to Monck immediate publicity he had directed that it be printed in a Gazette Extraordinary. More especially he felt that it was due to many highly respectable and loyal gentlemen in the community, who were of the opinion that the retention of the local governments would lead to disunion, in order to give them an opportunity of learning the attitude of the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 108, Cardwell to Monck, December 3, 1864, Canada No. 93. Enclosed in Nova Scotia No. 26, Vol. 108.

Imperial Government before they committed themselves to any decided line of action. The publication of the despatch was received with joy by the "Morning Chronicle" and the "British Colonist". The "Chronicle" asked whether the people of Nova Scotia would "prefer dollars and cower and cringe beneath another flag and sing 'Yankee Doodle'" or would they rather make a few sacrifices to ensure the British connection. The paper asked what England's attitude would be if Nova Scotia paralyzed all attempts for the common defence of the colonies. The "British Colonist" said that it was glad to learn that British statesmen regarded union as a means of strengthening the British tie. It said that it was evident from the despatch that Great Britain did not intend to throw the whole burden of defence upon the colonies as some had contended.

In the meantime the first important meeting in Nova Scotia on the subject of the Quebec scheme had been held. It was held at Temperance Hall, Halifax on December 9th, as a result of a requisition of a number of the citizens to the Mayor for the purpose of allowing the Nova Scotian delegates to present their views on the scheme. Before the delegates spoke Mr. A. M. Uniacke on behalf of a large number of citizens enquired whether it was intended to permit an adjourned meeting at which the opponents of the scheme might express their views. Dr. Tupper said that the delegates wanted ample discussion of the Quebec scheme. Mr. P. Lynch also suggested the propriety^{of} allowing at such adjourned meeting a free expression of opinion for anyone desiring it. It was finally agreed that at the close of the delegates' addresses the meeting

1. Morning Chronicle, December 23, 1864.
2. British Colonist, December 24, 1864.

should stand adjourned until December 19th.

The first of the delegates to speak was Jonathan McCully. He began by attempting to show that in the colonies there were ample resources to build a nation. According to McCully the necessity of union was admitted by everyone and the time was most auspicious because the provinces were pressed by no external influences. He next turned to a discussion of federal and legislative union. Looking at the cases of Ireland and Scotland under legislative union with England he declared that the representation of the Maritime Provinces in the general government was proportionately larger than either Scotland or Ireland obtained when united with England. This was also used to justify representation by population as the basis of representation in the central government. According to McCully, representation by population was the fairest system for the Maritimes with their small towns and expansive country districts. In the Upper House Nova Scotia had the same representation as Upper Canada despite the great difference in population. Under legislative union one of the provinces might have been excluded from representation in the Senate as counties sometimes were from representation in the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia. No such changes could be made since the Maritimes' share in the Legislature of the country would be secured by an Imperial Act. Similarly all powers peculiarly local had been left in the hands of the provincial governments where they could be managed best. In making the scheme, the division of powers had been made clear so that no troubles like those of the United States

could befall the new nation. Legislative union was impossible because of Lower Canada. McCully claimed the Quebec scheme had all the virtues and none of the vices of both legislative and federal union. It was a scheme best suited to the growing prosperity of the country. The time had come when the necessity was being felt of having a government to centralize the strength of the provinces. It would be no surprise after what had happened in the republic to south if British Americans within two or three years were called upon to summon all their energies to protect their liberty and their country. This possibility should be provided against. The circumstance that when the news of the projected conference arrived in England the credit of the provinces went up, Nova Scotia's ten per cent and Canada's fifteen per cent, was of no small importance to a commercial country. According to McCully there were two classes in the community - the money made and the money making - and the latter were all in favour of confederation which would open a field for the young and the enterprising.

A. G. Archibald, who followed McCully, attempted to show that Nova Scotian interests were closely guarded by the Quebec scheme and that while guarding these interests the delegates also had in view the welfare of the entire nation to be. Nova Scotia's position would be vastly higher under confederation than if she stood alone. Nova Scotia was very prosperous but the majority of the people of England looked forward to a bare existence in their old age. It was only just for England to ask the Nova Scotians to take over some of the burdens Nova Scotia was imposing on her. It was not

reasonable to expect the people of England to pay \$5.00 per head for the army and navy while the people of Nova Scotia paid six cents per head for the militia. While a disinclination was arising in England to do Nova Scotia's work the danger was growing in North America that she might be called upon to do it. Archibald pointed to the recent change of the United States from a peaceful to a great military nation. The speaker met the argument that confederation would mean higher taxation and higher tariff by saying that if the people wanted the contracted for Pictou Railway and the mythical Annapolis Railway the revenues of Nova Scotia would have to be raised by two hundred and nineteen thousand dollars. Thus the tariff would have to be raised. In addition Archibald said that Nova Scotia would have to contribute more to defence in the coming year and he calculated that Nova Scotia could hardly contribute less than one hundred thousand dollars. This would require an additional sum of seventy-eight thousand dollars, making a total increase in the revenue needed of two hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars. The cost of government per head to Nova Scotia was \$2.60; under Confederation it would only be \$3.00 and for this Nova Scotia would get the Pictou Railway, the Annapolis Railway or the connection with Moncton, and the Intercolonial and European railways besides. After the Civil War taxation in the United States would be very high and this would divert immigration to the new nation where the immigrants would be taxed less, have greater security and free institutions. According to Archibald, the contribution of the central government together with Nova Scotia's mineral resources and revenues left her

for local purposes would give Nova Scotia ample financial provision for her needs. Under Confederation Nova Scotia's manufactures would develop greatly and she would be able to supply a great part of the new country. It remained now for the people of Nova Scotia to ratify or reject the work of the delegates. The delegates felt that the future prosperity and happiness of Nova Scotia were "identified with and inseparable from Union".

Dr. Tupper was the next and the last speaker. He began by stating that union had never been a party question. He continued by alluding to the great sentiment of loyalty everywhere in British North America. The delegates had met in a time of peace and prosperity when union could be considered carefully and calmly so as to advance the interests of the colonies in connection with the parent state. The colonies had great area and resources and these could be utilized better if the divisions between them were broken down. The United States had been transformed recently into a great military power and there had been a steady growth of hostility toward the British provinces. The time had come when the colonies would have to assume a determined attitude which would halt the United States before aggression took place and ensure the assistance of the Mother Country. He declared that England was anxious for the colonies to assume a greater part of the expenses for defence and those who valued the British connection would have to cooperate. In addition the Canadians had needed a new constitution; seeing that there was a universal desire for change they had asked the Maritime Provinces for cooperation. The greatest barrier to union before this time had been lack of

connection but if Confederation took place the intercolonial railway would be built. By the Quebec scheme Canada entered the union on the same terms as the other provinces; this eliminated the argument of her heavy debt. Furthermore Canada would enter with a surplus because of her better financial position of late. Tupper declared that a legislative union was impossible under the circumstances and that representation by population was the fairest principle for Nova Scotia in the House of Commons. Under the Quebec scheme no trouble would arise as it did in the United States between the federal government and the local authorities. Tupper then asked how long the colonies could rely on the permanence of their institutions if the United States saw that they would not unite. Under union Nova Scotia would become a great manufacturing centre and her markets would increase. The speaker said that the gigantic power of the United States and the divided state of British North America had shaken the credit of the provinces abroad but the mere discussion of union had already raised their credit. Tupper said that the plan of union was no novelty and this objection was not valid. The cry that Nova Scotia had been sold was ridiculous since there would be no gain in dealing treacherously with her. Union would open up a field for talent and Nova Scotia would lose her identity for a much larger one. The trouble with Nova Scotia had been that she had been isolated and insignificant. Canada would have no interest in oppressing Nova Scotia because if she did so she would be oppressing her right arm. Moreover, by representation by population Nova Scotia would be able to frustrate such an attempt

if it were made. Nova Scotia would gain rather than lose financially by confederation. Union would bring the intercolonial railway. According to Dr. Tupper the undertaking of public works such as railways would require a higher tariff anyway to raise the necessary revenue. Various attempts to create a commercial zollverein had failed and therefore this argument could be disposed of. He then repeated his arguments in connection with the British attitude to defence and the need for compliance with these wishes in order that the colonies besides their own efforts might have the additional protection of the British army and navy. Tupper emphasized that confederation would not sever the British connection but would preserve it. Change of some kind had been forced upon the provinces; they could not remain long as they were.¹

These were the essential arguments of the delegates. From this time on they were used again and again on the platform and in the union press, varying in emphasis according to the needs of the moment but with little essential change. The "British Colonist"² and the "Morning Chronicle"³ printed these speeches fully but apparently did not feel the need of much comment at the time. On the other hand the "Acadian Recorder", while it commended highly the speeches of the delegates, felt that they had brushed away obstructions where there were no obstructions. However, the "Recorder" stated that this was necessary again and again because there were people to create alarm without foundation and they had to be thwarted. The paper was anxious to learn whether the powers of the

1. Morning Chronicle, December 12, 1864.
2. British Colonist, December 13, 1864.
3. Morning Chronicle, December 12, 1864.

local governments were to be controlled by any outside power either in the central or the Imperial Government. In addition it desired to learn whether the separate provinces were to have a voice again if the Imperial Power and the Confederacy consented to a separation.¹

After the meeting of December 9th Dr. Tupper made some attempt to place his views before the country. According to the "British Colonist" he delivered a speech on the proposed union at Canard on December 15th which was enthusiastically received. Similarly another meeting at Wolfville which he addressed on December 16th was reported as eminently successful.² These are the only meetings at this time that have been noted. Nevertheless no definite statement can be made without a study of all the provincial newspapers. It does not appear, however, that many public meetings were held on the subject of the Quebec scheme until later.

The "Morning Chronicle" took a large view of the proposed consolidation. On December 16th it said:

"Union means one tariff, one treasury for all. It means British Empire for British America. Union means Halifax as the great naval station for British power on this continent. Union means a great highway, ere long from Ocean to Ocean, and Halifax the terminal station for the Atlantic side. It means more. Union means that the great back country to be traversed by rail shall be the home of European immigration, the abode of the freest, most enlightened and liberty loving race on the face of the Globe."

1. Acadian Recorder, December 11, 1864.
2. British Colonist, December 20, 1864.

According to the "Chronicle" it also meant obtaining the pride and prestige of nationality at little cost. It meant that the credit of the provinces would take a high place on the world's exchange. moreover, England was in favour of the project. Others there were, however, who did not share this proud dream.

On December 19th the adjourned meeting at which the opponents of the Quebec scheme were to express their views took place. It does not appear that it was intended that they alone should have a voice but when the meeting began they asked to have the whole time to present their views. On this point a dispute arose and finally the anti-unionists declared that since the sentiment of the meeting appeared to be against them they would not speak. This was unfortunate. Their request was reasonable enough. The delegates had been allowed to present their views without interruption but when at the second meeting it was finally proposed by Tupper and others that the anti-unionists have their way they refused to speak at all. whether this was a piece of shrewd engineering by the unionists in order to discredit the anti-unionists it is impossible to tell but it was a mistake to refuse to speak. However, some other means to discredit them would have been found by the union press. the "British Colonist" under the title "The Private Public Meeting" said that the wealthy, if not numerous, opponents of confederation were "satisfied that open discussion" would not promote the adoption of their views and that flooding the country with ex parte and one-sided statements were the means to which they would have to look for success. ¹ Even the "Acadian

1. British Colonist, December 22, 1864.

"Recorder" disapproved of their behaviour. The paper called for a public debate on the question of union and said that there ought not to be any meetings in a corner. It said that it was factionists who had conducted themselves thus, not those who opposed the Quebec scheme from conviction but that they had received a reproof they would not likely forget. The "Acadian Recorder" knew that there were many grave objections to the scheme and wanted to find out whether these could be removed. If not, the "Recorder" would not be able to assent to the proposed constitution.¹ Several days later, in reference to a meeting to be held that evening at the request of a large number of "respectable citizens", the "Recorder" said the opponents of the Quebec scheme should be accorded respectful attention. The paper stated:

"We cannot afford to do without the opposition of Mr. Uniacke or the figures and calculations of Mr. stairs, or not a few 'home' questions from numerous men of intelligence, who see obstacles not a few which seem insurmountable".

In its opinion the question of confederation needed prolonged consideration because, although it had been thoroughly discussed previously, it was then an academic question whereas it was now a practical one.²

On the evening of December 23rd Temperance Hall, Halifax was crowded to hear the opponents of the Quebec scheme who were to have the platform to themselves. The first speaker

1. Acadian Recorder, Dec. 21, 1864.
2. Acadian Recorder, Dec. 23, 1864.

was Mr. A. M. Uniacke who attempted to show that a federal union was English neither in name nor in principle; that it would burden Nova Scotia with a crushing debt and that it would foster local jealousies. Mr. W. J. Stairs, the second speaker, made an able financial speech. By calculation he endeavoured to show that Nova Scotia would be burdened with heavy taxation to the extent of \$4.48 cents per head instead of \$3.00 as claimed by A. G. Archibald. Mr. Stairs was afraid that the Maritimes under union would have "the highest end of the log". Mr. A. Jones declared that instead of gaining by confederation Nova Scotia would lose \$169,284 annually. He concluded his address by expressing the hope that the question would be referred to the people. The next speaker was Mr. P. Power who complained that the fishing, mercantile and agricultural interests had not been represented on the Nova Scotian delegation to Quebec. He believed union would surrender Nova Scotia to Canadian politicians and would make it a mere appendage of Canada and was afraid that taxation could be increased greatly without any effective check. If union were accomplished he said a limit should be made beyond which the tariff could not go. Power felt that one result of union would be the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty. Mr. Miller said that he was in favour of an equitable scheme of union but he did not believe the Quebec scheme to be such. He attacked it as having all the disadvantages and none of the merits of both federal and legislative union and declared against the principle of representation by population. Under confederation the cost of Canadian defence would be enormous and Nova Scotia would be heavily burdened. All in all the scheme was designed in

his opinion to further Canadian interests. Mr. Annand, the last speaker, was in favour of Maritime union. He asked whether the plea that Canada had outgrown her constitution was a good argument to give Nova Scotians as a real reason for confederation. He felt that free trade and an intercolonial railway were attainable without union and was sure that the railways of the province could be constructed without raising the tariff of Nova Scotia. Union would mean a high tariff. The burden of confederation would be borne by the poorer not the wealthier classes. He felt that if the scheme were not referred to the people the present Government would occupy a sorry position.¹ The "Morning Chronicle" said that the anti-unionists arranged this meeting so as to get an array of figures and fable before the country without the refutation which they knew would accompany it if friends of union were allowed to speak.²

Another meeting on union took place on December 27th at Newport, Hants County, at which Dr. Tupper delivered an address. On December 28th he addressed a large meeting at Temperance Hall, Windsor. At this meeting John Tobin, R. G. Halliburton and Jonathan McCully also delivered addresses. According to the "Morning Chronicle" only a few people at the meeting seemed to be against union and invitations were pouring in from all over the country for addresses from the delegates. The paper said that so far the country seemed in favour of the scheme and expressed itself accordingly.³

1. British Colonist, December 27, 1864.
2. Morning Chronicle, December 28, 1864.
3. Morning Chronicle, December 30, 1864.

Temperance Hall, Halifax was the scene of another meeting on December 30th. At this meeting Jonathan McCully, Benjamin Wier, John Tobin, M.P.P. and A. G. Archibald spoke in favour of the Quebec scheme, while E. M. MacDonald and Alderman Tobin of Halifax spoke against. It was at this meeting that Jonathan McCully said that he had heard on good authority that there was in Halifax "an extensive organization of rich and wealthy individuals who had subscribed largely for the purpose of influencing public opinion on the subject of confederation" and that through this organization papers bearing speeches of the opponents of union had been scattered throughout the country. McCully denied that the delegates were trying to set class against class in Nova Scotia; this was what the above organization were trying to do. E. M. MacDonald denied that the wealthy as a class were against confederation. How could they be when they would benefit most from it. ¹ Joseph Howe attended this meeting but did not give an address. As yet he had committed himself to neither side. At the end of the evening the meeting was adjourned until the following night. On this evening W. J. Stairs and William Annand spoke against the Quebec scheme and Dr. Tupper and Mr. P. Lynch in favour. The speakers occupied themselves mainly with replying to criticisms of their earlier addresses.

The question of the anti-unionist organization was discussed by the "Morning Chronicle". The paper said that the opponents in Halifax of the Quebec scheme were men of respectability, of wealth and of mark; that the assertion they had organized to

1. British Colonist, January 3, 1865.

defeat the scheme had not been denied. The principal opponents of the scheme were named as being Messrs. A. W. Uniacke, W. Miller, W. Annand, W. J. Stairs, A. G. Jones, E. M. MacDonald and P. Power. The "Chronicle" said that the organization had an office on Bedford Row but that this was perfectly fair. On the other hand the "Chronicle" declared that the friends of union were unorganized. They embraced the leading politicians, the professions of law and learning and had supporting them the entire religious and most of the secular press. England too was on their side.¹

In January the Quebec scheme received its first test of public opinion in Nova Scotia at the polls. In this month two bye-elections were to take place. In East Pictou James MacDonald, who had replaced Isaac LeVesconte as Financial Secretary in December, was elected by acclamation.² In this election the question of union does not seem to have played any part. The other election took place in Annapolis County on January 12th. The "Morning Chronicle" on January 7th said that Annapolis might return a supporter of the Government but that it was very unlikely since outside of East Pictou it doubted whether there was any constituency that would return a Government candidate because the Government had promised so much and done so little. On January 14th the "Chronicle", now an opponent of the Quebec scheme,³ said that the election had been fought over the failure of the Government to keep its promises of retrenchment, its failure to extend the Railway to Annapolis, the School Bill of 1864 and last but not least Confederation. With

1. Morning Chronicle, January 4, 1865.
2. British Colonist, January 12, 1865.
3. See infra pp. 120-121.

regard to union the Chronicle said:

"But we must not look upon the seat that has been won merely as a Liberal victory so much as a triumph of the new organization which is rapidly taking shape and form, including prominent men of both parties - united together to retain our time-hallowed Institutions and resist the Confederation scheme brought hither from Quebec".¹

Less than a week later the "Chronicle" reported that Mr. Ray's only pledge was on nomination day when he pledged himself to oppose Confederation. According to the paper, the total votes cast were 3,238, of which Ray received 1,735 while Reid, his opponent, received 1503, giving Ray a majority of 232 votes. In 1863 J. W. Johnstone's majority over Ray had been 229 votes. This election thus marked a gain of 461 votes in eighteen months.² Actually it seems that in this election Confederation was so closely connected with the other issues mentioned above that it cannot be regarded as a very decisive victory against the Quebec scheme.

In January the anti-unionist party received a valuable accession of strength. William Annand, owner of the "Morning Chronicle", was one of the leaders if not the leader of the opponents of the Quebec scheme. Up to this time the "Chronicle" had been edited by Jonathan McCully, one of the delegates to Quebec, and the paper had declared in favour of the Quebec scheme. On the 10th of January the following notice appeared in the editorial.

1. J. W. Johnstone became Judge of Equity on May 11, 1864.
2. Morning Chronicle, January 19, 1865.

column of the paper:

"The editorial management of the 'Morning Chronicle' will be changed after the issue of this number. The Proprietor re-assumes the control of the Paper which will reflect his own opinions and those which he believes the country ought to and will ultimately sustain".

From this time on the "Chronicle" became the leading anti-confederate paper, in opposition to the "British Colonist" the leading union organ.

The "Morning Chronicle" was not the only accession of strength to the opposition. Joseph Howe, although he had attended a number of meetings held in Halifax on the subject of the Quebec scheme, had made no speeches on the subject and had not indicated his position in the matter. From time to time the unionists, quoting from his previous speeches, attempted to claim him for their own. This attempt failed however when on January 11th the first of his "Botheration Papers" appeared in the "Morning Chronicle". At last the anti-confederation had a man who could rally recruits around their banner. In these papers are to be found the essential arguments of the opposition to the Quebec scheme. In all their attacks, on the platform or in the press, the anti-confederates never went far beyond the views advanced in these editorials although there might be a shift in emphasis from time to time. Howe took up the cause with vigour and soon became the object of bitter personal attack. In this personal recrimination and abuse however the unionists were not alone; there was little to choose between both sides in this respect. These personal attacks helped to confuse the

struggle, as did the unpopularity of the railway, financial and educational policies of the Tupper Government, with a considerable number of Nova Scotians. In this, too, party strife played a part but more and more these questions became subsidiary to Confederation as the issue of the time although they could always be used to throw a bad light on the Tupper Government and thus discredit union.

The first of the "Botheration Papers" began with a question. Howe asked whether there was any actual need for Nova Scotia to enter a union where all the prizes won in the great battle for Responsible Government would be lost and Nova Scotia would be dominated by Canadian politicians. Howe declared that the old pre-Responsible Government system would be far better. He denied the pressing necessity for union and said that Nova Scotia secure of self-government could even bear with serenity an administration that certainly tried her patience at times for a year or two longer. Nova Scotia was prosperous, she had no questions to create controversy with any other country, and her militia had recently been re-organized. If the Canadians had outgrown their constitution let them mend it. The Canadians had always been in trouble and had always had riots and rebellions, religious feuds and secret societies. Howe referred to the Papineau and McKenzie rebellions and said that during that time Nova Scotia had been loyal. She had not been connected with Canada! Howe also referred to the troubles of 1849 and the Annexation Manifesto and asked if this was the country with which Nova Scotia ought to unite. Nova Scotia had no long border to provoke trouble, she was surrounded by the sea and she could rely upon the fleets and armies of England only ten days sail away. Howe

said that if Nova Scotians sold their birthright of self-government and provincial independence "for the precious mess of pottage¹ brought hither from Quebec" they would deserve contempt.

In the next article Howe discussed the statement of the unionists that many Nova Scotians who had been previously in favour of union now opposed it. He said that to be in favour of union in general did not necessarily mean to be in favour of the Quebec scheme. He then turned to sketch the part the French Canadians would play in the union. Ever since 1840 they had controlled Canadian government and legislation by sticking together and they would do the same in the Confederation. If, however, a chance combination thwarted them they would withdraw from the union. Maritime union on the other hand had many virtues but Howe felt that no one had tried very seriously to bring it about. The troubles in the Nova Scotia² were the result of attempts to over ride states rights and give the general government powers analagous to those claimed for the government at Ottawa. Under Confederation the provincial governments would sink to the same level as the Halifax City Council; men of ability would be unwilling to sit in them. Howe said that the Quebec scheme² had been framed in "a fortnight, amidst exhaustive festivities". This phrase "exhaustive festivities" was to appear time after time in the columns of the "Chronicle" along with other less complimentary³ phrases such as "drawing constitutions with corkscrews".

In his third article Howe said that if he had been at Charlottetown he would have helped the Canadians with good advice. The Canadians had always been in hot water, they had always been

1. Morning Chronicle, January 11, 1865.

2. Ibid, January 13, 1865.

3. Ibid, September 22, 1866.

divided among themselves but they had always been able to combine against anyone else when their interests were at stake. Nova Scotians did not trust the Canadians who had sold them in 1852 and deceived them as grossly in 1862. Measures, like uniform currency for the provinces, could be accomplished without union. Nova Scotia already had free trade with Canada in everything except manufactures and if Canadian manufactures were admitted free into Nova Scotia her infant industries would be prostrated. Nova Scotia's trade with the other British colonies was older than that with Canada and it would suffer greatly from Confederation. The tariff under union would not only be a tax on the British people who had always protected Nova Scotia but would also involve an increase in the tariff on things Canada did not manufacture to the great injury of Nova Scotia's trade with the rest of the world. The markets opened up by Confederation would be only those of ~~xxx~~ three or four million people as compared with Nova Scotia's present and possible markets in Britain, the fifty British colonies, the United States, South America, Continental Europe, and the East. There were five hundred million people in Japan, China, France, Italy and Spain whose trade Nova Scotia might share. Here was the field towards which Nova Scotian statesmen should bend their efforts. Nova Scotia had desired the inter-colonial railway but had never dreamed of paying more than money¹ for it.

