

the people want for Confederation at the next session, but not now; and I would have nothing to do with it at present. I have no object, anything to induce me to go into the Union. We would get thirty cents per head, and more to be sure. All the Colonies are agreeing, and why should not this Island do so too? We need not wait as I can see, expect that play if we go into the Union, and I will, therefore, support the Resolution introduced by Mr. Roper, the Leader of the Government.

Mr. HOWLAND: It is very amusing to listen to the Confederationists. They are not in favour of Confederation on the terms of the Quebec report at all—but they are to propose our own terms—to say what we will do and what we will not do—but hear the Resolution which they introduced last year.

Mr. BATHURST: The Report of the Conference of Delegates from the British North American Provinces and Colonies held at Quebec, in October last, upon the subject, contains a declaration of principles on the basis of a Federal Union, which this House considers just to the several Provinces and Colonies.

Mr. ROPER: That is not fair.

Mr. HOWLAND: It is quite fair; I have listened to the speech of the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Whelan) attentively, and I perceive that his views have undergone a change since last year. It is very gratifying to know that he has seen the error of his ways. The advocates of Union desire something more than what we would get by the Quebec Scheme. They suppose that a change has taken place, and no basis is laid down with regard to the financial part of the Scheme, which would our position, or what would we influence be? I might refer to Rhode Island, but that is an old story now. It would be said, "Who are you that attempt to raise your head?" A little isolated place like Rhode Island attempting to raise your voice? Come out now, if you do go you suppose (that little Rhode Island) will be allowed to play in the ring of the confederated Union? Then, why ask us to pay yes or no? Why are we here discussing the question when members are so anxious to get home? It is said that we are only 80,000 people—that we are not able to protect ourselves—and therefore we must go into the Union. And, say "Yes" or "No." If you do not go into the Union the Army and Navy of Great Britain will not protect you; but I know better authority for stating that the Army and Navy of Great Britain will protect us. Mr. Gladstone says that the Imperial Government pledged itself to protect, to the utmost of its power, every British subject in British North America. (Voice of No.) No! I say Mr. Gladstone does say so, and he is a member of this House of Commons, and quite as good a man as any of the hon. members who say "No." I say that the Imperial Government will protect us in any day in this Island, and of our Confederation? There is nothing respecting which we have not the right to partition, or which we have not the right to ask for, why then should we be forced to give up our Constitution? I see gentlemen here who are older than my father, and who say we must go into Confederation. If the ruling-estimates of Canada and Nova Scotia say that we must unite, in that case, I agree with them. I am sorry I am not right but I have that through I live on this little Island, I have as much liberty as I have in London, and I feel proud that the British Government is supposed to be the protector of its subjects in all the world.

British Fair will be absent from the hall unless we get telegrams. But I remember that at the last meeting (Hon. Mr. Whelan) suggested very different terms a very strong opinion was expressed. I remember the hon. member's estimate—much more than the subject for consideration. His mind was not in a state to consider these subjects as they have to call upon the other Colonies to contribute as they have to call upon us. It is said that if Nova Scotia and New Brunswick go into the Union, we also would for the purpose of mutual defence; but we have a large force in the whole Revenue of the Colony at the disposal of the Government for putting the Island in a state of defence, and we are willing to pay our proportion for the general defence of the Colonies; but why should we be forced into Confederation against our will? If I offer a general objection, there should be a majority in favour of Confederation, the day would be different, but to say that we must unite with Canada is absurd. If we were considered as to govern ourselves, and if we have conducted the business of the Colony properly for fifteen years, it does not appear reasonable to suppose that the British Government will now deprive us of our Constitution. Do not think the people of the Island are so much afraid of Confederation; but they object to being forced into it. We have, at present, as much right to tax ourselves at Canada, but, in the event of Confederation, will we stand in the same relative position to the other Colonies as Rhode Island does to the rest of the American Union? That is what has the same representation in the United States Senate as New York? Rhode Island is the smallest part of the American Union, and I suppose we would remain for a long time the smallest part of British America; still, we have shown a disposition to do what we can to defend ourselves, and have thereby shown that we are not disloyal, but we wish to let it be seen that Confederation is not applicable to us as to other portions of British America, and that, therefore, we are not disposed to go into the Union on the basis of the Quebec Report.

Progress reported and House adjourned at 10 minutes to 12.

THURSDAY, 8th May, 1866.

House in Committee of the whole on Despatches. Mr. JOHN YEO in the Chair.

Mr. CONROY: Sir, I have very little to say in addition to what I said upon the question last Sunday. I am decidedly opposed to Confederation. I am quite satisfied to remain as we are, and to retain the management of our own Affairs. I have considered the question with all the ability and attention I could bring to bear upon it, and I have failed to discover any advantage which would accrue to us through a Federal Union with Canada. But whilst I am persuaded that we should gain no advantage from it, I am convinced that, in almost every particular, it would be highly injurious. It not absolutely ruinous to us. According to the Quebec Scheme, we would have to give up our revenue, however great, to amount to upwards of £250,000 or £300,000 per annum, and we would have to surrender to the other Colonies the right to tax us, and to have the right to send troops to our assistance, and to have the right to send troops to our assistance, and to have the right to send troops to our assistance.