

were told the same stories, and were led to misunderstand the whole nature of our position. That was the reason which led us to say:

"The Committee, of course, cannot suppose that the British Government share the ignorance with regard to the history and character of the Federal Scheme which appears to prevail among the British public, and which induces the 'Times' newspaper of the twentieth of June, to observe that 'the two Canadas have put aside their ancient jealousies, and are ready to meet in a common Legislature, in apparent forgetfulness of the fact that they have so met for the last five and twenty years.'"

We thought he did show that ignorance in that dispatch, but we think new light has been thrown upon it by subsequent events. When we found statements of this kind in the "Times" newspaper operating upon the English people, who are Mr. Cardwell's master, we did not think it unjustifiable to make an allusion to an article which we believed was put before the people of England to create an erroneous impression of the state of things which existed in this Province, and I do not think we should be characterized as mean and low by so doing. The House will judge whether it was justifiable or not. I am free to admit it was out of the ordinary course of proceeding, but it had become somewhat necessary from the state of things that existed. It was not in accordance with strict decorum, but by so doing we were bringing the matter more forcibly, fully and clearly under the observation of the Colonial Secretary, and I appeal to the House to say if there was anything low or mean in our referring to that paper. We go on in say:

"The resolutions agreed to by the leading Canadian politicians in the month of June, 1864, as the basis of the formation of the existing Cabinet, and adopted solely under the pressure of local exigencies, contain the statement that on consideration of the steps most advisable for the final settlement of sectional difficulties, the remedy must be sought in the adoption of the Federal principle, and provide that if such negotiations were unsuccessful, they would be prepared to pledge themselves to legislation during the next session of Parliament, for the purpose of remedying existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle for Canada alone."

Was there anything disloyal, or not in strict accordance with facts, in that? Having heard so many attacks upon this "Minute of Council," I did expect to find it pointed out what particular part of it deserved such epithets. I have heard nothing beyond that, but we dared to doubt the precise meaning of Mr. Cardwell's words, and a reference to the *Times* newspaper. We continue:

"It is perfectly clear that the existing difficulties were the motive and groundwork of the scheme, and that the Federal Union was only sought as a means of separating the Canadas—a separation which the Canadian Government are pledged in all events immediately to effect—a fact which perhaps sufficiently accounts for the eagerness with which they seek to force its immediate adoption upon unwilling communities, for they are well

aware that did the plan avowedly contemplate only the separation of the Canadas, it would be impossible even speciously to present it to the Imperial Government as in a manner a scheme of union. Mr. Cardwell is perfectly right in supposing that the views and wishes of Great Britain are entitled to great weight, and they will be ever received with respectful attention in this Province; but the Committee feel certain that if there be one view with regard to the Colonies which is more clearly and distinctly held than another by Her Majesty's Government and the people of England; if there be one wish on their part, with respect to which there can be neither hesitation nor doubt, it is, that the people of this Province, and others, enjoying, through the wise liberality of England, parliamentary institutions and free self-government, should act in reference to their own affairs, as seems to themselves most consistent with their duty to their sovereign, and most conducive to their own interests."

Could the representatives of free men, having to assert the rights of free men, speak in more respectful language than that. We had to assert the rights of the people of this Province, but in doing so I declare again emphatically, that it was our most anxious wish and earnest desire to clothe our thoughts and ideas in such respectful, deferential, loyal language as would leave no room to doubt of our expressing what we believed to be due to the loyal people of this Province. We continue:

"To confer on this Province the right of self-government would have been mockery, if in consequence of its claims to deference as a protector the wish of the mother country was in all cases to be followed whenever expressed, whatever the opinion of those to whom the power of judging has been solemnly entrusted by the Sovereign and Legislature of Great Britain, and who being on the spot and fully conversant with the subject, consider themselves not unable to judge with respect to their own affairs."

Who are they to whom the Sovereign and Parliament have entrusted the right of judging in the affairs of this Province? Is it not the people of the Province themselves through their representatives. If any man says otherwise he misconstrues the spirit of our Constitution. We say:

"When a wish is expressed by Her Majesty's Government, it will be received with that deference which is due to suggestions emanating from so high a source, and will be considered with an anxious desire to meet the views of Her Majesty's advisers."

Is that the treason of which I have been accused before my country? If it be, it is treason which is shared in by every man who holds a high place in the history of his country. If I was endowed with any share of vanity, I would feel proud that I was deemed worthy to be placed in so high a position. I prefer retirement, but when attacks are made on me, and through me on the Government, which is working for the welfare of the country, I feel it my duty

to repel those attacks, and prove how unfounded they are. We continue:

"But if such views should unfortunately not coincide with the views of those on whom alone the responsibility of action in the Province falls, the Committee feel assured that Her Majesty's Government will expect and desire that the Government of this Province should act according to their own convictions of right, and in conformity with the sentiments of the people they represent."

I again proclaim my solemn conviction, that that is the language of loyalty and truth, and that that was our duty on that occasion to have spoken as we did. If there be in that memorandum one word an honest, impartial man can say is unbecoming for the Government of this country to utter in an address to the Imperial Government, I would humbly retract it. We pondered and deliberated over every word in it, and we had no intention, wish, desire or idea of conveying in it either insolence or disrespect, much less disloyalty or treason, and I defy any man to make treason, disloyalty or disrespect out of it. It stands before the intelligence of the empire, and it speaks for itself. I feel proud of it, and I am prepared to reiterate every word it contains. There has been no change of the opinions of the people in regard to Confederation. I meet men day after day, of all classes and all creeds, I speak to them in familiar intercourse, and I receive letters from all parts of the Province; but from the time of the last election up to the present moment, I never yet met the man who has changed from being in opposition to Confederation and become an advocate of the Quebec Scheme. True, the strong declarations of the Imperial Government have produced an effect upon the minds of some parties in the Province. We declare we are willing and anxious to meet and carry out the views of the British Government so far as is consistent with our interest; but this Quebec Scheme, the more we reflect upon it, the more we feel it will bring ruin and destruction upon the Province. It is said that you, the people of New Brunswick, must abandon everything—sacrifice your independence—throw away your property, and place yourselves completely under the control of Canada, because Mr. Cardwell says you ought to do so. That would be an unreasonable, slavish loyalty. We say we object to that scheme, more particularly in the principle of representation by population; but we are told that the people of Upper Canada have fought for that for twenty-five years, and they will never give it up. Some people say they object to the federal principle; but the people of Lower Canada say they can only be protected by that, and they never will consent to any other scheme. All our objections go for nothing; we must consent to anything Upper or Lower Canada may demand. They may refuse to consent to this or that, but if we refuse to accept any of the terms which they choose to give us, we are denounced as being disloyal. Will such arguments as that be accepted by the people of this country. That Memorandum has been one of the chief charges against the Government, and I have shown how disgraceful those charges are. They have charged the Government with being in my hand as