In his next paper Howe took up the question of defence. He declared that nothing Nova Scotia had done or refused to do had led to the discussion of that question. Nova Scotia had never been indifferent to the question and by buying British goods

1. Morning Chronicle, January 14, 1865.

she contributed to the cost of Imperial defence. In contrast to A. G. Archibald who reckoned Nova Scotia's contribution to defence at six cents per head, Howe calculated that it was seventy cents per head. Canada had been a great expense to Great Britain with her rebellions and her wastefulness but this had not been the case with Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia had been and was still always ready to contribute her share. Under Confederation the estimated sum available for defence would never fortify more than Montreal. Her vast extent of territory could hardly be adequately fortified. Howe felt that if there were danger defence measures should begin at home; if not the Unionists should stop trying to frighten the "Bluenoses" with "buncomb". He called for a real system of Empire defence paid for by an Imperial tax and managed by the Imperial authorities who had experience in such matters. ¹ At this point Howe put a severe strain on the argument.

The next three editorials were concerned with the Union of England and Scotland, ² and the Union of England and Ireland. ³ These were mainly historical and were attempts to show that Scotland and Ireland, far from benefitting, had suffered from union with England. Howe pointed out parallels between the position of these two countries before union and that of Nova Scotia in 1865. On these arguments and illustrations there is little need to comment. Both the Unionists and the anti-Unionists made frequent appeals to ⁴ history and from identical cases drew radically different conclusions.

Howe's eighth paper discussed the question whether

1. Morning Chronicle, January 18, 1865.
2. Ibid., January 20th and 23rd, 1865.
3. Ibid., January 27, 1865.
4. eg. British Colonist, February 14, 1865.

the Legislature could pass the Quebec scheme without first referring it to the people. Some of the unionists at this time were declaring that it could. Howe felt that this was absurd. Howe declared that some of the opponents of the Quebec scheme were afraid that it was going to be attempted but that he, having some respect for the delegates, felt that they would not do such a thing. He asked whether the Parliament of England would venture, without the express sanction of the people, to vote itself out of existence, and propose to send a limited number of representatives to the Parliament of Paris or the Congress of the United States. He claimed that for nearly two hundred years no attempt had been made to change the constitution of England without at least one appeal to the people. Howe then turned to examine the process by which amendments were made ^{in the United States} to the constitutions of both the federal government and the states. He referred the delegates to history to see how posterity had condemned efforts to make changes in constitutions without the assent of the governed. He asked them to consider what Nova Scotia's past statesmen who had fought for Responsible Government would think of such a proposal with only a despatch from the Colonial Secretary the sole reason why Nova Scotia's government should be handed over to another province and the people not be consulted on the matter.

The next article was in part a continuation. Howe began by illustrating from everyday life that the Legislature did not possess the right to pass upon the Quebec scheme without consulting the people. In one of these illustrations he asked whether a trustee "whose powers were limited by law and by the instrument under which he was appointed" would have "the right to burn deed,

1. Morning Chronicle, February 1, 1865.

squander the property, or to hand over the estate of third parties, without the consent of the owners". Howe then answered Jonathan McCully's objection that no one had ever heard of dissolving the Legislature before a question had been submitted. He said that the measure ought to be submitted in all its parts and discussed and the Bill and debates printed and scattered over Nova Scotia. Then the subject should be postponed until after the next general election. If it were objected that no vote on this single issue could be obtained each voter could be allowed a separate vote to cast for or against the Quebec scheme. Howe felt that if this were done the measure would not pass. If the delegates tried to pass the scheme without reference to the people they might be able to escape to Canada but their accomplices would not be able. Ten members of the Legislative Council could secure seats in the Senate but there would still remain eleven with no such refuge. Similarly, the delegates could not assure the members of the Assembly seats in the Parliament at Ottawa. The scheme might be passed but an election would have to be held and retribution was sure. Howe mentioned Annapolis, Yarmouth, Richmond and Antigonish especially as Counties where this retribution would be dispensed. He was confident also that none of the eighteen¹ counties of Nova Scotia would yield a majority for Confederation.

The tenth article was devoted to a consideration of the proverb 'Union is strength' and the catch word 'progress' and their relation to Nova Scotia at the time. The first he answered by citing cases when union was not strength. There could be no strength where the material was poor and the binding weak. He asked

1. Morning Chronicle, February 3, 1865.

whether Samson was strong when Dalilah got him "confederated" and cut off his hair. Howe similarly combatted the statement that Nova Scotia could only progress by uniting. He pointed to the progress she had made in the recent past and stated that Nova Scotia would not stand still if she did not unite with the other colonies. Her population would increase and her railroads and steamboat lines be extended. The markets of the world awaited Nova Scotia and her foreign trade capable of indefinite expansion would find new fields opened up by the arms and diplomacy of the Empire. Here were lines of progress clearly marked out without peril or impediment, without distant control or outward drain upon the public and private resources of Nova Scotia. Far better to follow these lines than to run "after the will of the wisp at Ottawa" and land in a "Slough of Despond".¹

The next editorial compared the Nova Scotian delegates with those who framed the United States constitution and the results of the labours of both: the Nova Scotian delegates and the Quebec scheme came off second best. Howe declared that the Canadians who talked of a new nationality shrank from the control of foreign affairs and did not pretend to assume the entire responsibility of defence. The great territory behind Canada would still be under the control of the Hudson's Bay Company. Under these circumstances, had the provincial governments been left with their full powers, there would have been no pretext for the Canadians to seize control of the revenues of Nova Scotia and interfere directly in her affairs. According to Howe, as soon as the Nova Scotian delegates accepted

1. Morning Chronicle, February 8, 1865.

representation by population they allowed themselves to be done "Brown". Howe then turned to compare the protection given to the smaller of the United States by the federal Constitution with that afforded the smaller provinces by the Quebec scheme. He discussed mainly the United States Senate and the ways in which the smaller states were protected by equal representation, by the power of the Senate to revise every appropriation, to prevent the abuse of federal patronage, to pass on every treaty and to either cancel or approve every appointment. There were no like securities in the Quebec scheme. In conclusion Howe recommended that the young delegates, with all their talents, pursue a course of historical investigation before making any more constitutions.¹

The twelfth and last of "Botheration Papers", which did not appear in the "Morning Chronicle" until March 2nd, surveyed the ruins of the "Botheration Scheme" in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and particularly in Nova Scotia. In New Brunswick the question very properly had been submitted to the people. In Nova Scotia it had been condemned by the people through public meetings and numerous petitions despite the initial advantages of the delegates on the platform and in the press. Howe referred to "the seats of commerce east and west" especially as having rejected the scheme.

Just six days before Joseph Howe began to publish his "Botheration" articles Lieutenant Governor MacDonnell transmitted to Cardwell a number of speeches delivered both for and

1. Ibid., February 10, 1865.

against union at public meetings held on this subject. He stated that the most influential part of the press and the most practised debaters were on the side of the Quebec scheme. He declared that his prompt publication of the Imperial Government's attitude toward the proposed union had given additional weight and prestige to the supporters of Confederation, and said that the result of discussion had been to disarm opposition and prevent effective organization on a large scale by the political opponents of the delegates and unionists. He added that neither party throughout the discussion could be regarded as more loyal than the other; the opponents of union claimed that it would weaken the British connection, the advocates that it would strengthen it.

Although the factors named above by MacDonnell did prevent some opposition to the Quebec scheme, they did not have as great an effect as he claimed. In January, meetings both for and against the scheme became numerous throughout Nova Scotia. The "British Colonist" invariably declared that the anti-unionist meetings were failures and the unionist meetings a success. The "Morning Chronicle" on the other hand claimed the reverse. In justice to the anti-unionists it must be said that as far as it is possible to tell most of these anti-unionist meetings were successful. Reports of the secretaries of many of these meetings appeared in the "Morning Chronicle"; these perhaps deserve more credence than the letters which appeared in the "British Colonist" signed with such pseudonyms as "One who was there".

The most important result of these meetings was the petitions which were presented to the Assembly and the Legislative
1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, January 5, 1865.

Council in the session of 1865 either asking that the Quebec scheme be referred to the people at the polls or expressing direct opposition to Confederation. Most of the petitions asked that the people be consulted on union.¹ During this session one hundred and eighty-four petitions² were presented to the Assembly and ninety-eight to the Legislative Council.³ Only one of the petitions to the Assembly was in favour of union. This seems to have been from Halifax and bore 1,500 signatures.⁴ The other one hundred and eighty-three bore upwards of fifteen thousand signatures.⁵ The number of signatures, however, on the petitions to the Legislative Council is not known. Of the Assembly petitions eighty have been found and identified, bearing approximately six thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven signatures.⁶ It is unfortunate that the rest have not been discovered since the strength of anti-union sentiment in the various counties cannot be given with any exactness. The number of petitions per county gives only a relative idea because the number of signatures on the various petitions vary greatly. As regards the petitions to the Legislative Council, in the case of Pictou and of Guysborough Counties the number of petitions was greater than to the Assembly. There is no way of telling how much the Assembly and Legislative Council petitions duplicated each other. Because of these difficulties it has been thought best to put all

1. Journal House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1865. See also appendix II
2. Ibid. (pp.232-241 of this study.)
3. Journal Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, 1865.
4. Morning Chronicle, March 14, 1865.
5. Journal House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868. App. 10, pp.22-23.
6. Assembly Petitions, Miscellaneous A, 1865-67. See also Appendix II pp.235-237 of this study.

the available facts about the petitions in an appendix and not attempt highly uncertain generalizations.

Meanwhile Lieutenant Governor MacDonnell had been worrying about the mode in which the Quebec scheme would be passed by the Legislatures. On January 13th he reported to Cardwell that a week before the Governor General, Monck, had asked him how he intended to get ^{the} assent of the Nova Scotian Legislature to Confederation. MacDonnell had replied that he intended to get the Legislature to adopt an address to the Crown asking the Queen to direct that steps be taken toward passing an Imperial Act on the general basis of the Quebec Resolutions. Both he and his advisers felt that the simplest course and the one least likely to create dissension would be to have the Imperial Government frame an act with the aid of representatives of the various provinces rather than to have the various Legislatures discuss the Quebec Resolutions in extenso. This MacDonnell understood was the course Monck and the Lieutenant Governors of the other provinces intended to follow.¹ However, in a "confidential" despatch of the same date, MacDonnell told Cardwell that he perceived from Monck's reply to Cardwell's despatch of December 3rd, which stated the Governor General's policy, that Monck did not seem to intend to follow the simple programme he had announced to MacDonnell. Since Canada had taken the lead in the preliminary proceedings and since the Governor General would be regarded as fully conversant with the Imperial Government's policy the course suggested by him would be regarded as suggested for the other provinces. According to MacDonnell, Monck apparently intended to allow the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, No. 51, January 13, 1865, MacDonnell to Cardwell.

Canadian Legislature to discuss the Quebec Resolutions. If this course were followed in the maritime provinces the Lieutenant Governor and his advisers thought it hopeless to expect any unanimity of result. Therefore, he told Cardwell, on December 9th he had written confidentially to Monck explaining his views on the matter and asking him not to publish for the present his reply to Cardwell's despatch of December 3rd. He had also written to the various Lieutenant Governors making the same request.

In connection with the discussion of the Quebec Resolutions by the various legislatures MacDonnell stated:

"I may add that in this Province at least the knowledge that the Governor General actually expected each Legislature to reopen the general discussion and embody fresh conditions and resolutions in their several addresses to the Crown would ~~be~~ in the opinion of my ministry have a prejudicial effect. It certainly would convert many present friends of union into opponents and dishearten others by the prospect of the inextricable confusion into which it might lead."¹

However on February 2nd he reported that Monck and the Lieutenant Governor had agreed to follow his suggestions.²

When he opened the Legislature on February 9th MacDonnell referred to some correspondence he had had with Monck respecting uniformity of action on the subject of confederation in the Legislatures and said that it would be submitted

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, January 13, 1865, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Confidential.
2. Ibid., February 2, 1865.

to the House. However, this correspondence gave no hint of what MacDonnell told Cardwell on January 13th.¹ In his speech MacDonnell took a neutral position toward the Quebec scheme. He hoped that the subject of union would be discussed with "dispassionate care and prudence" but he had not the least intention to influence the decision of the Legislature.² On February 20th correspondence and papers relating to the Quebec and Charlottetown Conferences were presented to the Assembly. Here the question of union rested for a time.

The attitude of MacDonnell to the anti-unionists at this time was rather sympathetic. In February P. S. Hamilton sent him a printed collection of papers on union that he had written previously, together with a letter describing the opponents of the Quebec scheme, with the request that he forward them to the Colonial Secretary. MacDonnell complied but at the same time felt that he should strongly express his "dissent from the very illiberal and unfounded picture" which Hamilton gave of the anti-unionists. He interpreted part of Hamilton's letter to mean that:

"Her Majesty's Government should by Imperial Act or other extraordinary pressure compel this Province to enter this Federation, without either an appeal to the country at large or even regard to the feelings of the existing Legislature"

and said:

"In case Her Majesty's Government agrees on that point with Mr. Hamilton I shall no doubt receive the necessary instructions for my guidance."

1. Journal House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1865, App. 3, pp. 27-28.
2. Ibid., 1865, pp. 10-11

The anti-unionists were, according to MacDonnell, a body of men who numbered amongst them "gentlemen of the highest social standing here and in fact comprise most of the leading bankers and merchants, the wealthiest farmers and the most independent gentlemen in the province. The very fact that such is the case has been adroitly used as a leading argument against their views". They opposed union at the "expense of old party sympathies not because of personal or party antipathies."

The question of union in Nova Scotia had already been complicated by events in New Brunswick. On February 8th the New Brunswick Legislature had been dissolved and an appeal was to be made to the people. On February 20th reports of the Charlottetown and Quebec Conferences were tabled in the Nova Scotia Legislature but no further move was made. Nova Scotia was waiting on New Brunswick. At a meeting of the Executive Council on March 9th MacDonnell read a despatch from Monck reporting the passage of a resolution in favour of Confederation through the Canadian Legislative Council. The Executive Council very cautiously felt that only a formal acknowledgment should be made in answer. MacDonnell then invited their attention to Maritime union. He said that this measure had been entrusted to him by the British Government when he left England for Nova Scotia and if the course of events had placed general union out of their reach he thought it was their duty to accomplish as much as they could, Maritime union being the natural step toward general union if the latter ever became expedient. Dr. Tupper, however, stated that they would soon have

surer knowledge what course New Brunswick would be following and the discussion was adjourned.¹ The Executive Council was pursuing a very cautious policy.

By March 16th it was clear that the New Brunswick² Government had been defeated on the question of Confederation. Six days later Dr. Tupper tabled a resolution in favour of Maritime union but it was not until April 10th that he moved the following resolution:

Whereas, under existing circumstances an immediate union of the British North American Provinces has become impracticable:

And Whereas, a legislative union of the Maritime Provinces is desirable whether the ^{larger} Legislative union be accomplished or not:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the negotiations for the union of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island should be renewed in accordance with the resolution passed at the last session of the Legislature.

In the debates which followed the main attention of both the unionists and anti-unionists was directed to Confederation rather than Maritime union. Each side seized upon it as a good opportunity to speak on general union. Dr. Tupper in moving the resolution made a strong speech in favour of Confederation, only devoting about one twenty-fifth of his speech to Maritime union.³ On April 12th when the debate was resumed A. G. Archibald followed the same

1. Minutes Executive Council Nova Scotia, March 9, 1865. A despatch from Monck reporting the passage of a union resolution in Canadian Assembly was read in Executive Council on April 10th and only formal acknowledgment was given.
2. Morning Chronicle, March 16, 1865.
3. Debates and Proceedings, 1865, April 10th.

course. Mr. Annand did likewise, except that he condemned Confederation.¹ Mr. LeVesconte said that if Maritime union was to be looked upon as a step toward union with Canada he would have to oppose the resolution. Mr. McLelan felt that the preamble of the resolution was a device to get their names on record as for Confederation. It is not clear from the reports what his attitude was toward Maritime union but it seems that he opposed it. Mr. Shannon was in favour of the Quebec scheme. Mr. Bourinot said that he would not support the Maritime union resolution unless a pledge was given that the people should be consulted before any change was made. Mr. McFarlane was in favour of both Confederation and of the resolution. Mr. Locke held views similar to those of McLelan. Mr. Killam could hardly see what use Maritime union could be but if it were proved practicable he would not oppose it.² On April 24th Mr. A. G. Archibald suggested that since the preamble of the resolution had been the cause of objection it should be removed. To this Dr. Tupper agreed. Mr. Annand announced that he was in favour of Maritime union. Mr. Miller said that if he had any desire for union it was with Canada. Mr. Tobin was in favour of the larger scheme but saw little advantage in Maritime union. The question was then put and³ the resolution, shorn of the preamble, passed without division.

On April 27th MacDonnell transmitted the Maritime union resolution passed in the Assembly. He said that the present attitude of New Brunswick made it impossible to pass the Quebec Scheme in Nova Scotia, that the opponents of the scheme would have

Ibid., April 12th.

Ibid., April 17th. According to Journal of Assembly 1865, also debated on 18th and 19th but there are no reports in the debates and proceedings.

Ibid., April 24th.

said it was impracticable and out of season. He said Nova Scotia should be regarded "as having placed on record no decision and not even any opinion relative to the merits of the larger question." MacDonnell transmitted the speeches of Archibald, Tupper and McCully. He agreed to a large extent with Archibald, who felt that whether general union came or not Maritime union would be valuable of itself. The Lieutenant Governor told Cardwell that the views of the Imperial Government would influence greatly the result of any negotiations. ¹ On May 9th MacDonnell transmitted a resolution passed by the Legislative Council which contained the preamble ² dropped from that of the Assembly.

Unfortunately the Imperial authorities did not now look with favour upon Maritime union. On May 2nd MacDonnell wrote to Dr. Tupper, suggesting that a delegation be sent to England in acceptance of an invitation from Canada. At this time a Conference was proceeding between the Secretary of State and Canadian ministers at London. MacDonnell felt that Nova Scotia should be represented at the Conference since the Canadian ministers intended to press upon the Imperial Government the expediency of enforcing measures of common defense and since general union would probably be discussed. The Nova Scotian delegation could also discuss the Reciprocity Treaty, protection of the fisheries, railway affairs and could explain why the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, April 27, 1865.
2. Ibid., May 9, 1865.

Nova Scotian government had revived Maritime union.¹ On May 4th this letter was read in the Executive Council. Dr. Tupper agreed that a delegation ought to be sent, if only to explain their course with regard to Maritime union and Confederation, since the Imperial Government had evidently misunderstood it. However, he felt that the people of Nova Scotia might think that this was an attempt to force Confederation without an appeal to the people; this would do more harm than the good the delegation might do in other directions. MacDonnell then read some of his recent correspondence with Cardwell to the Executive Council. One of his despatches, dated March 16th and confidential, informed Cardwell that Maritime union was about to be revived in Nova Scotia. Another of the despatches, dated April 1st, was Cardwell's reply to the above giving reasons why the Imperial Government would not consent to revert to Maritime union. MacDonnell said that he felt the language of the despatch was so pointed and strong that he was precluded from even naming delegates. MacDonnell then read his despatch of April 13th in which he had explained to Cardwell the position of the Nova Scotian government in relation to Confederation and Maritime union. The Executive Council felt that the explanations given in MacDonnell's despatches were sufficient. MacDonnell, however, was not satisfied. He suggested that either the Council draw up a memorandum or Dr. Tupper, when answering his letter of May 2nd, detail fully the reasons for regarding a delegation as unseasonable.²

1. Minutes of Executive Council, Nova Scotia, May 4, 1865, MacDonnell to Tupper, May 2, 1865.
2. Minutes Executive Council, May 4, 1865.

Dr. Tupper's answer of May 11th gave a full interpretation of his policy since the Quebec Conference. The letter was written, however, with a view to justifying his revival of Maritime union to the Imperial Government and this must be kept in mind. Tupper explained that in the fall of 1864 he had had every reason to expect that the Quebec scheme would be accepted in Nova Scotia but that when he returned from Quebec "an opposition to the proposed scheme was organized in this city by a number of mercantile men of both parties associated with active opponents of the Government". The Administration, while supported in general by a large majority in the Legislature, were in a disadvantageous position to meet this unlooked for opposition since hostility to the School Bill of 1864 on the part of many Nova Scotians had destroyed the confidence of many members in the security of the Government in case of an appeal to the people. Notwithstanding the efforts of the delegates, a strong opposition to the Quebec scheme had grown up comprising enemies of the School Bill, Liberals and numbers of people whose fears had been excited by the statement that Confederation would involve a great increase in taxation. The Government, having obtained the support of leading members of the Opposition, could not rely therefore on the party support available under different circumstances. The Unionists had done their best to make Confederation popular but just when it was being demanded that the question be referred to the people the Legislature of New Brunswick had been dissolved and writs

for a general election issued. When the Legislature of Nova Scotia met it was impossible to get a vote in favour of Confederation due to alarm throughout the country and it would have been fatal to have allowed a hostile vote to be recorded in Nova Scotia before the New Brunswick elections. When the Confederation party in New Brunswick had been defeated it became still more difficult to pass a union resolution in Nova Scotia and it was very important that no hostile vote should be recorded in the Legislature. Since the opponents of Confederation were in favour of Maritime union and since the Unionists looked upon it as a step towards Confederation, resort was then had to the smaller union. It would remove two objections to the Quebec scheme: 1, lack of unity in the Maritimes, 2, insignificance of local governments in these provinces under Confederation. If successful, it would remove the obstacles recently raised to Confederation in New Brunswick; if it failed it would remove the smaller scheme from public attention. Tupper said that he had not been prepared to find the Maritime scheme regarded as hostile to the Quebec scheme. He knew that the Canadians did not view it in that light. When he introduced the Maritime union resolution he had advocated Confederation so zealously and had treated the smaller scheme so subsidiary to the larger plan that considerable opposition had been aroused among the anti-Confederates. At the time of the New Brunswick elections an appeal to the people of Nova Scotia would have had the same result as in New Brunswick.

Tupper said that a delegation to England would have a prejudicial effect on the Confederation cause in Nova Scotia.¹ This letter, together with MacDonnell's of May 2nd, was transmitted to England.²

From January until this time the campaign for and against union in the press adhered to the lines laid down in the speeches of the delegates and Howe's "Botheration" papers. During this time the "British Colonist" repeatedly declared that the British connection depended upon Confederation and that the alternative facing Nova Scotia was either union or annexation. On the other hand, the "Morning Chronicle" in numerous editorials said that the Unionists were attempting to frighten Nova Scotia into union by magnifying the dangers from the United States. The "British Colonist" emphasized a great deal the favour in which England looked upon union. This was one of its strongest arguments and as each despatch confirming England's approval of Confederation was published the strength of the argument increased. The "Morning Chronicle" in reply declared that England had been misled as to the sentiments of Nova Scotia regarding union with Canada and that Britain would never force Nova Scotia into Confederation against her will. The "Colonist" said that since England was in favour of union and Nova Scotians were loyal they should heed her wishes. The paper also combatted the assertion of the "Chronicle" that Confederation would break the British connection and by annexation to Canada result in the end in annexation to the United States. In the struggle the

1. Minutes, Executive Council, May 19, 1865: Tupper to MacDonnell, May 11, 1865.

2. Minutes, Executive Council, May 19, 1865.

position of Canada evoked a great deal of controversy. The "Chronicle" drew attention to as many unfavourable aspects of Canada, including Canadian politicians, as it could, while the "Colonist" on its part devoted considerable space to placing Canada in as favourable a light as possible. The "Chronicle" had an advantage over the "Colonist" in this controversy, in that it could appeal to the deep-rooted distrust of Nova Scotians toward Canada and things Canadian. Another crucial question was whether the Nova Scotia Legislature could pass the Quebec scheme without an appeal to the people. Each side, of course, answered this question according to its desire.

In the struggle the economic aspect of Confederation was not neglected, particularly by the anti-Unionists. Thus the "Morning Chronicle" devoted a great deal of attention to the question of the tariff and of taxation. Actually the tariff was clearly recognized by the "Chronicle" to be a form of taxation. The "Chronicle" claimed that under Confederation the tariff would be greatly raised and Nova Scotia would be exploited for the benefit of Canada. Similarly, internal taxation would be increased with the same end in view. Nova Scotia's foreign trade would be ruined and her infant manufactures prostrated. Under Confederation she would be the economic slave of Canada. The "Colonist" saw a brighter picture. This paper claimed that under Confederation Nova Scotia would be the manufacturing centre of the country and that she would also hold the most important position in the foreign

trade of the new nation. Reference was also made to the benefits which would accrue to her from internal trade. The question of defence was partially economic. The unionists claimed that united the provinces would have the resources for defence measures but the anti-Unionists said that to adequately defend Canada would require tremendous sums of money which would not be available even under Confederation.

No bare summary can give an adequate picture of the wealth of logic spun, the amount of personal recrimination or the appeals to prejudice and to alarm. In the latter neither side was much better than the other, but when all the confusing extraneous matter is excluded the arguments are seen to centre around loyalty, the critical position of the Colonies, the wishes of Britain, which were closely linked with loyalty, and last but far from least the economics of union.

The revival of Maritime union met a favourable reception from both the "Chronicle" and "Colonist". On March 24th the former paper said that the Confederates had at last hauled down their flag and welcomed Maritime union. However, on April 19th the "Chronicle" asked what guarantee Nova Scotia had that Maritime union would suffer any better fate than in 1864. The "British Colonist" on May 6th said that Maritime union was valuable with Confederation. It stated that misstatements by the anti-Unionists had aroused thousands in the country and the Government had been wise to avoid having any member of the Legislature record

a vote against Confederation. Nova Scotians would have sufficient time to consider the Quebec scheme carefully and fairly and they would be able to fully instruct their representatives. A vote at that time would have spelled defeat. After this time the struggle over union died down in the press, but never ceased, arising from time to time. Both papers kept up educative work on the subject.

The British Government never faltered in its approval of Confederation and its disapproval of Maritime union except as ancillary to general union. On June 24th Cardwell transmitted copies of correspondence between himself and Lord Monck on the affairs of British North America, lately the subject of a conference at London. Cardwell directed MacDonnell to lay this correspondence before the Legislature at the next session and at the same time to express "the strong and deliberate opinion" of the Imperial Government as to the desirability of Confederation on many grounds of "moral and material advantage". He added:

"But there is one consideration which Her Majesty's Government feel it more especially their duty to press upon the Legislature of Nova Scotia. Looking to the determination which this Country has ever exhibited to regard the defence of the Colonies as a matter of Imperial concern, the Colonies must recognize a right and even acknowledge ^{an obligation} incumbent on the Home Government to urge with earnestness and just authority the

the measures which they consider to be most expedient on the part of the Colonies with a view to their own defence".

Cardwell added that he was aware that general union had not been received in Nova Scotia with that cordiality which had marked its acceptance by the Canadian Legislature but he hoped the Maritime Provinces would soon see the advantages of the scheme.¹ On July 6th MacDonnell reported to the Colonial Secretary that this despatch had contained "such an emphatic declaration by the Imperial Government of the paramount importance of union, expressed in a manner so calculated to impress the people of this Province with a sense of the just authority attaching to the deliberate opinion of Her Majesty's Government" that he had felt it his duty not to withdraw it "a single day from publicity".² The publication of this despatch was received with joy by the "British Colonist".³ The "Morning Chronicle" on July 10th said that since the Colonial Secretary apparently felt that union should take place without delay the Government should immediately submit the question to the people. On July 22nd Cardwell told MacDonnell that he saw no objection to having acted on the opinion that publication of the despatch would help Confederation in Nova Scotia.⁴

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 109, Cardwell to MacDonnell, June 24, 1865.
2. P. A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, July 6, 1865.
3. British Colonist, July 8, 1865.
4. P.A.N.S., Vol. 109, July 22, 1865, Cardwell to MacDonnell.

Although the Executive Council in May had not been in favour of sending a delegation to England in June they apparently changed their minds. By that time the conference of the Canadian delegates in London was over and perhaps they felt that they could now send delegates without raising an uproar. On June 20th Dr. Tupper and W. A. Henry were appointed to go to England with regard to the Reciprocity Treaty, Nova Scotia railway extension, immigration and other matters. No reference to union was made in their authorization.¹ However, on July 28th Cardwell, referring to his conferences with the delegates, told MacDonnell that he had discussed both Maritime union and Confederation with them.² He said:

"I have stated that Her Majesty's Government can give no countenance to any proposals which would tend to delay the Confederation of all the Provinces which they are so desirous to promote: and can only aid in the promotion of a closer union between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick if that closer Union be ancillary to and form part of the scheme for general Union".

The British Government, while showing clearly that it was in favour of Confederation, made some attempts to make the scheme more attractive for the Maritimes. On July 22nd Cardwell wrote to Monck telling him that Canada should give the Maritimes more positive assurances as to her readiness

1. Minutes, Executive Council, June 20, 1865.

2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 109, Cardwell to MacDonnell, July 28, 1865.

to ensure construction of the intercolonial railway following Confederation. Cardwell said this would be very satisfactory to the friends of union in the Maritimes and would encourage their efforts to recommend Confederation to their fellow provincials by whom it had not been supported up to that time.¹ This action seems to be due to the efforts of MacDonnell. On March 20th MacDonnell had written to Monck concerning the policy of J. A. MacDonald and his colleagues with reference to the intercolonial railway. He did not question their good faith but they had been impolitic "in not impressing others with a due sense of their good intentions". He said:

"They seem not to have cared how very Canadian-selfishly Canadian, they may have appeared to Bluenose who is very happy as he is - who is already in possession of good harbours - and who does not look to Canada particularly for his market".

According to MacDonnell the Nova Scotian was friendly and neighbourly but did not wish to pay too much for union or be excluded by a high tariff from buying in the cheapest market. MacDonnell felt that the Canadian Ministers made a mistake in not having exhibited a desire to get provision for the intercolonial railway in the Imperial Act as a first charge on the funds of the Confederation, making its construction sure.

1. Ibid., Cardwell to Monck, July 22, 1865, Enclosed in Nova Scotia No. 47, Cardwell to MacDonnell, August 31, 1865.

The Nova Scotians desired the railway and the attitude of the Canadian ministers, unintentional though it might have been, was unfortunate. It had resulted in the rout of the Confederates in the Maritimes in spite of the fact that in Nova Scotia at least "they had the writing and printing and speaking power and an immense deal of executive energy on their side at the commencement in putting the matter before the country". MacDonnell recorded a growing distrust of Canada in the Maritimes. He questioned the Canadian ministers' "politic manipulation of the subject with so keen a Spectator as Bluenose watching the game". MacDonnell said that he had put these opinions before Cardwell. He felt that it would be best to start the new edifice from the base with a legislative union of the Maritimes rather than begin at the roof with general union.¹

The Imperial Government also took an interest in efforts to renew the Reciprocity Treaty. On May 25th MacDonnell had sent Cardwell a memorandum of his Executive Council which drew attention to the need for concerted measures to renew the Reciprocity Treaty. He expressed the hope that the Imperial Government would find it possible to consult the wishes of Nova Scotia before any renewed treaty was ratified.² Nearly two months later Cardwell transmitted a suggestion by Lord Russel that the various colonies appoint representatives to a Confederate Council

1. Lieutenant Governor's Correspondence, Miscellaneous, Vol. I, 1865, No. 127, MacDonnell to Monck, March 20, 1865.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1866, App. 7, p. 1.

which would be presided over by the Governor General and would furnish an opinion to the Imperial Government in the negotiation of commercial treaties in which the colonies were concerned.¹

MacDonnell welcomed this suggestion because, he said:

"The suggested Confederate Council will it is hoped prevent the recurrence of any proceeding calculated to isolate these Provinces and awaken jealousies, which even when groundless, are injurious to the general interests of the whole group of Colonies."

He reported that he and his ministry had been embarrassed recently when Canada had sent representatives to Washington on the subject of the renewal of Reciprocity without asking the other colonies to cooperate until the necessary steps for negotiating such a renewal had been agreed upon by the Canadians and Sir Frederick Bruce,² British representative at Washington.

The Confederate Council met at Quebec in December. Besides deciding to press for renewal of reciprocity, the Council resolved to attempt to extend the trade of the colonies with the West India Islands, with Spain and her Colonies and with Brazil and Mexico.³ The Executive Council of Canada then suggested to Monck that a commission be appointed to go to these countries, even if reciprocity were renewed, and, if possible, extend

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1866, app. 7, p. 2, July 22, 1865.
2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 127, MacDonnell to Cardwell, August 2, 1865.
3. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1866, App. 9, p. 1.

British North American trade. Monck was asked to request permission from the Imperial Government.¹ This Government looked with favour on the proposal but said that it applied not to Canada alone but to the British North American Colonies collectively.² However, the British Government did not relinquish control over the negotiation of trade treaties. On November 18th Cardwell, on advice from the Foreign Office, said that the commissioners were to have no authority to negotiate treaties. They were only to enquire into the possibilities of extending trade and to consult/^{with} the British ministers to the various countries. The Imperial Government would negotiate any treaties.³ This did not mark any change in Imperial policy but it was a reminder to the Provinces of the pressure which Great Britain had in her power. Moreover, six days later Cardwell told MacDonnell that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had advised him that in the opinion of the British representative at Washington:

"the necessity of having to submit a Treaty of Commerce to the separate action of the various Provincial Legislatures would be a serious difficulty in his way and that the Union of the Provinces would afford the best hopes of obtaining such a Treaty".

Cardwell said that similarly it was evident that the same difficulties would apply to treaties with other countries but "the Union of the Provinces would in every such case afford the best hope of bringing

1. Journal, House of Assembly, 1866, App. 9, pp.1-2.
2. Ibid., pp.2-3.
3. Ibid., pp.4-5.

such arrangements to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion".¹ This despatch was printed in a Royal Gazette for December 20, 1865. It was welcomed and concurred in by the "British Colonist" on December 21st but the "Nova Scotian", weekly counterpart of the "Chronicle", stated that it had been inspired by the Canadians.

In September Lieutenant Governor MacDonnell was transferred to Hong Kong. He had served little over a year instead of the usual six year term. The British Government was anxious for Confederation and, unless they wished to put someone in as Lieutenant Governor who would push the policy of union more vigorously, it was strange to make a change at so important a time. Although the British Government did not have a great deal of confidence in MacDonnell's judgment in reference to other incidents,² he was lukewarm in support of Confederation and the attempt to revive Maritime union in conjunction with his lack of enthusiasm, may have alienated the Imperial Government. At any rate he was removed to make way for a man who had the cause of union at heart. Apparently the move came as a surprise to MacDonnell. In a despatch of September 28th he transmitted an address to himself by the Mayor and Corporation of Halifax because of its unusual tone and feeling.³ He did this presumably to show that he had been popular in Nova Scotia. In another despatch of the same date he reported that he was "pressed by a multiplicity of business."⁴ In another he referred to the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 109, Cardwell to Williams, November 24, 1865, received December 9th.
2. W. M. Whitelaw, op. cit., pp. 267-268.
3. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Sept. 28, 1865, No. 109.
4. Ibid., No. 108.

"hurry and pressure unavoidable in the peculiar circumstances" of his position and observed:

"brief as my stay in Nova Scotia has been it has sufficed to impress me with a durable sense of the general social worth and loyalty of its hardy inhabitants, and the immense importance to Great Britain of its geographical position and noble harbours".¹

This is very reminiscent of his despatch of December 8, 1864 criticizing the Quebec scheme. On September 29th Doyle became Administrator of the Province.

The man chosen to succeed MacDonnell was Sir William Fenwick Williams, a native of Nova Scotia, who had distinguished himself in the British army and was further distinguished by being very favourable toward Confederation. He was chosen by the British Government to put Confederation through in Nova Scotia.² Unfortunately the private letter offering the appointment to Williams is not in our possession. However, on November 8th Williams printed in the Royal Gazette a despatch dated September 26th which offered him the appointment.³ By error this despatch contained part of the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, MacDonnell to Cardwell, Sept. 28, 1865, No. 110.
2. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book, Williams to Gordon, No. 13, March 7, 1866.
3. Royal Gazette of Nova Scotia, Nov. 8, 1865. The essential difference between this despatch and the correct one later sent was that the former stated that the declared policy of the Imperial Government if successful would "lead to the abolition of the office of Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia" and referred directly to general union as the policy of the Imperial Government. It would seem from the first difference that either some mistake was made or that the British Government was contemplating some form of legislative union.

private letter and was dated September 26th instead of October 28th. On November 11th Cardwell informed Williams of these facts and enclosed the correct despatch.¹ The despatch which Cardwell enclosed stated that since "the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government" would "if successful, lead to the discontinuance of the Office as at present constituted" he was to regard himself as appointed, not for the usual term of six years, but only for such time as was convenient for the Imperial Government.²

In December a bye-election took place in Lunenburg County. Mr. Zwicker, an erstwhile Liberal, was nominated, so the "Nova Scotian" charged, by Tupper's Government with liberty to speak both against the School Act of 1864 and Confederation "whatever he might do after his election". Mr. Hebb, the other candidate, pledged himself against the Quebec scheme or any other scheme of union until the question had been referred to the people. The "Nova Scotian" admitted that the question of the School Bill had had considerable effect in the election but contended that Confederation had been made the main issue by Mr. Hebb and by the "British Colonist" of December 14th. The feeling against union in Lunenburg must have been strong at this time, since both candidates declared they were against Confederation. In the election Hebb received 1,332 votes while Zwicker polled 646. The "Nova Scotian" contrasted this election with that of 1863 when the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 109, Cardwell to Williams, Nov. 11, 1865, Separate. Received Nov. 21, 1865.
2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 109, Cardwell to Williams, Oct. 28, 1865, N.S. No. 2, Enclosed in the "separate" despatch of Nov. 11, 1865.

Conservative candidate obtained 2,274 and the Liberal 1,765 votes. According to the "Nova Scotian", this marked a turnover of 1,195 votes in two years. The paper also mentioned the new franchise act and claimed that under the old law Hebb's majority would have been much greater. It said that the present victory had been won despite the Government's "lavish and unscrupulous" expenditure of road monies.¹ The "British Colonist" interpreted the election figures differently. The "Colonist" said that not a single intelligent Conservative would vote for Hebb because of his lack of education and they did not trust Zwicker since he had declared against Confederation and admitted that he had been paid to run as a Liberal in 1863. The paper drew attention to the close close correspondence between the Liberal vote of 1863 and the total vote cast in 1865, stating that in the latter election the two candidates had split the Liberal vote between them. It also drew attention to the great decrease in the total vote and stated that it could not be due to the Franchise Act.² However, if the "Colonist's" claims be taken seriously, they imply that the new franchise law disenfranchised none or few of the 1765 Liberals who voted in 1863 and that the other 213 voters³ gained in 1865 were unintelligent Conservatives. This new Franchise Law, both papers mentioned, originated with Joseph Howe's Government but did not come into operation until June 24, 1865. The exact reduction

1. Nova Scotian, January 8, 1866.
2. British Colonist, January 2, 1866.
3. Morning Chronicle, June 27, 1865.

in the electorate is not known but it was estimated at about one-third.¹ This, of course, applied to Nova Scotia as a whole and there is no way of telling how much the reduction would be in one particular county. Therefore there is no accurate way of analyzing the election results of 1865. Two facts are sure: that both candidates expressed themselves against Confederation and that 1,938 votes were cast in Lunenburg against the scheme in 1865 unless, of course, in the latter case Zwicker's pledge was designed to steal a victory for the Government and the 646 who voted for him were aware of this.

In January, 1866, difficulties for Tupper's Government arose in Yarmouth. On the 16th of that month George S. Brown, member for the Township of Yarmouth, resigned his seat in the Legislature on the grounds that the Legislature should be dissolved since a new Franchise Act had come into operation in the previous summer and that the Government by their conduct had lost² the confidence of the people. Brown had delayed his action for a considerable time. If he had expected to precipitate a general election he was disappointed. Naturally the "Morning Chronicle" welcomed this move. The question whether the new Franchise Act made a general election necessary had been discussed by this paper on May 24, 1865, a month before the Act came into operation, and on June 27th of the same year the "Chronicle" had called for

1. See Morning Chronicle, May 22, 1868. The paper quoted Wm. Annand and an English paper in favour of Confederation. Both agreed that the reduction was about one-third.
2. Morning Chronicle, January 22, 1866.

a dissolution on this ground. The question had been referred to from time to time¹ by the paper, more with the idea of embarrassing the Government than in the hope that a dissolution would take place. In January it resumed its agitation.² On January 29th a meeting took place at Yarmouth to choose candidates for the vacated seat and a resolution was passed affirming the intention of the electors not to nominate any person who was not opposed to the policy of the Government, particularly with respect to Confederation.³ On Nomination day Messrs. Townsend and Goucher accepted nomination; both agreed to the resolution of January 19th.⁴ No Government candidate was nominated. In the election, issues such as retrenchment and the School Bill entered in but the contest was not over Confederation. That question had already been settled. The contest between the two candidates was waged largely on personal popularity and on more or less local issues; it was won by Mr. Townsend with a majority of fifteen votes.

In 1866 the controversy in the press between the Unionists kept up. The "British Colonist", while not ceasing to advocate union, did not attempt to provoke the anti-Unionists needlessly. The "Chronicle" at this time began calling for a new convention on the subject of union but its distrust of the Unionists did not decrease. On January 19th the "Chronicle"

1. Morning Chronicle of July 15, July 21, Aug. 3, 1865.
2. Ibid., Jan. 26, 29, 1866.
3. Ibid., Feb. 5, 1866.
4. Ibid., Feb. 14, 1866.

said that the Nova Scotian Government was waiting for New Brunswick to act; that it was still manoueuvering; that it should appeal to the people. On January 27th an editorial appeared in the "British Colonist" which was very conciliatory to the "Chronicle's" demand for a new union conference but the paper did not become a convert. The "Colonist's" policy at that time was to avoid stirring up controversy and arousing suspicion.

At this time the Lieutenant Governors of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were waiting on each other.* The Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick was anxious for Williams to help him. On February 20th he telegraphed Williams that a strong expression in favour of union in his Speech from the Throne would help Confederation in New Brunswick.¹ On the 21st Williams replied that all arrangements had been made for the opening of the Nova Scotian Legislature on the following day; that he knew the feelings of both the provinces and was certain that such a declaration would injure Confederation in both. He said: "My instructions are to follow you".² On February 27th Williams told Monck that the success of Confederation in the session of 1866 hinged on Gordon's prompt efforts.³ Monck felt, however, that Williams' silence on the question of union was making it much more difficult to carry Confederation in New

1. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book, No. 1, Gordon to Williams, February 20, 1866.
2. Ibid., No. 2, Williams to Gordon, February 21, 1866.
3. Ibid., No. 3, Williams to Monck, February 27, 1866.

Brunswick.¹ Williams replied that Gordon knew the Unionists were a minority in Nova Scotia until Confederation had been approved by New Brunswick.² Gordon was evidently complaining to Monck that Williams was not cooperating enough. On March 7th Williams telegraphed Gordon that he was sorry that his "line of operations" had not helped him. Williams said he hoped that:

"anti Confederate joy will turn to sorrow by your measures. My total abandonment of Confederation is too much like Punch even for their sincere³ belief. They know what I was sent here for".

Despite Williams' assertion, the people of Nova Scotia do not seem to have been nearly as alarmed as in 1865. The leaders of the anti-Unionists felt that the Nova Scotian Government was waiting for New Brunswick to move. They still distrusted the Government but as the session passed they appear to have been careless and over-confident. Very few public meetings were held and the country on the whole does not seem to have been greatly alarmed. Only one hundred and thirty-four petitions, bearing about 8,500 signatures, were presented to the Assembly⁴ in 1866. None were presented to the Legislative Council.

1. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book, No. 4, Monck to Williams, February 28, 1866.
2. Ibid., No. 5, Williams to Gordon, February 28, 1866.
3. Ibid., No. 13, Williams to Gordon, March 7, 1866.
On March 7th Williams sent the following telegram to Monck: "I am now able to reply to proposals dated Montreal 26th of February highly approved here and I feel sure they can be carried in both Provinces". (Ibid., No. 14, Williams to Monck, March 7, 1866) This telegram is too cryptic to be explained. What the proposals were it is impossible at present to say but they probably referred to union.
4. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, App. 10, p.23. See also Appendix II to this study, pages 242-243.

In March apparently the prospects of the Unionists improved. On March 12th Williams informed Gordon that he hoped Gordon would deal with Confederation as quickly as possible since he was sure that just then he could carry anything agreed upon by the New Brunswick Assembly once it had led the way.¹ On the same day Williams reported "a great change here" to Monck and asked Monck to urge Gordon on since all the ordinary business of the session was finished in Nova Scotia and Howe was away.² Monck in reply asked if Williams could not act without waiting for Gordon and Williams said that he had every hope of doing so.³ However, Williams still delayed. On March 19th he reported that things were quiet locally and on the following day he said that all parties were working cordially for defence.⁴ This telegram was in connection with fears that the Fenians were about to attack the British Provinces. Reports of Fenian movements appeared in the Halifax press during early March but the "British Colonist" made no attempt to make a scare of the question with the idea of

1. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book, No. 17, Williams to Gordon, March 12, 1866.
2. Ibid., No. 18, Williams to Monck, March 12, 1866. Telegram in full read: "A great change here, if Gordon acts promptly for Quebec scheme or otherwise. Pray read my message and urge him on, nearly all our ordinary business done and Howe is away".
3. Ibid., No. 19, Monck to Williams, March 12, 1866.
4. Ibid., No. 22, Williams to Monck, March 14, 1866. Telegram read: "Have every hope of doing what you hint at".
5. Ibid., No. 33, Williams to Monck, March 19, 1866.
6. Ibid., No. 38, Williams to Monck, March 20, 1866.

pressing for union. It was not until March 17th that fear reached any height in Nova Scotia. On March 17th Williams called out the Militia. He felt the Fenian threat would have the effect of binding the Colonies "into one camp for their mutual defence by rendering future intrigues for annexation out of the question and thus exhibiting in these vast dependencies of the Crown one unmistakeable and manifest destiny for them". It was not only the Americans who could talk of "manifest destiny". Williams reported the militia had cheerfully responded and that the Legislature had promised cordial support and entire loyalty to England.¹ The "Colonist" said that considerable military activity had been carried on previously but that it was not until that date that the people were alarmed by a rumour that the Fenians intended to attack Halifax with ironclads. The "Colonist" said that there was little actual danger but that it was valuable in that it would give the peoples of British North America a feeling of solidarity which would hasten the victory of Confederation.² Similar views were expressed several days later.³

In the latter part of March Confederation had to wait on discussion of the Government's Pictou Railway policy. On March 26th Williams informed Monck that the attack of the Opposition on this policy would leave him with perhaps a majority of four and that with that "clog" out of the way the question of Confederation soon would be settled.⁴ Williams

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Cardwell, March 27, 1866.
2. British Colonist, March 20, 1866.
3. Ibid., March 22, 1866.
4. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book, No. 45, Williams to Monck, March 26, 1866.

was unduly pessimistic; on March 29th the attack of the Opposition was defeated with a majority of eleven. Five days later Williams was able to report to Monck and Gordon:

"Today at 3 P. M. Miller the violent anti Quebec scheme member moves the Resolution for Confederate union to be framed by Act of Imperial Parliament¹ assisted by delegates".

On April 4th he reported that Miller had spoken beyond an hour and that, the course being clear, his advisers were preparing a resolution.² On April 7th, enclosing a resolution, he asked Gordon whether he could carry a similar one if it passed in Nova Scotia.³

On April 3rd Mr. Miller, Independent member for Richmond and opponent of the Quebec scheme, addressed the House on union. He embarked first on a lengthy vindication of his course with respect to the Quebec scheme. He was still opposed to it but the abrogation of Reciprocity by the United States with the intention of bringing about annexation, together with the Fenians' avowed opposition to union, made it imperative upon any lovers of British rule to unite in common defence of the privileges they held so dear. Since Britain was determined to have the Provinces united they should, by treating her advice with due respect and deference, place themselves in a position where

1. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book, No. 51, Williams to Gordon and Monck, April 3, 1866.
2. Ibid., No. 54, April 4, 1866.
3. Ibid., No. 57, Williams to Gordon & Monck, April 7, 1866.

they deserved the protection of the Parent State. He thought that Canadian interests had dominated the Quebec Conference but he felt it was better not to call a new conference in British America to remedy this. He declared that he was quite prepared to authorize the Imperial Government, with the assistance of delegates from the Provinces, to decide upon the disputed details of the scheme of union, since he was confident that the fullest measure of justice would be meted out to the Maritimes by that august and impartial tribunal. Therefore he asked whether the Government in the present important emergency would be willing to meet the friends of union who opposed the Quebec scheme on some ground upon which all could unite.

Dr. Tupper in reply did not concur with the objections to the Quebec scheme because he felt it offered ample security for the Maritimes. He would have to consult his colleagues in the Government and those who had assisted them in preparing the measure but he expressed the hope that they could find some common ground acceptable to the house and ^{to} the people. Mr. Annand was greatly annoyed that such a step should have been taken without his knowledge and concurrence. Mr. S. MacDonnell said that Annand had recently written in the "Chronicle" that the Province would have to decide between annexation and loyalty to Britain and that he was in favour of union but against the Quebec scheme. Mr. MacDonnell supported Miller's proposal.

Several of the other members made brief remarks and the matter was dropped.¹ Annand apparently had a well founded suspicion that the Quebec scheme would be little changed by the British Parliament.

The "British Colonist" welcomed Miller's proposal^x and soon began to play up more strongly the danger from the United States. The anti-Confederate leaders were called annexationists and Fenian sympathizers. These names had been thrown at them before. Annand came in for the major share of the attack first.² The other anti-Confederates received their share of the attack. Howe did not escape but the weapons used were ridicule and pity.³ On May 1st the "Colonist" attacked Howe for inconsistency; it said Howe was trying to overthrow Responsible Government and the British connection. The paper admitted it was mortified to admit that Howe had placed himself at the head of a group of annexationists like Killam, Locke, Brown and Townsend. The "Colonist's" policy was clearly one of trying to discredit the leaders of the anti-Unionist party without arousing the country at large any more than necessary. The "Morning Chronicle" the day following Miller's proposal began to call "traitor" and this word was frequently used.⁴ Thus both sides waved the flag.

1. British Colonist, April 5, 1866.
2. Ibid., April 10, 1866. Quoting "Halifax Reporter".
3. Ibid., April 14, 21, 1866.
4. Morning Chronicle, April 4, 1866. "Traitors in the House - the Country to the Rescue".

On April 10th Tupper moved a resolution which asked the Lieutenant Governor to appoint delegates to arrange a scheme of union with the Imperial Government which would "effectually ensure just provision for the rights and interests" of Nova Scotia. Upper Canada and Lower Canada were to be considered as separate provinces, each to send its own delegates.¹ The speeches which followed added little new material. The resolution was debated on April 13th, 14th, 16th and 17th, the anti-Unionists in the Assembly battling fiercely but with no success. On April 17th, when the question was put, Mr. S. Campbell moved a long resolution by way of amendment. The resolution attacked the legality of the Quebec Conference because it had been authorized by neither the Legislature nor the people of Nova Scotia. It said that since the adoption of the Quebec Resolutions no general elections had been held but that in special elections held in Annapolis, Lunenburg and Yarmouth the people had expressed themselves as hostile to the scheme and the members elected there were prepared to act in obedience to the declared wishes of their constituents. Furthermore many petitions had been presented to the House asking it not to concur in the proposed scheme and praying that no change be made in their institutions without an election, while only one petition had been presented in favour. It would be unwise and dangerous to the peace and general interests of the country in the present time of crisis to force the Quebec scheme on the people without a decided

¹⁸⁶⁶
1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, p. 60.

and distinct expression in its favour. Therefore no measure should be passed until the people had been referred to at the polls. In the division which followed eighteen members voted for the resolution and thirty-one against it. The original resolution was then put and thirty-one voted in favour and nineteen against it.¹ A similar resolution had already passed² in the Legislative Council thirteen to five on April 16th.

Although the anti-Confederates had lost in the Assembly, they did not lose heart. On April 26th Lieutenant Governor Williams forwarded to the Colonial Secretary an address to the Queen from five members of the Legislative Council and eighteen members of the Assembly. He did not remark on "the unusual course adopted by these gentlemen, or the tone of their address" but stated that he fully concurred with the opinions expressed in a minute of his Council which he enclosed.³ The address stated that for more than a century Nova Scotia had had advantages of representative institutions and since 1839 had generally exercised the right of self government under the Queen's authority. These privileges had never been abused but had been exercised with justice and discretion. Nova Scotia had been loyal during the American Revolution, the War of 1812 and during recent frontier troubles. The blessings Nova Scotians

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1866, pp. 69-70. See Appendix 3 to this study, p 244.
2. Journal, Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, 1866.
3. P. A. N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Cardwell, April 26, 1866.

enjoyed made them indisposed to "try rash experiment, by which their control over their own affairs must be surrendered and their connexion with the Parent State may be ultimately broken". The proposed change had been unconstitutional from the beginning. The present move was an attempt to force it through with "indecent haste" and without deliberate review and general acceptance by the people. The petitioners claimed that this had been done by the free use and abuse of the Queen's name and by the threat that Imperial protection would be withdrawn. The people of Nova Scotia would "deeply resist" any change in this manner which would be a violation of the trust reposed in their representatives, and, if approved by the Imperial Government, "in the pledged faith and honour of the Crown". The petitioners prayed that the Queen allow no measure to effect grave changes in the constitution of Nova Scotia until they had been "published in the Province, considered in the Legislature and submitted to the deliberate acceptance or rejection of the people at the polls."¹

The Executive Council in reply claimed that they could not see how Self Government could be maintained if the majority of the Nova Scotian Legislature were to be overruled by the Imperial Government at the instance of a minority of said Legislature. Confederation would not mean that Nova Scotians would surrender control of their own affairs nor would the British connection be weakened; it would be strengthened.

1. Minutes of Executive Council, Nova Scotia, 1860-67. Section II, pp. 279-280. For names of petitioners see Appendix to this study, p. 245.

As for the charge that the Quebec Conference was held without the authority of the Nova Scotian Legislature, this could hardly be considered accurate when it was considered that all the memorialists who were in the Assembly in 1861 voted for the union resolution of that year which passed unanimously.¹ The Executive Council overlooked the fact that the Legislature in 1864 had only authorized the consideration of Maritime union. The Council countered the charge of "indecent haste" by stating that over a year had elapsed since the Quebec Conference.² However, this delay was due to New Brunswick, not the Government of Nova Scotia, and the "indecent haste" mentioned in the address seems to have referred to haste in 1866 not since the Conference. The members of the Executive Council declared that no use or abuse had been made of the Queen's name. They had merely stated the declared policy of the Imperial Government to effect union by every proper means without delay. They had felt justified in pointing out the wishes of the Imperial Government/^{for union} to improve defence and in urging upon the Legislature the duty of the Colonies to look to their defence in this way lest they "might imperil the disposition of the Imperial Government" to afford them protection. The Council declared that the text of the resolution recently passed refuted the memorialists' statement that certain gentlemen had been given the power to overturn

1. Minutes of Executive Council, Nova Scotia, 1860-67, Section II, pp. 281, 282.

2. Ibid., p. 282

the constitution of Nova Scotia at their pleasure. They answered the complaint that action was to be taken without recourse to the people by referring to the resolution of 1861 where, they claimed, there was no intention of appealing to the people. They quoted Howe's letter to the other Provincial Governments in 1862 as proof.¹ However they only quoted part of the letter. The purpose according to Howe in this letter was for the question "to be set at rest by such a formal discussion and decision as would promote such a union, if there was any general desire to effect it, and save much time if there was not."² In addition, Mulgrave had said in this connection:

"my Government are of the opinion that a meeting of the leading men of the different provinces should take place, in the hope that, after dull deliberation and discussion, some practicable scheme may be devised to which the public attention may be directed in the future consideration of the subject."³

As regards the legitimate powers of the Legislature in reference to union, the Council quoted several minutes of the previous Executive Council and an extract from a despatch of Lieutenant Governor Mulgrave to Colonial Secretary Newcastle.

1. Minutes of Executive Council, Nova Scotia, 1860-67, Section II, pp. 282-283.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1863, Appendix 17, pp2-3, Howe to Dorion, Tilley and Pope, August 14, 1862.
3. Ibid., Appendix 17, p. 1, Mulgrave to Newcastle, May 21, 1862.

The essential position of the previous Council is best exemplified in Mulgrave's despatch. He had declared that when the people elected a representative that representative had to consider the interests of the whole country, not simply the interests of his own constituents; that the member was not a delegate, subject to recall at any time when his constituents became dissatisfied with him, nor subject to their coercion.¹ The situation in 1866, however, was vastly different from that in 1860-61. In 1866 the question was one of far reaching constitutional change. The Executive Council stated that although more than a year had passed since they had submitted the Quebec Resolutions to the Legislature and although these resolutions had been the object of constant discussion during that time the opponents of the scheme had only been able to submit the signatures of 8,085 persons out of a population of not less than 350,000 asking that the question be referred to the people. The resolution had been carried in the Legislative Council by a vote of thirteen to five and in the Assembly by a vote of thirty-one to nineteen. The Council concluded:

"Under these circumstances the Council believe they are fully warranted in the opinion that the public sentiment of this Province has been most emphatically expressed on this question in the manner recognized by the Constitution of this Province and the practice of Great Britain."²

1. Minutes, Executive Council, 1860-67, Part II, pp. 284-286. Enclosed: Minute of Council, Nov. 1, 1860; Minute of Council Jan. 29, 1861; Mulgrave to Newcastle, March 30, 1861 in part.
2. Ibid., pp. 286.

The passing of the union resolution soon evoked a hostile response in the country. On May 2nd the "Morning Chronicle" said that leagues against Confederation were being formed throughout Nova Scotia. However it reported only one meeting at this time - a meeting at Yarmouth on April 25th. According to the "Chronicle" this meeting was called by the Sheriff of the County and passed a number of resolutions. One of these expressed opposition to Confederation and specifically to handing over to Canada the revenues of Nova Scotia; another condemned the Nova Scotian Legislature for handing over their constitution to England and invited fellow Nova Scotians to join in protest; another appointed a County Committee to correspond with other counties or provinces for support and to solicit subscriptions to pay for the expenses of circularizing the county, sending delegates to a Provincial Convention or to assist in defraying the cost of a delegation to England. Still another resolution recommended that a Provincial Convention be held. The committee appointed consisted of J. W. Lovitt, George Killam, Wm. Burrill, Jr., Walter Goucher, A. S. Murray, Chas. Pitman, Forman Hatfield, J. E. Clements, C. E. Brown, W. Rogers, G.S. Brown and R. Hunter. The "Chronicle", referring to the action being taken, said that at some places effigies of members who had voted for the union resolution had been burnt but stated that the procedure adopted at Yarmouth was the most satisfactory

way of indicating the sentiment of the people. It would appear from the account of this paper that the action taken at Yarmouth was possibly the first taken in the Province outside of Halifax.

✓ In Halifax, action had also been taken on April 25th. According to the "Nova Scotian" a league for the preservation of the constitution of Nova Scotia was formed on that day by a number of influential citizens.¹ From other sources we learn that it was called the League of the Maritime Provinces and that the President of the League was Joseph Howe, one of the Vice-Presidents W. J. Stairs, a prominent merchant and the Joint Secretary Robert Wetherbee.² Some of the other members were: Patrick Power, A.G. Jones, John Gibson, Robert Boak, Jeremiah Northup, Edward MacDonald, in Halifax, and A. W. McLellan, Hugh MacDonald and Thomas Killam from outside Halifax.³ Despite its name, the membership of the League was confined to Nova Scotia and largely to Halifax; merchants of that City played a very important part in its formation and activities. The total membership of the League is unknown. The constitution of this body echoes the well known statements of the anti-Unionists. It said that the Maritime provinces had enjoyed all the blessings of self-government and that the people of these provinces were loyal subjects of the Queen. These people had been peaceful among themselves and with foreign countries

1. Nova Scotian, April 30, 1866.
2. L. J. Burpee, Joseph Howe and the Anti-Confederation League, Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 1916, Vol. X, Section II, p. 409.
3. Ibid., p. 466.

and had been, and were still, ready to play their part in the British Empire. They were ready to promote measures for the joint construction of railways, for the establishment of inter-colonial lines of steamers, for the adoption of a uniform currency, for the general extension of trade and for effective mutual defence, but they were opposed "to rash innovation and revolutionary changes" and especially to the Quebec scheme and the methods proposed to give it effect. The League was formed to protect the institutions of the Maritime provinces and to assert the right of the people to be consulted before their revenues were taken away and a distant authority given powers which the Imperial Government for twenty-five years had not pretended to exercise. ¹

The League was not long in becoming active. On May 8th a public meeting was held at Windsor, Hants County, at which a number of the members of the League were present and Joseph Howe delivered an address. At this meeting representing Hants County an address to the Queen was adopted. In the evening the Hants branch of the League of the Maritime Provinces was formed. ² On May 10th Lieutenant Governor Williams transmitted the address to the Queen, together with his reply to the deputation which presented it to him. Williams said that he believed Howe's first attempt to agitate the province had failed completely. He mentioned Howe because Howe was principal on that occasion and he believed that Howe had drawn up the address. Williams

1. L. J. Burpee, op. cit., pp. 466-467.

2. Acadian Recorder, May 11, 1866.

further stated that the number reported to be present at the meeting at which the address was adopted was "highly exaggerated".¹

Despite Williams' assertion, agitation in Nova Scotia was by no means a failure. Williams was either a "wishful thinker" or deliberately concealing the facts. Two days after he transmitted the Hants address, a meeting was held at Kentville, Kings County, at which Howe spoke and at which an address to the Queen was adopted.² Following this meeting Howe made a tour of ^{Bridgetown} the western counties of Nova Scotia: he spoke at Yarmouth, Clare, Weymouth, Digby, Barrington, Shelburne, Liverpool, Port Medway, Caledonia, (Queens County) Bridgewater, Mahone Bay and lastly at Chester on June 15th.³ At these meetings resolutions were passed commending the local representatives if they had voted against Dr. Tupper's resolution or condemning them if they had voted for it. In a number of cases representatives were asked to resign. At these meetings addresses to the Queen were adopted asking that the people of Nova Scotia be allowed to vote on union. In all, addresses were sent from Hants, Yarmouth, Digby, Annapolis,⁴ Shelburne (2), Queens (2), Lunenburg and Kings Counties. In

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Cardwell, May 10, 1866, No.35. P.A.N.S., Vol. 110, Cardwell to Williams, May 25, 1866, No.43.
2. Acadian Recorder, May 14, 1866.
3. Lieutenant Governor's Correspondence, 1866, folio vol., Nos. 116, 104; Acadian Recorder, May 30th; Lt. Gov's. Corr., 1866. No. 111; Nova Scotian, May 28th; Lt. Gov's. Corr., 1866, Nos. 112, 113, 124; Nova Scotian, June 18th; Nova Scotian June 25th. The numbers are those of letters accompanying addresses to the Queen passed at the meetings. Not all the letters are in our possession and recourse to the newspapers was necessary.
4. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Nos. 35, 43, 44, 51, 50 & 48, 56 & 49, 61, 63.

addition, an address to the House of Commons was adopted at a meeting at Port Medway, Queens County, but no address to the Queen¹ was passed.

In essentials these addresses were very similar. They referred to the past loyalty of the people, the chief industries of the County, the blessings of responsible government, their prosperity, their desire to maintain the British connection, their desire to retain control over their revenues and their dislike of "revolutionary change". Several expressed opposition to being annexed to Canada with whose people they declared that they had little commercial or social intercourse. All asked that before any measure went into force the people be given the² opportunity of voting upon it.

On July 5th, his fellow officers of the Maritime League asked Joseph Howe to go to England to see whether the Imperial Government intended to entertain the idea of union and to find how much time there would be, after the measure was prepared and printed, for the people of Nova Scotia to review and, if objectionable, petition against it. Even if the new plan were better than the Quebec scheme, the officers felt that it should be given very careful consideration and be subject to the direct approval of the people whose future it would affect. If the Imperial Government did not see that this was reasonable, Howe

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Carnarvon, Aug. 16, 1866, No. 68.
2. A number (6) of these addresses may be found in the Lt. Gov's. Correspondence, 1866, folio volume. These have been clipped together and labelled for reference. The other addresses may be found in the various Halifax newspapers of the time.

was to take "prudent and legitimate" steps to have the true interests of Nova Scotia understood in England. If necessary, other delegates would be sent over to assist him and petitions to the House of Commons then being "extensively signed" would be forwarded.¹ On the same day Howe left for England.² By August 3rd Howe was in possession of petitions from Nova Scotia bearing 18,000 signatures.³ On August 18th he wrote to W. J. Stairs:

"Do not neglect the petitions. It is all important that we shall be able to show that the manhood of our country is adverse. 1,500 names out of 30,000 are too few for Halifax. Pray see that the work goes on. We must have the 40,000."⁴

In all, petitions bearing about 40,000 signatures were sent to England. The number was reduced to about 31,000 by the House of Commons.⁵

The addresses to the Queen had all come from the Western Counties but the Eastern Counties of Nova Scotia were as opposed to Confederation. On April 17th, the day that Dr. Tupper's union resolution passed, twenty-five petitions asking that the people be consulted had been presented to the Assembly from Antigonish County. Moreover, reports in the press indicate

1. Burpee, op. cit., pp. 423-425.
2. Nova Scotian, July 9, 1866.
3. Burpee, op. cit., p. 427.
4. Ibid., p. 428. For Halifax petition see Morning Chronicle, July 19th, August 2nd, 1866.
5. Morning Chronicle, April 12, 1867; Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, App. 10, p. 16.

considerable opposition in Eastern Nova Scotia. Barring several notable exceptions, opposition to union in 1865 seems to have been strongest in these counties.¹ In 1867 the elections showed strong opposition there. Perhaps the meetings held in 1866 were held in Western Nova Scotia because it was necessary to arouse enthusiasm there, although in the case of Yarmouth at least this was not needed. It is likely that, if the struggle had not been transferred to England in the summer, meetings would have been held in the Eastern Counties at which addresses to the Queen would have been adopted. The circulation of petitions was a much quicker method. Thus a considerable number of signatures on the petitions to the House of Commons must have been those of residents of Eastern Nova Scotia.

In the summer of 1866 the question of Reciprocity and the use of the Colonial fisheries by the Americans became entangled with the Question of Confederation. In the spring of that year the Reciprocity Treaty had been abrogated. This possibility had been foreseen as early as the summer of 1865 and the "British Colonist" in a number of editorials had declared that the only hope for renewal of this treaty lay in union of the Colonies.² However, on February 17th the "Colonist" said that whatever the people of Nova Scotia thought of union the failure of Reciprocity would result in closer commercial ties between

1. See Appendix

2. British Colonist, Sept. 21st, Oct. 10th, Dec. 16th, 1865; Feb. 8, 1866.

the provinces. This editorial was in line with the more conciliatory tone adopted on the subject of union at this time by that paper. At the same time, the "Morning Chronicle" had devoted considerable attention to the subject of Reciprocity. As early as August 30, 1865, the "Chronicle" had declared that Nova Scotia could get along without Reciprocity. On September 7th the same paper characterized the argument that Confederation would bring renewal of the treaty or if that did not happen would make up for it as "The Last Ditch". On September 9th the "Chronicle" had said that if the treaty were abrogated it would not be for long and on October 13th had declared that if the Reciprocity Treaty were abrogated Nova Scotia should look for new trade channels; that if the Americans were debarred from the fisheries they would soon sue for renewal of the Treaty. The general policy of the "Chronicle" was to minimize the effect that abrogation of Reciprocity would have on Nova Scotia.¹ Strangely enough, the "Chronicle" did not make bitter attacks on the Canadians in regard to the Treaty. In several editorials the paper stated that the Canadians had bungled in their efforts to get renewal; that these were the men, the "would be" statesmen of Canada, who would negotiate treaties for the proposed new nation.² It was not until after the summer of 1866 that frequent attacks were made against the Canadians on the subject of reciprocity. In April Union crowded Reciprocity off the stage.

1. See also Morning Chronicle, Feb. 9th, March 14th, 1866.
2. Ibid., Dec. 30, 1865, Jan. 9, 1866.

The ability to debar the Americans from the Nova Scotian fisheries was the strongest retaliatory weapon Nova Scotia had to force renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty. As early as November 4, 1865 the Government of Nova Scotia had asked the Imperial Government to look to the efficient protection of their fisheries since the Reciprocity Treaty would expire in March, 1866.¹ On March 14, 1866, Lieutenant Governor Williams transmitted an address to the Queen passed unanimously in the Legislative Council and Assembly which asked Imperial aid for the protection of the fisheries of British North America. The Lieutenant Governor stated that he had been asked to transmit it in as favourable a manner as possible. He told the Colonial Secretary that he would transmit it with misgivings if

"I could not record a decided change in the public mind bearing on the project of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces which I trust will be achieved ere many months elapse and which will place them collectively in such a position as will enable them to assert as a right that protection which they now claim as a boon".²

On March 19th Williams issued a proclamation forbidding foreign fishermen the use of the Nova Scotian fishing grounds.³ Canada followed a similar course.⁴

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1866, App. 21, p. 1, Doyle to Cardwell, Nov. 4, 1865.
2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Cardwell, March 14, 1866.
3. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1866, App. 21, p. 6.
4. Ibid., p. 3.

On March 19th, however, Governor General Monck telegraphed Williams that his Government was in favour of issuing fishing licenses according to tonnage, the licenses to be issued by the Nova Scotian Government at the mouth of the Gut of Canso and to apply to all Colonial waters. The license fees would be used to form a common fund for the protection¹ of the fisheries. Three days later Williams replied by telegraph:

"Government here see objection to issue of fishing licenses as detriment to Confederation if proposed before passing that measure but await your despatch explaining that policy - I scarcely think time has come though fully comprehend the force of your wishes² to lay something definite before Mr. Cardwell".

On March 31st, replying to a communication from Monck, Williams telegraphed that his Ministers were strongly opposed to the issue of fishing licenses to Americans.³ Despite the opposition, the Canadian Government had its way. On June 20, 1866, the Executive Council of Nova Scotia, still objecting, agreed to the issue of fishery licenses for one year.⁴ On July 4th the Lieutenant Governor with advice of his Council directed that a proclamation to this effect be issued.⁵

1. Lieutenant Governor's Telegram Book., No. 36, Monck to Williams, March 19, 1866.
2. Ibid., No. 44, Williams to Monck, March 22, 1866.
3. Ibid., No. 49, March 31, 1866.
4. Minutes, Executive Council, Nova Scotia, June 20, 1866.
5. Ibid., July 4, 1866.

Even before the proclamation was issued some intimation had been given the public. On June 23rd the "British Colonist" stated that it understood that in deference to the wishes of the Imperial Government fishing licenses were to be issued to the Americans. Referring to this, the "Morning Chronicle" said that the statement that it was being done in deference to the wishes of the Imperial Government might be true but that the Canadians had fixed the fee and had sold the fisheries to the Americans. The paper used this as an example to show what would happen to the Maritimes if they united with Canada.¹ From then on the cry that the Canadians had sold the fisheries was used to stir up Nova Scotians, particularly Nova Scotian fishermen, against Confederation. The part that the Nova Scotian Government played was often described as that of "honest broker" by the anti-Unionists and reinforced their cry that the Government was selling Nova Scotia to Canada at eighty cents a head.

Meanwhile elections had taken place in New Brunswick in the early part of June which resulted in a victory for Confederation. The Unionists had been helped considerably by the liberal use of funds from a Canadian source.² The Unionists in New Brunswick wasted no time in rejoicing. On July 19th Williams reported that delegates from New Brunswick had arrived in Halifax

1. Morning Chronicle, June 25, 1866.
2. C. Martin, British Policy in Canadian Confederation, Canadian Historical Review, March, 1932, pp.11-12.

the day before determined to go to England and that his Executive Council were similarly decided. He had informed Monck a few days before that his advisers were planning to go and that he concurred but Monck had telegraphed that he did not believe the Nova Scotian delegates should go. He had also asked Williams to try to stop the New Brunswick delegates. Williams, however, was in favour; he wanted to get an Imperial Act passed in 1866 and he told Carnarvon that the New Brunswick and Nova Scotian delegates were leaving for England that very day.¹ The sailing of these delegates transferred the struggle to England. Joseph Howe, representing the anti-Confederates, was already there and sometime in July the Maritime League sent William Annand to assist him. Hugh MacDonald, Antigonish County, a stronghold of anti-Confederate sentiment, followed later. The Canadian delegates did not reach England until the middle of November.²

In Nova Scotia the battle in the press went on. The arguments used were the same as those advanced since 1865, with the exception that the anti-Unionists could use the fishery license issue to arouse Nova Scotians against their Government and that of Canada. As a perusal of the editorials shows, they recognized its value and never ceased to use it. The progress of Union was eagerly watched in Nova Scotia. Both sides expressed confidence that they would win. Both the "Morning

1. P.A.N.S., Vol.128, Williams to Carnarvon, July 19, 1866, Separate.
2. Burpee, op. cit., p. 411.

Chronicle" and the "British Colonist" indulged in bitter personal abuse; it is difficult to award the prize to either. The fact that no act of union was passed in the session of 1866 afforded some hope to the anti-Unionists that Union might be defeated but it was only a postponement of their defeat.

In 1867, while the delegates of the League were struggling to defeat Confederation, some attempt was made in the Nova Scotian Legislature to oppose Confederation, On March 16th Lieutenant Governor Williams in the Speech from the Throne congratulated the House upon the success which had attended the Nova Scotian delegation in England.¹ On the same day Mr. Bourinot moved the Reply which contained a paragraph reciprocating the Lieutenant Governor's congratulation.² When the Reply was discussed on March 18th Stewart Campbell moved that the paragraph be struck out and paragraphs inserted which expressed refusal to reciprocate the congratulation upon the "assumed success" of the Nova Scotian delegation, protest against the action of the delegation and demanded that no act of union be given operation in Nova Scotia until it had been deliberately reviewed by the Legislature and sanctioned by the people.³ After a lengthy debate the amendment was defeated by a vote of thirty-two to sixteen.⁴ This was the last attempt of the anti-Unionists in

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1867, pp.2-3.
2. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
3. Ibid., p. 4.
4. Ibid., p. 5.

that session of the Legislature. They could only hope that either the measure would be defeated in England or that an election would be held in Nova Scotia before the Act came into operation.

On March 29th the British North America Act received the assent of the Queen and by proclamation came into force on July 1, 1867. Although the Nova Scotian Government now had to risk defeat in the elections for the House of Commons it had the power to appoint Senators to represent Nova Scotia in the Upper House. Here at least the anti-Unionists could make no headway. These appointments were first offered to the Legislative Council but of the members of that body R. M. Cutler, James MacNab, Alexander Keith, Henry G. Pineo, John Creighton and Archibald Patterson declined.¹ On April 11th Williams forwarded to the Colonial Secretary the names of those who had accepted appointment to the Senate from Nova Scotia. They were the Honourables E. Kenny, Jonathan McCully, Thomas D. Archibald, R. B. Dickey, John H. Anderson, John H. Holmes, J. W. Ritchie; Messrs. Benjamin Wier, John Locke, Caleb R. Bill, John Bourinot and William Miller. He said that a number of gentlemen had declined the appointment; that the appointments had been made from both political parties; that McCully, Archibald, Anderson, Wier and Locke were all members of Howe's late administration; and that all except Wier, who was a leading Halifax merchant, were members of the Legislature.²

1. Minutes, Executive Council, Nova Scotia, April 10, 1867.

2. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Buckingham, April 11, 1866.

There was another way that the anti-Unionists, if they got into power, could be partially thwarted. On June 27th Williams reported to Carnarvon that with the advice of his Council he had appointed, subject to the approval of the Queen, John McKinnon, Peter Smyth, William O. Heffernan, Samuel Creelman, Daniel M. Parker and James Frazer¹ to the Legislative Council to replace those members of that body who had been appointed to the Senate and A. Comeau whom sickness had prevented from attending the Council. His Government also desired the Queen to appoint C. J. Campbell, making a total membership at the time of nineteen. Williams enclosed resolutions passed by both Houses of the Legislature in which it was proposed to ask the Queen "to limit the number of members of the Upper House to eighteen whenever hereafter from any cause the Council shall be reduced to that number." On June 29th Williams sent a despatch to Carnarvon asking that the Queen allow Charles Tupper, W. A. Henry, James MacDonald, S. L. Shannon, Alexander McFarlane and A. G. Archibald to retain their rank and precedence in British North America. Williams said that in this list would be found the names of those men "to whose talents, zeal and loyal devotion we are in a high degree indebted for the happy results of our Confederate labours"².

As the first Dominion Day approached, the Government apparently became a little anxious as to what the

1. P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Buckingham, June 27, 1867.
2. Ibid., July 29, 1867.

anti-Unionists might do. On June 29th, after recording that the minions of Canada were trying to get up a demonstration on July 1st and after expressing the hope that they would not use public money for the purpose, the "Morning Chronicle" reported that a large number of special constables had been sworn in for July 1st, the day upon which Nova Scotia was to be handed over to "jobbing Canadian politicians". The "Chronicle" said that there was no need for alarm; that the anti-Unionists would go about their business as usual and there would be no disturbance.

On July 1st Nova Scotia became part of the Dominion of Canada. On that day the "Morning Chronicle" was issued as an obituary edition with broad black lines between the columns. The leading editorial was as follows:

"Died"

"Last night at 12 o'clock, the free and enlightened province of Nova Scotia. Deceased was the offspring of old English stock, and promised to have proved an honour and support to her parents in their declining years. Her death was occasioned by unnatural treatment received at the hands of some of her ungrateful sons, who taking advantage of the position she had afforded them, betrayed her to the enemy. Funeral will take place from the Grand Parade this day, Monday, at 9 o'clock.

Friends are requested not to attend, as her enemies with becoming scorn, intend to insult the occasion with rejoicing."

Dominion Day appears to have passed off with little violence but funeral obsequies were held in many places in Nova Scotia. Perhaps the lack of disturbance was due to the solemnity of these last rites. It was certainly the hush that precedes the storm. At various places flags hung at half mast and black crepe was draped from windows. Accounts of these performances were reported in the newspapers at the time and need not be recounted since they followed much the same pattern. One account of the observance of Dominion Day, because of its piquancy and because it was perhaps typical, deserves more extended notice. On July 5th C. J. Campbell, writing from Baddeck, said that the Custos rotulorum of that place had scraped together all the flags that he could get and had flown them at half mast; that he had compelled some of his tenants to do likewise; that his son had had the flag pulled down from the Academy; and that the Inspector of Schools had flown flags at half mast as well. But Campbell had not finished his horrible story. He reported that he had been told that Mr. Ross, M. P. P. had spoken of the Proclamation of the new Dominion in a most disrespectful manner and had stated that he had used it "for a certain purpose". (sic) Campbell

however said that the unionists had won the flag contest. Whether he was correct or not in his last statement, occurrences such as this did not augur well for the Unionists when they had to face the electorate. If Nova Scotians wept at the death of their country, they brushed the tears away with clenched fists and redoubled their preparations for the elections which had to be held soon. Here was their opportunity for vengeance.

1. Provincial Secretary's Correspondence, 1867, folio vol. C. J. Campbell to an unknown official of the Provincial Government on July 5, 1867. Addressed to "My Dear Henry" - perhaps Attorney General W. A. Henry, No. 13.

Chapter V.

Repeal Agitation in Nova Scotia

1867-1870.

In Nova Scotia apparently the first meeting of the campaign for the forthcoming general election was held at Truro in the early part of January at which Central and Local Committees for Colchester County were appointed, consisting of about one hundred gentlemen in all. The "Morning Chronicle" said that in this meeting old party lines had been obliterated, Conservative joining with Liberal against the enemies of Nova Scotia.¹ It was not until the end of March, however, that the campaign really began. On March 27th a meeting was held at Halifax by the anti-Unionists who were now aware that their delegation to England had failed. At the meeting a vote of thanks to Joseph Howe was passed.² On the following day W. J. Stairs wrote Howe that it was the wish of his friends in Nova Scotia who had been present at the meeting that he should discontinue any line of action which might sacrifice his personal feelings and interests, and that if he joined the Parliament at Ottawa he would have a most important influence in moulding the constitution of the new Dominion. Mr. Stairs said that assurances had been given that he (Howe) would be returned for the County of Hants.³ At this time, therefore, Howe

1. Morning Chronicle, January 16, 1867.
2. J. A. Chisholm, op. cit., p. 507.
3. L. J. Burpee, op. cit., pp. 459-460.

could have abandoned the struggle but he did not feel free to desert the people of Nova Scotia on the eve of a general election of such importance.¹ In May, Howe returned to Nova Scotia and threw himself into the election struggle. In the campaign the anti-Confederates took the name of the Nova Scotian or People's Party, calling their opponents the Canadian or anti Nova Scotian Party. By this time the old party lines had practically vanished.

Nova Scotia entered the Dominion of Canada on July 1, 1867. Not until September 18th were the people of Nova Scotia given an opportunity at the polls to say whether they wanted Confederation or not.² By that time the country had been thoroughly canvassed and the platforms of both parties clearly enunciated. On September 17th the following paragraphs appeared in the Morning Chronicle":

1. Chisholm, op. cit., p. 508. Howe to Stairs, April 12, 1867. Stairs was a prominent Halifax Merchant and Vice President of the League of the Maritime Provinces.
2. Though this statement is in general true, there had been three bye-elections earlier in which the Confederation issue played an important part. In each case the election had been won by the candidate who had expressed opposition to union. In Annapolis County on January 12, 1865 Mr. Ray was elected with a majority of 232 votes (Morning Chronicle, Jan. 19, 1865); in Lunenburg County in December, 1865 Mr. Hebb was elected with a majority of 686 votes (Nova Scotian, Jan. 8, 1866); in a Yarmouth County election in February, 1866 no candidate offered who declared in favour of union. (Morning Chronicle, Feb. 14, 1866) In East Pictou an election had been held in January, 1865 in which the union issue played no part. James MacDonald, Financial Secretary of the Tupper Government, was elected by acclamation.

"NovaScotians remember Wednesday, 18th September.
No terms with the traitors who sold us for eighty cents
a head. We have thirty two black spots to wipe out....
..Nova Scotia expects every man to do his duty.

We leave to Unionists to canvass on grounds of
party, religion or nationality. It is a weak cause
that requires prejudice to support it. We appeal
to all. The whole ticket in any county, irrespective
of religion or nationality or party will be voted for
wherever the great whole souled party of the people
is well served.....Vote the whole ticket; we
must have all our men in.

Who desires increased Taxes? Who desires to
be cut off from the British Empire, to be ruled
by Yankee Howland, Washington McDougall, Galt the
Annexationist, McGee the Fenian informer, and
Cartier the runaway rebel?.....Who is true to
his allegiance, and true to the people at once?
Who has self-respect or honesty? Let him vote
in every county for the whole ticket of the Nova
Scotia Party.

From the report of the Canadian Board of
Audit, made in 1862 Canada's prosperity can well
be gaged. From 1855 to 1862 there was an increase
in the liabilities of \$20,403,298 an annual average increase
of \$2,914,756. Of the first mentioned sum but \$5,980,740
were expended on public works thus showing that in seven
years the 'master minds' of Canada spent \$14,422,558
in useless extravagance. Yet the people of this country
are told that it is for their benefit to unite with a
country rolling downhill to bankruptcy, and give up
the control of their revenues to politicians whose
corruption is a by word.

The supporters of Tupper and his friend Archibald have told the people of Nova Scotia that they are unfit to decide upon great questions. Why, then, do they come before the people and ask them to decide upon what they say is of the greatest possible moment the representation of Nova Scotia in the Dominion Parliament? The reason is plain - they come because they cannot help themselves. Let us give them a warm reception.

Who wishes for a militia conscription - for a standing army, and a costly, useless fleet, let him vote for Tupper, Archibald or their friends. Never mind the taxes.

Let us decide tomorrow by our votes whether Nova Scotia is owned by four lawyers and a doctor, or her own people.

Tomorrow night will tell whether Nova Scotians in their own opinion are or are not fit to govern themselves. Let us decide as honour directs.

Tomorrow, fishermen will you vote for the men who taxed your flour and pork, sold the fisheries, and neglected the Reciprocity Treaty? If not, vote for the whole anti-union ticket.

Farmers of Nova Scotia, will you vote for direct taxation - for a tariff fifty per cent higher than our own? If not vote the whole anti union ticket.

Who will vote to enrich Canada - to build up her public works with our taxes? Not Nova Scotians."

The platform of the Unionists, as expressed in the "British Colonist" for September 17th, in many respects was more diffuse than that of the anti-Confederates. According to the "Colonist" the future of the whole country was at stake in the elections. The paper said that the existing Government of the Dominion was so strong that it could not be shaken by an adverse vote in Nova Scotia. The "Colonist" then asked how the interests of Nova Scotia would fare at Ottawa if the Province was represented by persons pledged to opposition to the party in power in the Dominion Government. This Government would not consult the anti-Unionists if they were elected and Nova Scotia would not obtain consideration. No matter how well disposed the anti-Unionists might be to make the union "what they have sworn it can never be, a blessing to Nova Scotia, they would be powerless, as Anti unionists to do anything toward such a result". They had sworn Nova Scotia would never get the advantages from Confederation which the Unionists had predicted, such as beneficial enactments, grants of money for public works, subsidies for steamboats, aid in building railways, new post offices, bounties for fishermen, protection for the fisheries, encouragement for agriculture and a favourable tariff. Having made such statements, how could they ask the Dominion Government for these advantages. The "Colonist" drew attention to the effect on Nova Scotia of being without "a voice in the Parliament and Government which must shape the policy of the Dominion in its infancy, and as a consequence, must exercise a very great influence over its future destinies."

The "Colonist" next considered the question of local elections. It declared that repeal of Confederation was out of the question; that nothing but separation from the Empire could sever the connection with Canada. The real question before Nova Scotians was how to control local affairs so as to make the most of Nova Scotia's new position. The anti-Unionists had contended Confederation meant utter ruin for Nova Scotia. They would not scruple to make their prophecies come true, but the Unionists on the other hand had everything to gain by making the country happy and prosperous under Confederation. The anti-Unionists had declared that under union the roads and bridges, the schools and all other local services would sink into ruin unless a direct tax be imposed and their character as public men would be lost unless, by squandering public money, they could make direct taxation appear necessary. The union party could only redeem its pledges by conducting the government efficiently and satisfactorily on the revenue already provided. If the present resources proved insufficient, the union party would apply to the Dominion Government for a direct subsidy rather than levy direct taxes. The anti-Unionists had expressed no intention to seek a larger subsidy - direct taxation suited their purposes better. Even if they did apply there would be little probability of a favourable answer. The "British Colonist" devoted a great deal of attention to the question of an inter-colonial railway. The paper declared that union would ensure

the railway but the anti-Confederates had pledged themselves to repeal the union. The implication was clear. The "Colonist" asked whether the loyal Province of Nova Scotia was to be represented at Ottawa by men tainted with disloyalty and whether Nova Scotians would vote for men motivated by partizan hate and factionism. It declared that those who failed to vote for the union candidates would fail to comprehend the destinies and resources of the country. If the anti-Unionists won, the fishermen of Nova Scotia would receive no bounties.

Considerable attention was devoted to the City of Halifax. The "Colonist" asserted with the highest degree of faith that obtaining an intercolonial railway depended on a Unionist victory. With such a railway, Halifax would become the Liverpool of America but if the Union party were defeated in all probability St. John instead of Halifax would secure the terminus of the intercolonial line. The paper called upon the workmen of Halifax to vote for the Union party because it had given their City the railway.

These were the questions before the electors when they went to the polls on September 18th - a day long memorable in the minds of many Nova Scotians. Feeling ran high but there was little if any violence. When the results became known it was found that the anti-Confederates had scored a telling victory - they had won eighteen out of nineteen seats in the Federal and thirty-six out of thirty-eight in the Local elections. In the

Federal elections for the counties of Cape Breton, Guysborough, Shelburne and Victoria the candidates opposed to Confederation were elected by acclamation. Similarly, in the counties of Hants, Yarmouth and Richmond none of the candidates who offered declared in favour of Confederation. In Cumberland Dr. Tupper was returned by a majority of ninety-seven out of a total of two thousand six hundred and thirty-nine votes polled; he was the only Confederate candidate elected to the House of Commons of Canada from Nova Scotia. In most of the other ten counties anti-Confederates were elected with very substantial majorities. In the local elections only Shelburne County elected its representatives by acclamation. In all the other counties contests were held. In Cape Breton County all the candidates who offered declared against Confederation and in Yarmouth County five anti-Confederates and one Confederate offered. In Yarmouth the Confederate candidate received ninety-four votes. In Cumberland H. G. Pineo, Unionist candidate, had a majority of less than one hundred and in Inverness County Hiram Blanchard, the other Confederate elected, had a majority of fifty and that by splitting the votes of the three anti-Confederates who ran against him. In the other counties anti-Confederate candidates were returned with substantial majorities. 1

On November 7th the members of the Assembly of Nova Scotia met in the Provincial Building to construct an administration. ² On the same day Lieutenant Governor Doyle, who

1. See Appendix VI, pp. 247-252 of this study.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, App. 10, p. 47.

had succeeded Williams shortly before, announced the membership of the new Executive Council. The new ministry consisted of William Annand, Provincial Treasurer and President of the Council; W. B. Vail, Provincial Secretary; M. I. Wilkins, Attorney General; Robert Robertson, Commissioner of Mines and Public Works; J. C. Troop, R. A. McHeffey; E. P. Flynn; and John Ferguson. ¹ Having constructed an administration, the members adopted a declaration unanimously and ordered it published. The declaration, too long for quotation in full, read in part:

"We the representatives of Nova Scotia, having assembled for the purpose of constructing an administration, and having effected that object cannot separate without making known to our constituents our unanimous and unalterable determination to use every lawful and constitutional means to extricate this province from the operation of the British North America Act, the passage of which in the Imperial legislature was obtained by falsehood, fraud and deception.

We shall take the earliest opportunity of informing the Queen and her Parliament that the people of Nova Scotia were systematically and perseveringly prevented from expressing their will on the subject of Confederation until after the Imperial statute was enacted, and we shall respectfully insist that the act is invalid as to this Province, because it subjects her people, without their consent, and against their will, to a legislature on which it assumes to confer a power of taxation which the Imperial Parliament itself does not constitutionally possess".

The members in no way impeached "the prudence or patriotism" of the Nova Scotian members of the Dominion Parliament in resolving to take their seats, but protested that such acceptance or any action they might take in the Dominion Parliament should not be construed as submission to Confederation on the part of

1. Morning Chronicle, November 8, 1867.

Nova Scotia. The declaration also embodied a request to the new administration to take action with the Imperial Government in connection with the appointment in June of six Legislative Councillors.¹

On December 18th the Executive Council drew up a minute which declared that when six vacancies had occurred in the Legislative Council in June no appointments should have been made to fill these vacancies until after the general elections had been held. Instead, six men who were in favour of Confederation had been appointed, making twelve members in the Council in favour of union, seven against and leaving only two vacancies. The Executive Council claimed that if these appointments had been designed to promote the interests of Nova Scotia and likely to prove acceptable to the people the Lieutenant Governor should not have concealed them from the 27th of June to the 23rd of October, the day on which they were gazetted. Moreover, the minute of the Council recording the six appointments was printed, not written, and obviously had been added subsequent to the meeting of the Council. The Executive Council declared that the minute was dated the 28th day of June, the anniversary of the Queen's Coronation, and it was not signed by Williams which was contrary to his usual practice. Far worse, the despatch to the Colonial Secretary in which Williams announced that he had made the appointments on the advice of his Executive Council was dated June 27th, a day before the Council convened to consider

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, App. 10, pp.46-48

the appointments. The Executive Council asked Lieutenant Governor Doyle to call the attention of the Imperial Government to this matter in order that this "injury to the people of Nova Scotia" might be redressed.¹ The attempt of the Executive Council failed, however.² With this failure the effectual removal of the Legislative Council as a body from the struggle for repeal of Confederation was confirmed.

On January 30, 1868 the Legislature of Nova Scotia opened and the Sheriffs' returns for the general election were presented. Only two, those from Cape Breton and Cumberland Counties, were accompanied by protests.³ In his Speech from the Throne Lieutenant Governor Doyle informed the new members that the financial affairs of the Province were not in a very satisfactory condition and that it was extremely probable that not enough funds would be available to meet the requirements of the country. Doyle also referred to an almost total failure of the fishery in 1867. He concluded by drawing attention to Nova Scotia's long record of loyalty and expressed the hope that if the people of Nova Scotia desired political changes their representatives would seek such changes in a constitutional manner and in a loyal spirit.⁴ In their reply the House declared that they would certainly do so. However, the Lieutenant Governor

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, App. 13, pp. 1-5. For Williams' despatch see P.A.N.S., Vol. 128, Williams to Carnarvon, June 27, 1867.
2. Ibid., App. 13, pp. 5-7.
3. Journal, House of Assembly, 1868, p. 4. As far as I have been able to learn these protests were not acted upon.
4. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

seems to have been nervous because he replied to the House that he was persuaded that the Legislature would conduct itself "in a spirit of calmness and moderation".¹ This emphasis is revealing, especially as the Lieutenant Governor when he closed the second session of the House in 1867 on September 21st made a similar reference.²

The Assembly soon moved toward repeal of Confederation. On February 5th Attorney General Wilkins moved fifteen resolutions relative to the British North America Act. These resolutions declared that the previous Legislature had had no authority to change the constitution of Nova Scotia without reference to the people at the polls; that their only authority had been the union resolution of April 10, 1865. Even if they had had the authority, which the House by no means admitted, the resolution had not empowered the delegates to arrange union without including Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. The delegation had not been legally constituted since no delegates from these two colonies had been present when the Imperial Act for union was framed and since each of the other colonies had not sent an equal number of delegates. Moreover, the delegates had not ensured "just provision for the rights and interests" of Nova Scotia which the resolution of 1866 had promised. The resolutions further declared that the constitution of the Province could not be changed except by a Provincial Statute after the change had

1. Ibid., pp. 11-12.
2. Ibid., p. 127.

been referred to the people. The Quebec scheme had never been submitted to the people until two and a half months after Confederation. Due to all these facts the preamble of the British North America Act, which declared that the Provinces desired Confederation, was untrue in the case of Nova Scotia and the Queen and her Parliament had been deceived. If the preamble were untrue, and the recent election was proof that it was, the whole Act was unconstitutional. The resolutions declared that the people of Nova Scotia were determined to be subject to no one but the Queen and would not allow their rights as British subjects to be taken away from them. The former union of the Colonies by their common relationship to the Queen had been a more peaceable and less dangerous connection than any scheme of union no matter how fair, wise and judicious. In the resolutions no "intentional injustice" was imputed to the Queen and the Imperial Parliament since they had been misled as to the sentiment of Nova Scotia. The final resolution declared that an address to the Queen should be drawn up asking for the repeal of Confederation as far as it related to Nova Scotia.¹ These resolutions were debated on February 10th and 11th. On the following day, when the question was put, Hiram Blanchard, Confederate member for Inverness, moved by way of amendment a set of resolutions which directly contra-²verted the arguments of the resolutions of the Attorney General. On the following six days these amending resolutions were debated. Finally, on February 21st, the original resolutions

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, pp. 12-14.
2. Ibid., p. 24, February 12th.

were passed unanimously by the Assembly and a select commission¹ was appointed to prepare an address to the Queen. A day later an address which followed closely the resolutions introduced by the Attorney General was presented to the Assembly and unanimously passed.

Meanwhile, on February 13th, the Provincial Secretary W. B. Vail had laid before the Executive Council petitions to both Houses of the Parliament signed by sixteen of the Nova Scotian members of the House of Commons of Canada and by thirty-six members of the Assembly of Nova Scotia asking for repeal of Confederation as far as it concerned Nova Scotia. The Council thereupon agreed that Joseph Howe should be requested to go to England to make arrangements for the presentation of these petitions.² On the following day Howe sailed for England. Three days later the Executive Council agreed that Joseph Howe, William Annand, J. C. Troop and H. W. Smith be a delegation to proceed to England to obtain the repeal of Confederation as far as it related to Nova Scotia.³ It was not until February 25th that the House of Assembly passed two resolutions relating to this matter. The first of these authorized the Lieutenant Governor to appoint such delegates; the second authorized the delegates to represent Nova Scotia's opposition to Confederation in England and to ask for the repeal of the British North America Act with regard to Nova Scotia. The

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, pp. 35-36.
2. Ibid., App. 10, p. 10.
3. Ibid.

delegates were to accept no alteration of, or amendment to, this Act; they were to take all necessary steps to accomplish their mission and were authorized, if necessary, to retain counsel to plead Nova Scotia's case before the bar of the House of Commons. ¹

The delegates went to England with the majority of the people of Nova Scotia firmly behind them. Between December 27, 1867 and February 17, 1868 meetings had been held in each of the counties of Nova Scotia, at which Confederation had been condemned. In most of the counties only one meeting had been held but in the Counties of Lunenburg and Inverness four meetings each had been held and in the Counties of Halifax and Pictou three ² meetings each. Moreover, the ratepayers and electors of Yarmouth County had petitioned the Assembly to send a delegation to England to secure the repeal of Confederation as far as it concerned Nova ³ Scotia.

In addition to working for "repeal", the Assembly had dealt with the matter of the proposed intercolonial railway. The Confederates had claimed that the railroad depended on Confederation and that if the anti-Confederates were elected Nova Scotia would lose that great benefit. The intercolonial railway had long been an object of desire on the part of Nova Scotians. On February 24th steps had been taken to prove that the contention of the Confederates was false and to ensure the support of those Nova Scotians who

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, pp. 42-43.
2. Ibid., App. 10, p. 48.
3. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, p. 19.

feared that "repeal" would mean loss of the railway. On that day Attorney General Wilkins moved a resolution in the Assembly which provided that when Nova Scotia had been released from Confederation the Assembly would be prepared to make provision for "its full and just provision of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway". The resolution was passed by a vote of twenty-seven¹ to five. On the following day the House adjourned until August 6th.

While a large number of the people of Nova Scotia were strongly in favour of "repeal", they did not become disloyal as a result of Confederation. In the editorials of the local newspapers, as well as in some of the speeches of that date, veiled references to annexation as better than Confederation if Nova Scotia was deserted by the Imperial Government were made but they may be interpreted as "bluff", with the purpose of bringing pressure upon the Imperial Government to release Nova Scotia from Confederation. Only one "frank and open" plea for annexation has been found.² On March 4, 1868 a small double sheet entitled the "Bluenose" was published at Digby. It was expected to appear weekly,³ but only the first issue has been found. Besides his editorial, the editor devoted about half his space to an exposition of the economic advantages of annexation.⁴ The editorial, which deserves quotation, read as follows:

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, p. 41.
2. Incidents of the Repeal Agitation in Nova Scotia, ed. D.C. Harvey, Canadian Historical Review, March, 1934, p. 48.
3. Ibid., p. 51.
4. Ibid., pp. 48-49.

Repeal

Why all this clamor for repeal? Have we not already had enough of England's taunts and oppression? Why add to this another refusal? Our situation reminds one of the schoolboy, who when he is once struck, dares you to strike him again.

The remedy lies in our own legislation, but most of all in our own stout hearts and strong arms. The only power that will ever repeal the Stamp Act of '67 is the power that repealed the Stamp Act of '76.

But still we must not be ungrateful! Oh no! Well, instead of asking for repeal, let us ask for our independence. It has been said in the British Parliament that we would be allowed a peaceable separation (sic).

But before that is accomplished, let us make our bargain with the Republic. What is there of treason in this? What maiden would leave her home until after she was married?

Let us be prudent. Let us seal our betrothal to Jonathan and then ask John Bull to let us go. If he refuses, we may make a runaway match.

But by all means let us have no talk of armed rebellion. Let us make an honest bargain, and get the best of it if we can. The Alabama claims will help to pay for the property that Great Britain owns in this Country. Our starving fishermen will have a market for the fish they take, and the bounty when they do not take any. Our Coal will find a ready market at a good price, and with the introduction of American capital our deserted ship yards will ring with the sounds of industry.

On March 9th the Secretary of the Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Moody, transmitted a copy of the "Bluenose" to Mr. Wilkins, the Attorney General, with the request that he inform the Lieutenant Governor whether action should be taken against the publisher of the newspaper. Moody reported that the Governor was "most anxious to take vigorous measures for the suppression of this the first

open indication of disaffection which has shewn itself in this loyal Province". In a reply of the same date, Wilkins said that the paper was too insignificant for criminal prosecution and that an attack on it in the Courts would only confer notoriety on the editor - the only object which that person could possibly hope to achieve. Wilkins stated that if left alone the editor would soon expire "under the contempt of every true Nova Scotian".¹

Meanwhile Howe had reached London on the 29th of February and, while waiting for his colleagues to join him, had employed his time in airing the object of his mission in the English Press. On the 12th of March the rest of the delegation arrived. It was not until April 3rd that the delegates had a conference at the Colonial Office, since they had to wait until the address to the Queen and the resolutions of the Assembly reached England via Ottawa. At their meeting with the Colonial Secretary and several other officials, no definite decision of the Imperial Government was announced but the delegates saw that great difficulties lay before them. They at once had copies made of the petition to the House of Commons signed by federal and local members of Nova Scotia, the address and resolutions of the Assembly and mailed them to every leading newspaper of the British Isles and to all the prominent members of both Houses of Parliament. They also consulted legal counsel who informed them that the Imperial Parliament had absolute power to bind Nova Scotia by a statute with or without precedent legislation. When, in the early

1. D. C. Harvey, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

part of May, Joseph Howe and Mr. Smith had their second interview with the Colonial Secretary, having decided that immediate "repeal" was out of the question, they urged that he accept a parliamentary committee or a commission to investigate Nova Scotia's case when a motion for such was made in Parliament.¹

On June 11th the delegation was informed that the British Government would not consent to "repeal". They were told that they would see from an enclosed despatch addressed to Governor General Monck by the Colonial Secretary and dated June 4th that the Imperial Government, while they could not entertain the idea of "repeal", were anxious as they were sure that the Dominion Government would be anxious to bestow the utmost consideration on the special wants and interests of Nova Scotia.² On June 16th John Bright moved in the House of Commons for a commission to enquire into the causes of discontent in Nova Scotia. The motion was voted down by an overwhelming majority.³ In the House of Lords the motion of Lord Stratheden was similarly defeated. The delegation had shot its last bolt and missed. Before leaving England they drew up a public protest on July 3rd and had it published.⁴ Nothing more could be done in England and they sailed for home.

The Nova Scotian delegates were accompanied in the ship by their leading political opponent, Dr. Tupper, who had

1. Journal, House of Assembly, 1868, App. 10, pp.1-3.
2. Ibid., App. 9, p. 1. For the Colonial Secretary's despatch to Monck see pp.2-4.
3. L. J. Burpee, op. cit., p. 416.
3. For protest see Journal, House of Assembly, 1868, App. 10, pp. 52-57.

been sent to England by the Dominion Government to oppose
"repeal".¹ While in England Tupper had a number of discussions
with Howe on the subject of "repeal" with the idea of winning him
over to Confederation.² On May 26th Tupper had written John
A. MacDonald that he had met Howe a few days before and had
discussed the question of "repeal" with him. Tupper said:³

"I am satisfied that he is fully convinced that the
interests of his country, his party and himself all
require him to take hold with us, but both he and I
feel that we must handle the subject with great
delicacy".

In the middle of July the "repeal" delegation
reached Halifax. On July 17th Mr. Tilley, Premier of New
Brunswick, wrote John A. MacDonald that he had just had a
discussion with Howe and that Howe wanted a Royal Commission
appointed to decide the question of "repeal" or ^{if} that were not
possible a conference between the Dominion Government and the
leading anti-Confederates of Nova Scotia, the Dominion Government
to make some proposal for their consideration or at least have
a friendly talk to see if some agreement could be reached.
Tilley reported that Howe had told him that the delegates, the
members of the local Government and a few of their leading
friends had met the day before and had decided that a Convention

1. Sir J. Pope, Memoirs of Sir John A. MacDonald, p. 377.
2. Sir Charles Tupper, Recollections of Sixty Years, pp. 73-74,
pp. 80-81, pp. 91-92.
3. Ibid., pp. 91-92.

of the members of the general and local Parliaments should be held on August 3rd. Tilley also said that Howe thought that a visit from MacDonald a little previous to that time would do much good. Tilley suspected that the nature of concessions from the Dominion Government mattered less to the moderate anti-Confederates than the fact concessions had been made. He strongly urged MacDonald to come to Nova Scotia. On the same day A. G. Archibald, leader of the Liberal Party until it had been swallowed up in the Confederation issue, wrote to MacDonald to much the same effect. Tupper also sought out Sir John at Toronto with the same advice.¹

Toward the end of July Sir John A. MacDonald, accompanied by Messrs. Cartier, William McDougall, Tupper and John Sandfield MacDonald, reached Halifax.² Before they arrived the editor of one of the evening papers hinted that they might be received with violence. In reply Joseph Howe on July 30th addressed a letter to the "Morning Chronicle" stating that these men had responded quickly to the Imperial Government's transference of responsibility for the appeasement of Nova Scotia and that they deserved a fair hearing.³ A day or two after he arrived Sir John had an informal meeting with Howe. MacDonald reported to Monck:

"He told me frankly that, if he saw any course open to him by which he could continue to press

1. E. M. Saunders, ed. *The Life and Letters of The Right Honourable Sir Charles Tupper*, Vol. I, pp. 183-184. See also Sir J. Pope, *op. cit.*, pp. 380-382.
2. Sir J. Pope, *op. cit.*, p. 382.
3. Chisholm, *op. cit.*, pp. 537-538.

for repeal of the Union, with any hope of success, that he would do so, and that he had so stated to all his friends; but that he had not hesitated to declare that he would oppose any attempt at resistance to the law, either active or passive, as well as all attempts at annexation to the United States".

He also said that he had asked Howe to join the Dominion Government but that he had refused. MacDonald reported that after some difficulty the Convention had agreed to hear what he and his colleagues had to say; that he and Cartier had addressed the Convention; and that they had said that while they were debarred from entering into the political aspects of the question they were quite ready to deal with the financial side. MacDonald had said that the Dominion Government would have no complaint to make if the Nova Scotia members urged the repeal of the British North America Act "by legal and constitutional means". He reported his gratification that the Convention before breaking up passed a resolution which agreed that their exertions for repeal should be conducted "in a legal and constitutional manner". MacDonald also reported that it had been arranged with Howe that as soon as the Nova Scotian Legislature prorogued he was to address a letter to Howe the terms of which would be settled between them and which, "though marked 'private' he is to use among his friends, with the view of inducing them to come to his support in case he or some leading man of his party should take office".

1. Pope, op. cit., pp. 382-388.

On August 6th the Legislature of Nova Scotia opened. There had been some doubt as to whether it would open but moderate counsels prevailed. The Assembly, however, took care to justify itself. On August 10th Attorney General Wilkins, relative to the Imperial Government's refusal of "repeal", moved a resolution which declared that the House in the interests of the country felt called upon to adopt such legislation as might be necessary "to invite the introduction of foreign capital, promote industry, and generally for the improvement and amendment of the law" but that in doing so it recorded its solemn protest that such legislation should not be construed as signifying any direct or implied approval of Confederation. This resolution was agreed to on August 12th.

On August 14th Wilkins moved several resolutions relative to the Colonial Secretary's despatch to Monck of June 4th which embodied the Imperial Government's refusal to repeal Confederation in regard to Nova Scotia and his invitation to the Dominion Government to consider "better terms" for Nova Scotia. The most important part of these resolutions referred to this latter subject and said that whereas five members of the Dominion Government had been several days in Halifax, during part of which time a Provincial Convention had been in session, and whereas no offer of "better terms" had yet been made to the Nova Scotian Government:

Resolved, That no mere financial arrangement or

1. Pope, op. cit., pp. 386-387.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, p. 45.

offer can be made which would satisfy the people of Nova Scotia, short of a restoration of their Constitution, with full powers of self government, which they consider the only effectual guarantee for the wise regulation of their trade and fisheries, for protection from unjust and excessive taxation and for the economic and wise administration of affairs".

The resolution also declared that only Imperial coercion would force them to accept the British North America Act; that they were loyal to their Sovereign but that they intended to use all the constitutional means in their power to secure "repeal".¹

During the debates on these resolutions the question of another delegation to England came up and the Government were asked what they intended to do if the Imperial Government refused to entertain their proposal of "repeal". On September 3rd, Attorney General Wilkins delivered a strong anti-Confederate speech² on this point. On the following day the "Morning Chronicle" reported his statements thus:

"He desired to give notice to the Governments of Great Britain and Canada - and they would hear him - that if the constitutional liberties of Nova Scotia were not restored and her grievances redressed before the next session of the Legislature, it would be necessary for us to proceed to redress them ourselves.-A tariff bill would be passed, and the Collectors of Customs instructed to obey it. If Nova Scotia was too weak to perform the task herself, she would appeal to other people to assist her".³

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, pp.53-55.
2. H. Moody, Political Experiences in Nova Scotia, 1867-1869, Dalhousie Review, April, 1934, page 69.
3. Morning Chronicle, September 4, 1868.

On the same day that this account appeared in the "Chronicle" the Lieutenant Governor wrote Wilkins enclosing copies of this report and of another published in the "Halifax Reporter" of September 3rd and asking whether "the disloyal sentiments attributed to him there were really uttered by him."¹ On September 5th Wilkins replied that he was incapable of entertaining or expressing sentiments of disloyalty and that when the official report of his speech was published it would be found to be entirely free from disaffection.² Doyle immediately replied that he presumed Wilkins would not object to having his loyal sentiments published.³ Doyle also informed the Executive Council of the above correspondence with Wilkins. His memorandum to the Council pointed out that the report of Wilkin's speech

"contained such disloyal sentiments as in his opinion urgently to require a disavowal from a Member of his Government, more especially from one holding the position of Attorney General, to whom the Lieutenant Governor has to look to carry out the Law".⁴

On September 7th Wilkins wrote Doyle that he would thank him to publish his note of September 5th. He asked the Lieutenant Governor to add the following paragraph to it:⁵

1. Doyle to Wilkins, Sept. 4, 1868, Printed in: D. C. Harvey, Incidents of the Repeal Agitation in Nova Scotia, Canadian Historical Review, March, 1934, pp. 52-53.
2. Wilkins to Doyle, Sept. 5, 1868, *ibid.*, pp. 53-54.
3. Doyle to Wilkins, Sept. 5, 1868, *ibid.*, p. 54.
4. Memo: Doyle to Executive Council, Sept. 5, 1868, *ibid.*, pp. 54-55.
5. Wilkins to Doyle, September 7, 1868, *ibid.* p. 56.

"Should it be the will of Providence that Nova Scotia shall be deprived of her old constitution without her consent and against the will of her loyal people, it is the opinion of the Attorney General that the political system of any other civilized country would be preferable to the constitution which has been provided for her by the "Act for the union of Canada Nova Scotia and New Brunswick"-".

On September 7th this correspondence was published in the Halifax press. According to the Lieutenant Governor's Secretary, Mr. H. Moody, who took all the credit for the whole transaction, the publication of these letters sowed distrust and dissension among the leaders of the anti-Confederate party and demonstrated¹ that brave talk did not mean action.

The incident, however, did not end here. On the following day the Assembly sat behind closed doors.² In the evening Mr. Moody met W. B. Vail, the Provincial Secretary, at a Ball at Government House and Vail informed him that in the afternoon the House, after severely criticizing Wilkins, had passed a vote of censure on the Lieutenant Governor for interfering with the privilege of free speech. Mr. Vail knew nothing of the Governor's memorandum to the Council; according to Moody, Annand had suppressed it for purposes of mischief. Moody then said that he had not heard that the Executive Council

1. H. Moody, op. cit., p. 71.
2. On the same day an amendment to the Militia Law was introduced in the Assembly which provided against the militia of Nova Scotia being removed from the Province. It passed in both the Assembly and the Legislative Council but the Lieutenant Governor shelved it by reserving it until the Governor General's pleasure should become known. See Journal, House of Assembly, Sept. 8, 17, 21, 1868.

had resigned. When asked what he meant he said that under responsible government as he understood it a vote of censure on the Governor was a vote of censure on his advisers and the Council ought to resign. Moody, according to his account, succeeded in "bluffing" Vail into believing that if the Council resigned the Lieutenant Governor would accept their resignations and would not dissolve but would do as best he could without his advisers until other arrangements could be made. After a long argument Vail gave way and Moody's ultimatum was accepted. It was that, first, the note of censure should be erased from the Journals before the public were admitted; second, that the governor, expressing great surprise, should send a memorandum to the Council calling for an explanation; and third, that some of them should call upon the governor and explain their conduct as best they could. This was done.¹ The Executive Council by their lack of unity and confidence had failed to seize a valuable opportunity. While it is impossible to say what would have happened if they had resigned, it seems almost certain that if a general election had been held the anti-Confederates would have won another victory. The Governor could hardly have failed to dissolve the House and another victory at the polls might have resulted in at least a Royal Commission being appointed to investigate Nova Scotia's case. It seems doubtful, however, that it would have resulted in "repeal"; it would

1. Moody, op. cit., pp. 71-74. This paragraph is based on Moody's account, which, while it should be used cautiously, is corroborated in outline by a letter from Doyle to Sir John A. MacDonald. Doyle, however, makes no reference to the part Moody claimed to have played. See Pope, op. cit., App. XVII, p. 735.

have taken more than a general election to change the British Government's policy.

The Attorney General's speech had another interesting, if minor, sequel which shows the interest with which Nova Scotia's actions were watched by "not altogether disinterested sympathizers in the United States".¹ On September 10th Wilkins sent Doyle a letter he had just received from a certain General (by courtesy) Wemys Jobson of Philadelphia which was dated September 5th. The writer declared that he would immediately take steps to sustain the "independent cause" in his city and if necessary support it with an army of fifteen or twenty thousand men within six weeks. Wilkins sent it to the Governor in order that Doyle might take whatever steps he thought advisable. In answer, Doyle, signing himself only as Major General,² wrote in red ink at the bottom of Wilkins' note accompanying the above letter:

"Tell the Attorney General he may inform his correspondent he may 'come on' here as soon as he pleases - I am ready for him".³

On September 18th the Provincial Secretary moved an address to the Lieutenant Governor which asked him to transmit to the Imperial Government a minute of the Executive Council protesting Buckingham's despatch of June 4th; the Attorney General's resolutions passed on September 4th; and the debates of the latter part of the session; and to confirm the Representatives in their

1. Harvey, op. cit., p. 48.
2. His military rank.
3. Harvey, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

solemn declaration that the people of Nova Scotia were opposed to Confederation.¹ On October 30th Doyle transmitted these papers, together with the address, to the Imperial Government by way of Ottawa.

In the meantime Sir John A. MacDonald had written Howe relative to "better terms" and to the latter's acceptance of office in the Canadian Government.³ Relations between Howe and the Provincial Executive had become more and more strained. He had refused to attend at the Bar of the House to receive the vote of thanks tendered to the "repeal" delegates. The proposition to present him with nearly seven thousand dollars, the amount voted by the Legislature to repay subscribers to the "repeal" fund, was declined unless given for past services, leaving his "future action untrammelled". The action of the Legislature in refusing to resign had also helped to alienate him.⁴ On October 21st, answering MacDonald's letter of the 6th instant, Howe said that it had been received; that he had informed Annand of the fact; but that he had not asked him to read it since the Provincial Government by

1. Journal, House of Assembly, 1868, pp. 118-119.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, 1869, App. I, Confederation, p. 1.
3. Pope, op. cit., App. XVIII, pp. 735-736.
4. Chisholm, op. cit., pp. 540-542. Howe had previously suggested five alternatives were before the Provincial Government: 1. Accept "better terms". 2. Create deadlock by the resignation of the Executive Council. 3. Passive resistance. 4. Last resource to take up arms. 5. Appeal to the new Government shortly due in England. (Chisholm, op. cit., pp. 534-536, Howe to Robert Robertson, June 20, 1868, see also pp. 551-552). On October 24th Howe declared there were only three peaceful courses open: 1. Appeal to new Government in England. 2. An attempt to revive Maritime union. 3. Negotiation for "better terms". (Chisholm, op. cit., p. 545.).

their resolutions had committed themselves to another attempt for "repeal". Howe, although still in favour of "repeal", was not hopeful of success in that direction and was willing to discuss "better terms". He was not ready to accept office, however, in the Canadian Government.¹ The subsequent story of the negotiation with the Dominion Government belongs to the history of "better terms" rather than that of "repeal". It was finally arranged that over a million dollars should be added to the debt with which Nova Scotia was credited under the British North America Act, and that an annual subsidy of Eighty-two thousand six hundred and ninety-eight dollars for ten years should be paid Nova Scotia.² On January 26th Howe and Mr. McLelan, federal member for Colchester County, who had been conducting the negotiation with the Dominion Government, accepted the arrangement as satisfactory.³

On January 13th Granville, the Colonial Secretary of the new government in England, replied to Doyle's despatch of October 30th. In his despatch, addressed to the Governor General of Canada, Granville said:

"I can hold out no expectation that Her Majesty's government will propose, or that parliament will entertain any measure for the repeal of the act of 1867".

He stated, however, that he felt that the Dominion Government would modify readily "any arrangement respecting taxation, or respecting the regulation of trade and fisheries" which prejudiced the interests

1. Journal, House of Assembly, 1869, App. 1, Dominion Documents, pp. 3-5. For Sir John's letter of October 6th see pp.1-3.
2. Ibid., p. 89.
3. Ibid., p. 97.

of Nova Scotia or the Maritimes.¹ This despatch arrived in Ottawa in the latter part of January and Joseph Howe, who was in the City at that time,² was informed of its contents. All hope of repeal had now vanished. On January 30th Howe was sworn in as President³ of the Council.

Howe's acceptance of office in the Dominion Government brought a storm of denunciation upon his head. Rumours that he had gone over to the Dominion Government had been abroad in Nova Scotia ever since the Provincial Convention of August, 1868, and bitter attacks had been made. He had never kept secret his determination to get "better terms" for Nova Scotia if "repeal"⁴ failed and he now felt that Nova Scotia should make the best of Confederation. The paramount question now became the Nova Scotian Legislature's reaction to the "better terms" arrangement.

The Legislature of Nova Scotia opened on April 29, 1869. On May 4th Granville's despatch of January 13th and copies of the papers and documents relating to "better terms" were laid before the Assembly. It was now for the House to decide on the question. On May 12th Attorney General Wilkins moved resolutions which declared that since the Imperial Government had thrown the responsibility of appeasing Nova Scotia upon the

1. Journal, House of Assembly, 1869, App. I, Confederation, p. 3.
2. Chisholm, op. cit., p. 586. On February 1st it was transmitted to Nova Scotia. (Journal, House of Assembly, 1869, App. 1, Confederation, pp. 2-3).
3. Howe reoffered for the County of Hants. After a bitter struggle he was elected by a majority of 383. Chisholm, op. cit., p. 590.
4. Chisholm, op. cit., pp. 542-571.

Canadian Government the House would accept any subsidy offered, as a partial instalment pending further investigation into the question of finance; that while "the enforced union of Nova Scotia under the British North America Act" continued it was the duty of the House to seek any modifications possible in the way of constitutional change; and that no final settlement should be made on the whole question of Confederation until it had been submitted for the approval of the people.¹ On May 18th resolutions in amendment were moved which said in effect that the House would accept any money "due and rightly belonging" to Nova Scotia but would not support the qualified approval of the British North America Act contained in the Attorney General's resolutions.² These resolutions of the more extreme anti-Confederates were defeated by a vote of twenty-eight to seven. The original resolutions then passed by a vote of twenty-eight to seven.³

Opposition was not yet over. On June 7th it was moved that an address be presented to the Queen asking that either the British North America Act be repealed or Nova Scotia be absolved of her allegiance to the British Throne. The Provincial Secretary, by moving a vote on whether the question should be put or not, prevented a vote being recorded on the subject of the address. Only seven members voted that the question be put. These seven members were the same ones who had voted against the Attorney General's

1. Journal, House of Assembly, 1869, pp. 28-29.
2. Ibid., pp. 44-45.
3. Ibid., pp. 55-56, May 25th. The seven members in both cases were: Chambers, Kidston, Ryerson, Jos. MacDonald, Murray, DesBrisay, Brown.

resolutions. These seven members were not disloyal; as the preamble to the resolution clearly shows, they hoped to shock the Imperial Government into action.¹

Even yet part of the Administration entertained some hopes of "repeal". On June 9th the Attorney General moved that an appeal be made to "the imperial courts of Justice" as the only constitutional means left to Nova Scotia for the repeal of confederation.² On June 11th the resolution passed by a vote of sixteen to fourteen³ but on the next day, having previously given notice of his intention, Mr. Pineo moved that the vote be rescinded. When a division was taken, fourteen members voted for Pineo's motion and twelve against it.⁴ This ended the "repeal" efforts of that session.

The Attorney General's resolutions of May 12th had made clear the Nova Scotian Government's desire for further financial grants and for constitutional change. While these resolutions are part of the struggle for "better terms", they pre-figured a revival of "repeal" in 1870. On July 22, 1869 Lieutenant Governor Doyle sent these resolutions to the Dominion Government with the request that a copy be forwarded to the Imperial authorities.⁵ Feeling that a mere acknowledgment of their communication was unsatisfactory,⁶ on October 15th the Executive Council asked the Dominion Government to appoint a joint commission

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1869, pp. 85-86.
2. Ibid., pp. 91-92.
3. Ibid., p. 97.
4. Ibid., p. 98.
5. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1870, App. 2, p. 91.
6. Ibid., p. 2, August 30th.

to arbitrate upon unsettled accounts between Nova Scotia and the Dominion.¹ In reply the Canadian Government said that the British North America Act defined the relations to subsist between the Dominion and the Province of Nova Scotia and that the Dominion Act of the last session embodying "better terms" provided that these two acts should be in full settlement of Nova Scotia's claims.² The Executive Council then shifted its attack and on January 11, 1870 drew attention to that part of the resolutions of May 12th which expressed the desire of the Nova Scotian Assembly for constitutional change.³ The Canadian Government at once replied that the place for discussing such changes was in the Dominion Parliament; that any suggestions in relation to taxation or the regulation of trade if made in any practicable form would be carefully considered by the heads of the departments charged with the fiscal affairs of the Dominion Government and by the Government as a whole.⁴

The replies stirred up the fires of "repeal" again. On April 9th Mr. Landers of Annapolis County and Mr. Kidston of Victoria County each presented a petition to the House which asked for an address requesting the Queen to return their "valued institutions" or to absolve them from their allegiance to the Throne.⁵ On April 16th the Attorney General moved resolutions which referred to the correspondence with the Dominion

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1870, App. 2, pp.2-3.
2. Ibid., p. 4, December 29th.
3. Ibid., pp. 4-5.
4. Ibid., pp. 5-6, January 24th.
5. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1870, p. 94.

Government and asked whether: 1. The Imperial Government would acquiesce if the Dominion of Canada desired independence; 2. the Queen would set free any one province if it desired independence. One of the resolutions also affirmed Nova Scotia's opposition to Confederation.¹ In reply the Imperial Government stated that it did not seem necessary to discuss such a highly conjectural question as the first; as to the second question the Government stated that it was not within the legal power of the Sovereign to dismember the Dominion of Canada. The rest of the despatch expressed the view of the Queen that further experience with Confederation would² justify it in Nova Scotian eyes.

1. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1870, pp.114-116. Agreed to on the same day.
2. Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1871, App. 8, pp.2-3.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

As early as the period after the American Revolution, proposals had been made for the union of the British North American Colonies. The main purpose of the early proposals was to retain the Colonies for Britain and prevent the spread of republicanism and democracy. Later, although these ideas were never lost from view and always played an important part, other reasons for union were brought forward. It was claimed that union would bring intercolonial free trade, an intercolonial railway, uniformity of currency, government efficiency and above all would provide for efficient mutual defence. The idea of nationality was also evoked. These proposals resulted in wider discussion of union but other forces were needed to bring the subject into practical politics. In the early 1860's in Canada at least such forces were coming into operation. In the year 1864 political deadlock, economic troubles and fear of the United States, as well as other less important causes, resulted in the formation of a coalition ministry in that Province which had as its program union of all the British North American Colonies if such were possible. The result was a conference at Quebec in the fall of 1864 and the drawing up of a plan of union. When this plan became public, however, opposition soon arose in

Nova Scotia. In this opposition the merchants of Nova Scotia played a considerable part.

Opposition to Confederation marks no break in the continuity of Nova Scotian history. The first half of the nineteenth century was a period of rising prosperity in Nova Scotia, accompanied by an intellectual awakening. Part of this awakening was a remarkable growth of local patriotism, together with a similar increase in loyalty to the British Empire and the Sovereign. The achievement of responsible government merely set the seal upon these two loyalties. At the same time, there was a growth of distrust of the Canadians, particularly of their politicians. As loyal subjects of the Queen, Nova Scotians, when they viewed the rebellions of 1837, the troubles of 1849 and various smaller incidents, contrasted this conduct with their own to the infinite advantage of the latter. Then, the negotiation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854 was regarded as an instance of Canadian duplicity and the failure to obtain an intercolonial railway, which Nova Scotians greatly wanted, and which rightly or wrongly they blamed on Canadian dishonesty, greatly confirmed this distrust.

When Confederation approached realization in the 1860's these sentiments were already present to cause Nova Scotians to look askance at union with Canada. Nova Scotians as a whole were prosperous, a fact militating against desire for constitutional

change. In addition, taxation in Nova Scotia was lower than that of Canada and having the usual colonial dislike of high taxes when thoughts of Canadian duplicity came to mind it was an easy step for Nova Scotians to feel that Canadian politicians would tax them for the benefit of Canada. Similarly, at least the import merchants of Nova Scotia regarded the tariff as a form of taxation. Canada had a higher tariff than Nova Scotia and it was natural for them to believe that Nova Scotia's tariff would rise under Confederation and that they would be taxed in this way for Canadian benefit. Thus these men, as far as it is possible to learn, were against Confederation. Moreover, many Nova Scotians believing that Canadians were disloyal and trouble makers came to the conclusion that Confederation meant annexation to the United States. Talk of annexation after Confederation was merely "bluff". Valuing their loyalty very highly, it was natural for Nova Scotians to think that England placed the same value upon it and would be reluctant to let them go. It was but a step to use this as a lever to force "repeal". There were certainly Nova Scotians who favoured annexation to the United States but they seem to have been a very small minority. In addition, rights are never as fiercely fought for as when, in prosperity, they are being taken away. The refusal of the Government of Nova Scotia to submit Confederation to the people at the polls contributed a great deal to the strength of the movement for "repeal". Furthermore, the psychological fear of a small community

to merge itself in a larger and lose its identity probably had considerable force. It is believed that these were the main reasons for opposition to Confederation.

On the other hand, there were reasons for desire for union. One of these was the fact that England was strongly in favour of Confederation. Against this, of course, the above argument about Confederation meaning annexation could be placed. Probably it was economics that decided which of these two arguments would have the greater force. The manufactures of Nova Scotia were in their infancy but this may have contributed to a desire for protection and thus for Confederation. The argument that Nova Scotia would be the manufacturing centre of the new Dominion may have had considerable force with those engaged in this branch of industry. Similarly, desire for the intercolonial railway and belief that Nova Scotian ports, particularly Halifax, would be the Atlantic outlet of the Dominion must have had effect. Belief, too that there was danger from the United States played some part. There was also the idea of nationality and of a larger field for ambition. Despite these reasons, the anti-Confederates were elected on September 18, 1867 and Nova Scotia began to fight bitterly for "repeal".

It is difficult not to believe that there was slight hope for "repeal" at any time. The groups in England which supported Confederation belonged to no one party. At this time

there was considerable "Little England" feeling in that country and even where there was no desire to get rid of the Colonies there was often lack of interest in them. At the same time, there was a movement in England which wished to transfer part of the burden of defence to the Colonies. Similarly, there was fear that the Colonies, weak and divided, would be a temptation to the United States and that Britain would be involved in war with that country. Finally, British investors in the North American Colonies looked upon Confederation as an ideal way to protect their interests and perhaps open up new fields for investment. Whatever party was in power in England, these groups decided the answer to "repeal".

The answer of the Imperial Government in 1870 marked the end of the "repeal" agitation for a time; it was an issue in the election of 1886 and the question has been raised at intervals since, particularly during periods of economic distress. The decline in Nova Scotia's prosperity which set in shortly after Confederation had been predicted by the anti-Confederates and since Confederation and this decline had so close a time connection it has been the fashion in Nova Scotia to assume a relationship of cause and effect. The economy of Nova Scotia before Confederation was a "wood, wind and water" economy from which she reaped great benefits in the first six decades of the nineteenth century. Soon after Confederation, however, iron ships replaced those of wood. No change in political relationship could have altered this

development. New England was largely in the same position at that time and suffered similarly. Technological changes were a far more important influence on the economic life of Nova Scotia than political changes. If Nova Scotia had remained outside Confederation the economic situation would probably have forced her in. Nova Scotia had to import more than she could export and she depended largely on her shipping to make up her balance of indebtedness. She would never have been able to compete in manufacturing with the United States and she would not have been able to export enough to pay for imports. With the loss of her shipping and largely of her markets, she would have had to turn to Canada for trade but Canada, by raising a high tariff, could have forced Nova Scotia into the Union.

APPENDIX I.

Members returned in the Elections of 1863.

Annapolis County

Hon. J. W. Johnston (C)
Avaré Longley (C)
George Whitman (C)

Antigonish County

Hon. W. A. Henry (C)
Hon. John McKinnon (C)

Cape Breton County

Thomas Caldwell (C)
John Bourinot (C)

Colchester County

North (A. W. McLellan (L)
(William Blackwood (L)

South (Adams G. Archibald (L)
(Francis R. Parker (L)

Cumberland County

Hon. Charles Tupper (C)
Hon. Alex. McFarlane (C)
Robert Donkin (C)

Digby County

John C. Wade (C)
Mathurine Robichau (C)
Colin Campbell (C)

Guysborough County

William O. Heffernan (L)
Stewart Campbell (L)

Halifax East

William Annand (L)
Henry Balcom (L)

Halifax West

John Tobin (C)
Hon. S. L. Shannon (C)
Henry Pryor (C)

Hants South

James W. King (C)
Lewis W. Hill (C)

Hants North

Ezra Churchill (C)
William Lawrence (C)

Inverness County

Hiram Blanchard (L)
Peter Smyth (C)
Samuel McDonell (C)

Kings North

Chas. C. Hamilton (C)
Caleb R. Bill (C)

Kings South

Daniel Moore (C)
Edward L. Brown (C)

Lunenburg County

Henry S. Jost (C)
Henry A. N. Kaulback (C)
William Slocumb (C)

Pictou East

James Fraser (C)
James McDonald (C)

Pictou West

Donald Fraser (C)
Alex. McKay (C)

Queens County

John Campbell (C)

South District (Andrew Cowie (C)
Chas. Allison (C)

Richmond County

Hon. Isaac LeVesconte (C)
William Miller (Independent)

Shelburne County

Thomas Coffin (L)

Township of Shelburne-John Loeke (L)
Township of Barrington-Robt. Robertson (L)

Victoria County

William Ross (L)
Charles J. Campbell (C)

Yarmouth County

Thomas Killam (C)
Township of Yarmouth-George S. Brown (L)
Township of Argyle-Isaac Hatfield (C)

Executive Council

Attorney General - J. W. Johnston
Provincial Secretary - Charles Tupper
Solicitor General - W. A. Henry
Receiver General - James McNab
Financial Secretary - Isaac LeVesconte

Without Portfolio

S. L. Shannon	John McKinnon
Alex. McFarlane	John Creighton

Speaker

John C. Wade

Note

On May 11, 1864, J. W. Johnston became Judge of Equity.
Hon. W. A. Henry succeeded him as Attorney General and
J. W. Ritchie became Solicitor General. In December, 1864,
Isaac LeVesconte resigned and James McDonald became
Financial Secretary.

APPENDIX II.

Union Petitions 1865.

(To the Assembly)

Form A.

To the Honorable the Representatives of the Province of
Nova Scotia, in General Assembly convened:-

The Petition of the undersigned Inhabitants of the County of
_____, respectfully showeth:-

That your Petitioners have heard, with deep anxiety and concern, that a measure for a Federal Union of the British North American Provinces will be submitted for the consideration of your honourable House during the present session - a measure involving a vital change in our most valuable institutions, and the surrender of the great part of our Revenues to a Parliament sitting at Ottawa, eight hundred miles off, in which Nova Scotia will be represented by nineteen gentlemen, in a House of Assembly composed of one hundred and ninety four members.

That it is the earnest wish and desire of your Petitioners that time should be afforded them to examine and fully understand the nature and consequences of the proposed change in our Constitution, which if adopted, will materially affect, for good or for evil, our posterity in future generations as well as ourselves.

Your Petitioners earnestly pray that before passing upon the measure, your honourable House will afford the people at large an opportunity of giving expression to their wishes, at the Polls, upon a measure involving such fundamental changes in the Institutions of their Country. 1

Form B.

(Heading as in Form A)

That your Petitioners learn, with much concern, that a measure will shortly be submitted to you for a Federal Union of this Province with the other British North American

Colonies, upon terms by which our taxes shall be largely increased, and the control of our ordinary revenue, as well as of that to arise from such increased taxation, shall be handed over to a Parliament sitting in Canada, eight hundred miles off, in which Nova Scotia shall have but one-tenth of the representation; while the amount to be placed at the disposal of the Province shall be largely diminished.

That your Petitioners believe the defence of these Colonies can be effectually provided for and that the people may contribute their fair quota towards the same without the proposed Union and consequent sacrifices.

That the various resources, commerce, manufacturing, skill, and industry of Nova Scotia will be better developed, encouraged and protected by our legislature, as at present constituted, than by one sitting at Ottawa, having many interests to subserve, which are totally inconsistent with ours.

That, by raising our tariff and incurring liabilities to the extent required by the proposed Union, this Province, if so disposed, can build the proposed railroads and be sole owners thereof without such Union.

That your Petitioners are unwilling that any tribunal should be placed between them and the British Cabinet; and they look with much concern and distrust upon a measure which involves the destruction of our best institutions, rendering our Local Parliament subservient to another and a distant one and which, if it once become law, cannot be repealed by any legislative power within this Province.

Your Petitioners beg leave to state that the electors of this Province are as capable of passing, in a Constitutional manner, upon the merits of the proposed Union, as their fellow Colonists in New Brunswick, and will regard any action of your Honourable House, arguing the contrary, as a reflection upon the intelligence and an infringement upon the dearest rights of this people.

They therefore earnestly pray that your Honorable House shall not assent to the proposed Union.²

Form C.

Petition against both the School Act of 1864 and Confederation.

Note

In 1865 one hundred and eighty-four petitions on the subject of union were addressed to the Nova Scotia Assembly. According to the Journal of Assembly of this year, these petitions asked that the people be given an opportunity to register their opinions on union at the polls. Of these petitions eighty have been found,¹ the majority of which, classified as form A above, make this request. It would seem probable that those petitions not found were similar to form A. However, the Journal of Assembly is not very explicit on this point and the form of the missing petitions is doubtful. Two of the petitions expressed opposition to both Union and the School Act of 1864. Neither of these has been found. Only one of the one hundred and eighty-four petitions was in favour of union.² This has not been found, and in the Journal of Assembly is not marked as being in favour of union.

1. Assembly Petitions, Miscellaneous A 1865-67.
2. Journal of Nova Scotia House of Assembly, 1868, Appendix 10, pp. 22-23.

Union Petitions, 1865

(To the Assembly)

<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Pre-sented</u>	<u>Form</u>	<u>Written or Printed</u>	<u>No. of Sign.</u>
Richmond	Miller	Feb.17	A	P.	226
"	River Inhabitants	"	"	"	W.	115
"	Red Islands	"	"	"	W.	137
Inverness	Smyth	"	A	P.	30
"	Broad Cove	H.Blanchard	Feb.20	A	W.	81
Halifax	Pryor	"	A	P.	34
"	"	"	A	P.	10
Guysborough	S.Campbell	Feb.21	A	P.	88
Antigonish	Monks Head & vicinity	J. McKinnon	Feb.22	B	P.	37
"	"	"	B	P.	51
"	Glenn Road	"	"	B	P.	74
"	Black River	"	"	Simple	W.	30
"	Pleasant Valley	"	"	B	P.	35
"	"	"	B	P.	46
"	"	"	B	P.	32
"	"	"	B	P.	82
"	Malignant Cove	"	"	B	P.	74
Kings	E. L. Brown	"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"
Victoria	St. Ann's	Ross	"	A	W.	87
Hants	King	"	A	P.	37
Antigonish	James River	McKinnon	"	none	list	50
"	Morristown	"	"	A	P.	72
"	Malignant Cove	"	"	A	P.	62
"	Back Settlement, Knoydart	"	"	A	W.	60
"	Cape George	"	"	A	P.	159
"	Tracadie	"	"	A	P.	135
"	St. Andrews	"	"	A	P.	60
"	Tracadie	"	"	A	P.	65
"	Arisaig & Knoydart	"	"	A	W.	176
"	"	"	A	P.	44
"	Main Road	"	"	B	P.	241
"	"	"	"	"	"
Cape Breton	Caldwell	"	B	P.	167
Richmond	Miller	"	B	P.	551
Kings	Moore	Feb.23	"	"	"
Hants	King	"	"	"	"
Colchester	Five Islands	McLellan	"	"	"	"
North Hants,	Eastern part	Lawrence	Feb. 24	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Antigonish	Harbour Bouche and					
"	Tracadie	McKinnon	"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Annapolis	Ray	"	"	"	"

<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Pre-sented</u>	<u>Form</u>	<u>Written or Printed</u>	<u>No. of Sign.</u>
Inverness (6)	McDonell	Feb.24			
Shelburne(12)	Locke	Feb.27			
Hants	Churchill	"			
Guysborough	Milford & Pt.Mulgrave	S. Campbell	"			
"	"	"	"			
Kings(3)	E. L. Brown	"			
Colchester	Brookfield	McLellan	"			
Victoria(2)	Ross	"			
Inverness	McDonell	"			
Antigonish	McKinnon	"			
Cumberland	Donkin	Feb.28			
Colchester	Londonderry	McLellan	Mar. 1			
Victoria	Ross	Mar. 2			
Victoria	"	"			
Victoria	"	"			
Kings	Moore	Mar. 3			
Inverness	River Inhabitants	Smyth	"	A	P.	200
Digby	Kobichau	Mar. 6	A	P.	58
Inverness	Plaister Cove and Creignish	McDonell	"	A	P.	75
Lunenburg	LaHave River	Jost	Mar. 7	A	P.	74
Lunenburg	"	"	A	P.	195
Lunenburg	"	"	A	P.	92
Lunenburg	"	"	A	P.	135
Lunenburg	"	"	A	P.	29
Lunenburg	"	"	A	P.	126
Colchester	Lower Onslow	McLellan	"	A	P.	83
Colchester	River DeBert	"	"	A	P.	45
Colchester	Lower Onslow	"	"	A	P.	58
North Queens	J. Campbell	"	A	P.	78
Victoria	Cape North	Ross	Mar. 8	A	P.	60
Lunenburg	New Dublin	Jost	"	A	P.	65
North Kings	E.L.Brown	"			
North Kings	E.L.Brown	"			
Halifax	Turns Bay	Pryor	Mar. 9	A	P.	28
Halifax	Lower Prospect	"	"	A	P.	37
Richmond	Miller	"	A	P.	95
Richmond	River Bourgeois	"	"	A	P.	45
Cumberland	River Philip	Donkin	"	A	W.	86
Lunenburg	Middle LaHave	Kaulback	"	A	P.	49
Shelburne(4)	Locke	Mar.10	A	P.	219
Inverness	Smyth	"	A	W.	46
Digby	Clare	C.Campbell	Mar.11	A	P.	10
Annapolis	Ray	Mar.13	A	P.	83
Cumberland(5)	Donkin	Mar.15	A	(1)P,(4)W	381
Inverness	Smyth	"	A	P.	75
Yarmouth(9)	G.Brown	"	A	P.	859

<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Presented</u>	<u>Form</u>	<u>Written or Printed</u>	<u>No. of Sign.</u>
Lunenburg	LaHave	Jost	Mar.15	A	P.	80
Richmond	Miller	"	A	P.	32
Richmond	"	"	A	P.	56
Richmond	"	"			
Hants	Newport	Lawrence	"	A	P.	105
Digby	Weymouth	C. Campbell	Mar.16	A	P.	120
Kings (2)	C. Bill	Mar.21			
Hants (4)	"	"			
Inverness	The Boom & adjoining	Smyth	"	C		
Victoria	Chas. Campbell	Mar.22	C		
Richmond	Miller	Mar.24			
Halifax (10)	Annand	"			
Victoria	North Shore	Ross	"			
Shelburne (3)	Robertson	Mar.25			
Halifax(5)	Annand	Mar.28			
Cumberland	Wallace	"	"			
Pictou(7)	McKay	Mar.30			
Victoria (2)	Ross	"			
Cumberland	Donkin	"			
Kings (3)	Bill	Mar.31			
Victoria	Bay St. Lawrence	Ross	"			
Pictou	J. Fraser	Apr. 3			
Annapolis (2)	Ray	"			
Halifax	Shad Bay	Annand	Apr. 8			
Lunenburg (2)	"	"			
Cumberland	Parrsboro	"	"			
Annapolis	Springfield	Ray	Apr.12			
Inverness	Blanchard	Apr.19			

four

The above one hundred and eighty petitions to the Assembly on union of the Provinces are mentioned in the Journal of Assembly, 1865. Only one was in favour of union.¹ This is not indicated in the Journal of 1865.

Eighty of these petitions have been found, which bear the name of the county from which they originated, the name of the member by whom they were presented in the Assembly and the date presented.² In some cases the district from which they were sent is also designated.² By checking them with a list compiled from the Journal of Assembly, 1865, it has been possible to identify the majority with a high degree of certainty. On the other hand, two papers, bearing two hundred and sixteen signatures in all, have been found but they are without sufficient identifying marks. There is a possibility that these lists may have become detached from two of the eighty petitions found. At any rate, their signatures have not been included in the above table. The total number of signatures on those petitions found and identified is 6,927, not including the two hundred and sixteen mentioned above. This figure has to be regarded as approximate, due to the fact that some of the signatures may have become detached and lost, but it is as accurate as possible.

1. Journal of House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, Appendix 10, pp.22-2
 2. Assembly Petitions, Miscellaneous A, 1865-67.

<u>County</u>	<u>Population (Males over 21)</u>	<u>Total Petitions</u>	<u>Petitions Identified</u>	<u>Number of Signatures</u>
Antigonish	4,049	24	20	1,585
Halifax West	8,605)			
Halifax East	4,598)	20	4	109
Shelburne	2,990	19	4	219
Inverness	5,619	15	6	507
Kings	5,005	14	-	-
Hants	5,073	13	2	142
Victoria	2,715	12	2	147
Lunenburg	5,522	11	9	845
Richmond	3,409	10	8	1,257
Cumberland	5,736	10	6	467
Yarmouth	4,232	9	9	859
Pictou	8,028	8	-	-
Colchester	5,480	6	3	186
Annapolis	4,326	5	1	83
Digby	4,059	3	3	188
Guysboro	3,812	3	1	88
Cape Breton	6,202	1	1	167
Queens	2,564	1	1	78
	<u>92,024</u>	<u>184</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>6,927</u>

Note Population according to the Canadian Census 1870-71.

Petitions to Legislative Council, 1865.
On Union.

<u>Petitioners</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Pre- sented</u>
Abraham Blois et al	Hants		McHeffey	Feb. 22
Roderick McDonald et al	Antigonish		Archibald	"
Rev. K. J. MacDonald et al	Antigonish		"	"
Joseph Gerrior, Sr. et al	Antigonish		"	"
Alex. McLellen et al	Antigonish		"	"
John McGillvery et al	Antigonish		"	"
Angus McDonald et al	Antigonish		"	"
Thomas Farnworth et al	Kings		Chipman	"
John H. Clarke et al	Kings		"	"
B. B. Woodworth et al	Kings		"	"
J. T. Kenny et al	Antigonish		McKeen	Feb. 24
Rev. A. P. Martel et al	Antigonish		"	"
R. McLellan et al	Inverness		"	"
Alex. McLellan et al	Inverness		"	"
Sam. Lawrence et al	Inverness		"	"
John G. Croudie et al	Inverness		"	"
John Smith et al	Inverness		"	"
Asaph Marshall et al	Annapolis		Whitman	"
Rev. J. J. Hill et al	Hants		McHeffey	"
Stephen H. Moore et al	Kings		Chipman	Feb. 27
George L. Brown et al	Kings		"	"
Dawson Patterson et al	Kings		"	"
Joseph Clarke et al	Cumberland		Anderson	Feb. 28
George Armstrong et al	Hants		McHeffey	"
A. M. Cochrane et al	Hants		"	"
S. S. Barbrick et al	Hants		"	"
Adam Hunter et al	Hants		"	"
Chas. Cox et al	Hants		"	"
Hugh McLean et al	Hants		"	"
James H. Pratt et al	Colchester		Chipman	"
Rev. John Shaw et al	Victoria	Ingonish	Archibald	Mar. 3
Murdock McDonald et al	Victoria	St. Ann's	"	"
John M. Hebb et al	Lunenburg		Anderson	Mar. 3
Henry Grant et al	Lunenburg		"	"
James W. Bates et al	Lunenburg		"	"
Charles Himmelman et al	Lunenburg		"	"
Ronald MacDonald et al	Inverness	Inverness	McKeen	"
Edward P. Freeman et al	North Queens	Tupper	F. Tupper	Mar. 6
Jacob Corkum et al	North Queens		McKeen	"
Hugh McEachern et al	Inverness		McKeen	"
Rev. Geo. Townsend et al	Cumberland		Dickey	Mar. 8
Thomas Smith et al	Lunenburg		Anderson	"
Joseph J. Blackburn et al	Hants		McHeffey	"
George Dill et al	Hants		"	"

<u>Petitioners</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Presented</u>
James Wilkie et al	Victoria	Cape North	Archibald	Mar.10
James Slaunenwaith et al	Halifax	Turns Bay	Anderson	"
Edmund Ryan et al	Halifax	Lr.Prospect	"	"
John Doyle et al.	Lunenburg	mid.LaHave	"	"
Richard Carter et al	Queens		F. Tupper	"
Peter Paint, Jr. et al	Guysboro	Canso	McKeen	Mar.13
William Shaw et al	Hants		McHeffey	Mar.13
Robt. Smith et al	Hants		F.Tupper	Mar.15
Cyrus Webster et al	Kings		Chipman	"
John A. Chipman et al	Kings		"	"
Angus McInnes et al	Inverness		McKeen	"
Sam. Brown et al	Yarmouth	Yarmouth	Brown	Mar.18
W. R. Vail et al	Digby	Digby	"	"
W. Meehan et al	Digby	Clare	"	"
James Ellis et al	Hants		McHeffey	Mar.23
David Redmond et al	Halifax	Shad Bay	Anderson	"
Charles Ross et al	Cumberland		Dickey	Mar.29
William Lusby et al	Cumberland		Dickey	"
William Murray et al	Pictou		Holmes	"
John Russell et al	Pictou		"	"
John Henry et al	Pictou		"	"
Robert Burr et al	Pictou		"	"
Joseph Kitchin et al	Pictou		"	"
R. McLean et al	Pictou		"	"
John Rettie et al	Pictou		"	"
Hugh McInnes et al	Pictou		"	"
Donald Murray et al	Pictou		"	"
A. P. Blackie et al	Pictou		"	"
Alex. McKay et al	Pictou		"	"
David Marshall et al	Pictou		"	Apr. 3
Chas. Hamilton, Jr. et al	Halifax		Anderson	Apr. 5
James Muir et al	Halifax		"	"
John McKay et al	Halifax		"	"
John D. Tupper et al	Halifax		"	"
James Murphy, Jr. et al	Halifax		"	"
Robert Higgins 3rd et al	Halifax		"	"
Henry Henritz et al	Halifax		"	"
John Nauffe et al	Halifax		"	"
John Leslie et al	Halifax		"	"
William York et al	Halifax		"	"
Philip Sheers et al	Halifax		"	"
W. A. Brine et al	Halifax		"	"
William Goreham et al	Halifax		"	"
Adam Dean et al	Halifax		"	"
John McKay et al	Colchester		"	"
Daniel McDonald et al	Lunenburg		"	"
Leonard Romkey et al	Lunenburg		"	"
Henry King et al	Cumberland		"	"
James B. Davison et al	Cumberland		"	"

<u>Petitioners</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Pre- sented</u>
Rev. Thomas Saers et al	Guysboro		Cutler	Apr. 20
John W. McKeen et al	Guysboro		"	"
Alex. McGuire et al	Guysboro		"	"
W. H. Hull et al	Guysboro		"	"
Israel Paris et al	Guysboro		"	"

Legislative Councillors who presented Petitions

<u>Legislative Councillor</u>	<u>County</u>
John H. Anderson	Halifax
T. D. Archibald	Cape Breton
G. Stayley Brown	Yarmouth
Samuel Chipman	Kings
R. M. Cutler	Guysboro
R. B. Dickey	Cumberland
John Holmes	Pictou
R. A. McHeffey	Hants
W. McKeen	Cape Breton
Freeman Tupper	Queens
W. C. Whitman	Annapolis

Note

None of the above petitions to the Legislative Council in 1865 were in favour of union. Most of them asked that the subject be referred to the people at the polls.¹ It is probable that they were very similar to Assembly petition form A. A few of the petitions asked that the proposed scheme of union be not assented to and were similar, perhaps, to Assembly petition form B. One petition to the Legislative Council from Acadian Mines, Colchester County, bearing 118 signatures, has been found among the petitions to the Assembly. Apparently it was presented with these because it is marked as presented by Mr. McLellan, a member of the Assembly,² but it is not certain to which group it belongs. According to the Journal of the Legislative Council, 1865, 134 petitions were presented in that year.

1. Journal of Legislative Council, Nova Scotia, 1865.
2. Assembly Petitions, Miscellaneous A, 1865-67.

Petitions to Assembly, 1866
On Union.

<u>County</u>	<u>Presented by</u>	<u>Date Presented</u>
Inverness	Blanchard	February 27
"	McDonnell	March 7
Hants (8)	Lawrence	March 8
Lunenburg	Annand	"
Digby	C. Campbell	March 12
Inverness	McDonnell	"
Antigonish (2)	McKinnon	March 16
Digby	C. Campbell	"
Lunenburg (3)	Hebb	"
Kings	C. Bill	"
Kings (4)	Lawrence	March 17
Inverness (4)	McDonnell	March 21
Guysborough	Heffernan	"
Inverness (2)	Blanchard	March 22
Digby (4)	C. Campbell	"
Victoria (6)	Ross	"
Digby (2)	Robichau	March 26
Lunenburg	Hebb	"
Annapolis	Kay	"
Hants	Brown	"
Colchester (2)	McLellan	March 31
Digby	Robichau	"
Lunenburg (3)	Hebb	"
Shelburne (8)	Locke	"
Victoria (3)	Ross	April 3
Inverness (2)	Annand	"
Digby	C. Campbell	April 4
Lunenburg (4)	Hebb	"
Lunenburg	Annand	April 5
Lunenburg (4)	Hebb	April 9
Victoria (3)	Ross	"
Halifax (4)	Balcom	"
Annapolis	Kay	"
Queens	Annand	April 11
Kings	Bill	"
Kings	Moore	"
Cumberland (4)	Annand	April 13
Richmond (11)	Miller	April 14
Inverness	Blanchard	"
Victoria	C.J. Campbell	"
Guysborough (2)	S. Campbell	April 16
Antigonish (25)	Ross	April 17
Victoria (2)	Ross	"
Kings (2)	Brown	April 19

Union Petitions

<u>County</u>	<u>To Assembly 1865</u>	<u>To Legislative Council 1865</u>	<u>To Assembly 1866</u>
Antigonish	24	8	27
Halifax	20	17	4
Shelburne	19	-	8
Inverness	15	8	12
Kings	14	8	9
Hants	13	13	9
Victoria	12	3	15
Lunenburg	11	8	17
Richmond	10	-	11
Cumberland	10	6	4
Yarmouth	9	1	-
Pictou	8	12	-
Colchester	6	2	2
Annapolis	5	1	2
Digby	3	2	10
Guysboro	3	6	3
Cape Breton	1	-	-
Queens	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
	184*	98	134

* One of these was for union.

APPENDIX III

Division taken on Mr. S. Campbell's amendment to
Union Resolution, 1866.

For:

Ray (A)
Annand (L)
Killam (C)
Hatfield (C)
Townsend (A)
S. Robertson (L)
S. Campbell (L)
McLelan (L)
King (C)
Brown (C)
Coffin (L)
Hebb (A)
Balcolm (L)
Lawrence (C)
Moore (C)
Locke (L)
Blackwood (L)
Ross (L)

Against:

Bill (C)
Robichau (C)
Parker (L)
Macfarlane (C)
MacDonnell (C)
John Campbell (C)
Shannon (C)
Donkin (C)
Allison (C)
Smyth (C)
Jost (C)
Tobin (C)
Whitman (C)
Tupper (C)
Bourinot (C)
C. J. Campbell (C)
Attorney General (C)
Kaulback (C)
Hill (C)
Blanchard (L)
Heffernon (L)
D. Fraser (C)
Hamilton (C)
McKay (C)
C. Campbell (C)
Cowie (C)
Longley (C)
McKinnon (C)
Miller (I)
Pryor (C)
Archibald (L)

when the original resolution was put J. Fraser (C) added his vote to the opposition. He had not voted on the amendment. otherwise the vote on the resolution was the same as that on the amendment.

(C) - Conservative; (L) - Liberal; (A) - Anti-Confederate elected in bye elections.
(I) - Independent.

Appendix IV

Members of the Nova Scotia Legislature who signed an Address to the Queen after the passing of the Union Resolution of April 10, 1866. (Minutes of Executive Council, 1866, pp. 280-281)

Legislative Council

Stayley Brown
W. Whitman

Samuel Chipman

Richard A. McHeffey
Freeman Tupper

Assembly

W. Annand
Daniel More
Stewart Campbell
Thomas Killam
Thomas Coffin
John Locke
A. W. McLellan
W. M. Lawrence
W. H. Ray
E. L. Brown
W. Ross
Robert Robertson
W. H. Townsend
Henry Balcom
Isaac Hatfield
James W. King
W. Blackwood
Abraham Hebb

East Halifax
South Kings
Guysborough
Yarmouth
Shelburne
Shelburne
North Colchester
North Hants
Annapolis
South Kings
Victoria
Shelburne
Yarmouth
East Halifax
Argyle (Yarmouth County)
South Hants
North Colchester
Lunenburg

For the Address see page 166 supra.

APPENDIX V

Division taken on Mr. S. Campbell's amendment to the proposed reply of the Assembly to the Lieutenant Governor's speech from the throne, 1867.

For:	Townsend	Against:	Heffernan
	Balcom		J. Fraser
	Killam		D. Fraser
	McLelan		Parker
	Robertson		Kaulback
	Blackwood		Tobin
	S. Campbell		Hamilton
	Annand		Donkin
	Hebb		J. Campbell
	Ross		Archibald
	Moore		Chas. Campbell
	Locke		Colin Campbell
	Ray		Bourinot
	King		Churchill
	Coffin		Pryor
	Brown		McKay
			Hill
			Jost
			Longley
			Cowie
			Blanchard
			Caldwell
			Bill
			Whitman
			Allison
			Shannon
			McFarlane
			McKinnon
			Financial Secretary
			Provincial Secretary
			Robichau
			Smyth

Appendix VI.

List of members returned in Nova Scotia to the House of Commons of Canada under the British North America Act, 1867.

<u>Name of County</u>	<u>Anti-Confederate</u>	<u>Confederate</u>
Annapolis.....	W. H. Ray	
Antigonish.....	H. McDonald	
Cape Breton.....	James McKeagney	
Colchester.....	A. W. McLellan	
Cumberland.....		Charles Tupper
Digby.....	A. W. Savary	
Guysborough.....	Stewart Campbell	
Halifax.....	A. G. Jones Patrick Power	
Hants.....	Joseph Howe	
Inverness.....	Hugh Cameron	
Kings.....	W. H. Chipman	
Lunenburg.....	E. M. McDonald	
Pictou.....	James W. Carmichael	
Queens.....	James Forbes	
Richmond.....	William J. Croke	
Shelburne.....	Thomas Coffin	
Victoria.....	William Ross	
Yarmouth.....	Thomas Killam	

List of members of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia returned at the General Election of 1867.

<u>Name of County</u>	<u>Anti-Confederate</u>	<u>Confederate</u>
Annapolis.....	Jared C. Troop David C. Landers	
Antigonish.....	Daniel McDonald Joseph McDonald	
Cape Breton.....	John Fergusson Alonzo J. White	
Colchester.....	Robert Chambers Thomas F. Morrison	
Cumberland.....	Amos Purdy	
Digby.....	William B. Vail Urbain Doucett	Henry G. Pineo, Jr.
Guysborough.....	John J. Marshall John A. Kirk	

<u>Name of County</u>	<u>Anti-Confederate</u>	<u>Confederate</u>
Halifax.....	Henry Balcan James Cochran Jeremiah Northup	
Hants.....	William Lawrence Elkanah Young	
Inverness.....	Alexander Campbell	Hiram Blanchard
Kings.....	Edward L. Brown David M. Dickie	
Lunenburg.....	James Eisenhauer Mather B. Desbrisay	
Pictou.....	Martin I. Wilkins Robert S. Copeland George Murray	
Queens.....	William H. Smith Samuel Freeman	
Richmond.....	Edmund P. Flynn Josiah Hooper	
Shelburne.....	Robert Robertson Thomas Johnston	
Victoria.....	William Kidston John Ross	
Yarmouth.....	William H. Townsend John K. Ryerson	

Note: For these lists see the "Acadian Recorder", September 23, 1867 and Journal, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1868, Appendix 10, pp. 45-46.

Returns of the General Elections of 1867 in Nova Scotia.

Kings County

Federal

Chipman (A) 1472
Coleman (C) 659

Local

Dickie (A) 1393
Brown (A) 1280
Harris (C) 904
Foster (C) 661

Digby County

Federal

Savary (A) 792
Wade (C) 494
Meehan (A) 362

Local

Vail (A) 1137
Doucett (A) 1010
Campbell 612
Melanson 403

(Morning Chronicle, Oct. 2, 1867)

Hants County

Federal

Howe (A) 1530
Kings (A) 956

Local

Lawrence (A) 1529
Young (A) 1479
Parker 921
McDougall 904

(Morning Chronicle, Oct. 1, 1867)

Victoria County

federal

Ross by Acclamation (A)

Local

Kidston (A) 571
J. Ross (A) 621
C. J. Campbell (C) 256
McLean 162
Haliburton 59

(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 28, 1867)

Shelburne County

Federal

Local

anti-Confederates by acclamation.

Lunenburg County

Federal

Local

MacDonald (A) 1557
Kaulback (C) 905

Eisenhaur (A) 1664
Jost (C) 853

Halifax County

Federal

Local

Jones (A) 2381
Power (A) 2361
Tobin (C) 2158
Shamon (C) 2154

Northup (A) 2386
Hill (C) 2152

Pictou County

Note: In the federal elections the anti-Confederate candidate Carmichael defeated Macdonald who had been elected there in 1865 by acclamation for the local Legislature.

(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1867)

Cumberland County

Federal

Local

Tupper (C) 1368
Annand (A) 1271
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1867)

Pineo (C) 1337
Purdy (A) 1309
Fullerton 1291
Vickery 1284

(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 24, 1867)

Richmond County

Federal

Croke (A) 475
Donovan (C) 257

Local

Flynn 519
Hooper 439
Hearn 324

Two polling places not heard from: about 50 votes.
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 23, 1867)

Guysborough County

Federal

Anti-Confederate by
acclamation
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1867)

Local

J. J. Marshall (A) 703
Kirk (A) 665
Tory (C) 428
MacDonald (C) 422
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 21, 1867)

Cape Breton County

Federal

Anti-Confederate by
acclamation
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1867)

Local

Ferguson (A) 715
McKay (A) 611
Cadegan (A) 416
Purves (A) 466
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 21, 1867)

Antigonish County

Federal

Hugh MacDonald (A) 1238
W.A. Henry (C) 390
(Acadian Recorder, Oct. 30, 1867)

Local

D. McDonald (A) 1224
J. McDonald (A) 1072
R. N. Henry 410
John MacDonald 193
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 21, 1867)

Colchester County

Federal

McLellan (A) 1649
Archibald (C) 1279

Local

Morrison 1630
Chambers 1622
Rettie 1311
McKim 1162
(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 21, 1867)

Yarmouth County

Federal

Killam (A) 1225
G. Brown (A) 667

Local

John K. Ryerson (A) 1138
W. H. Townsend (A) 853
W. G. Goucher (A) 726
J. V. N. Hatfield (A) 626
Isaac S. Hatfield (A) 61
J. S. Hatfield (C) 94

(Morning Chronicle, Sept. 20, 1867)

Queens County

Federal

Forbes (A) 844
J. Campbell (C) 271

Local

Smith (A) 823
Freeman (A) 827
Allison (C) 324
Campbell (C) 274

(Liverpool Transcript, Sept. 26, 1867)

(A) - Anti-Confederate; (C) - Confederate.

Unfortunately, all the returns have not been found in the newspapers.

Bibliography.

Manuscript Sources

- P.A.N.S., vols. 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110. Despatches from Colonial Secretary to Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, 1861-67.
- P.A.N.S., vols. 126, 127, 128. Office copies of despatches from Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia to Colonial Secretary, 1861-67.
- P.A.N.S., vols. 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 280, 281, 281½. Miscellaneous documents.
- P.A.N.S., Provincial Secretary's Office, In letters, 1861, 2 folio vols.; 1864-67, 8 folio vols.
- P.A.N.S., Lieutenant Governor's Correspondence, Miscellaneous, 1864-67, 6 folio vols.
- P.A.N.S., Petitions to Lieutenant Governor, 1863-1901, 1 folio vol.
- P.A.N.S., Assembly Petitions, Miscellaneous A 1865-67 1 folio vol.
B 1859-68 1 folio vol.

Primary Printed Sources

- Journals, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1854, 1858, 1860-71.
- Debates and Proceedings, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1865-67.
- Journals, Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, 1864-70.
- Minutes, Executive Council of Nova Scotia, 1851-60, 1860-67. (P.A.N.S. typescript).
- Journals, House of Assembly, New Brunswick, 1864, 1865.

Contemporary Writings

- Anderson, James, The Union of the British North American Provinces considered in a letter addressed to the Citizens of British North America, 1858. Reprinted in October, 1859 from Montreal Gazette.
- Johnston, J.W., Speech in Nova Scotia House of Assembly on the Union of British North America, Feb. 23, 1854, printed by MacNab and Shaffer, Halifax, 1865.
- Hamilton, P. S., Observations upon a Union of the Colonies of British North America, printed by English and Blackadar, Halifax, 1865.
Union of the Colonies of British North America considered Nationally, being three papers upon this subject, printed by John Lovell, Montreal, 1864.
- Sleigh, B.W.A., Pine Forests and Hackmatack Clearings, printed by R. Bentley, London, 1853.
- Taylor, Henry, On the Intention of the Imperial Government to Unite the Provinces of British North America, Toronto, 1858.

Newspapers

Morning Chronicle	1860-67
British Colonist	1860-67
Acadian Recorder	1860-64
Morning Journal	1860-64
Halifax Reporter	1860-63
Nova Scotian	1861, 1864
Evening Express	1861-63
Halifax Morning Sun	1861-64

These newspapers have been examined throughout. In some cases a considerable number of issues are missing in the files of P.A.N.S. These, of course, cannot be enumerated but may be easily ascertained from an examination of the papers themselves. The fact that the files in some instances are broken has been taken into account when generalizations have been made. In

addition selected issues of these and one or two other newspapers for other years have been consulted but not frequently enough to deserve mention here. In all such cases they have been indicated in the footnotes.

Selected Documents

- Burpee, L. J., ed. Joseph Howe and the Anti-Confederate League, Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 1916, vol. X, Section II.
- Harvey, D. C., ed., Uniacke's Memorandum on Nova Scotia, 1806, Canadian Historical Review, March, 1936, Incidents of the Repeal Agitation in Nova Scotia, Canadian Historical Review, 1934, pp.48-57.
- Short, A. and Doughty, A.G., Documents relating to the Constitutional History of Canada 1759-1791, 2nd ed. (Ottawa 1918) part II.

Articles

- Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association 1927,
- Harvey, D.C., Nova Scotia and the Convention of 1818, Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 1933, Section II.
- Martin, C., British Policy in Canadian Confederation, Canadian Historical Review, March, 1932.
- Moody, H., Political Experiences in Nova Scotia 1867-69, Dalhousie Review, April, 1934.
- Shannon, M. J., Two Forgotten Patriots, Dalhousie Review, April, 1934.

Books

- Chisholm, Sir J., ed., The Speeches and Public Letters of Joseph Howe, vol. II, Chronicle Publishing Company, Halifax, 1909.

- Pope, Sir J., Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John A. MacDonald, rev. ed., Oxford University Press, Toronto, 1930.
- Roy, J.A., Joseph Howe, MacMillan and Sons, Toronto, 1935.
- Saunders, E.M., ed., The Life and Letters of Sir Charles Tupper, Vol. I, F. A. Stokes and Company, New York, 1916.
- Trotter, R. G. Canadian Federation, J. M. Dent and Sons, Toronto, 1924.
- Whitelaw, W. M., The Maritimes and Canada before Confederation, Oxford University Press, Toronto, 1934.