

am not going to be coerced into giving a vote which I cannot approve. (Hear, hear.) I cannot say whether I will ever be called upon again to represent the county that I now have the honor to represent; whether I do or do not, it is a matter of no consequence to me; but I do say that I will not, under any circumstances, be coerced by the honorable gentleman. He should not forget, however, that his influence in Northumberland is not what he might have anticipated, and that when he thought proper to come down from Toronto, in April last, to oppose the Hon. Solicitor General, when he was contesting the West Riding with a very respectable farmer, that notwithstanding the very powerful speeches of the Hon. President of the Council, the Hon. Solicitor General was returned for that riding by a very large majority. I suppose that, had the Hon. President of the Council anticipated that he was, within two months, to have had a seat in the same Cabinet with the Hon. Solicitor General, he would have acted differently. I myself had a very strong invitation to go up to the West Riding to oppose the Hon. Solicitor General, but I was willing to act upon the principle of returning good for evil. I was quite willing to allow the electors of West Northumberland to choose for themselves whom they would elect for their representative in Parliament; and in regard to the Hon. Solicitor General, I must say that, as far as I can learn, he has discharged the duties of his office with satisfaction to the Government and the people that he represents, and with credit to himself. It is not my intention to give the Government any factious opposition. I will cheerfully support any good measures for the benefit of the country which they may bring forward for our adoption; but I wish the Government to understand, as I do not wish to occupy any doubtful position in this House, I am no supporter of theirs, and if a vote of want of confidence is at any time proposed, I am prepared to vote against them. (Hear, hear.)

MR. JACKSON—I think it right to say a few words on this question before the vote is taken; but at this late hour, I will not detain the House very long. The subject has been discussed from various points of view. In the early part of the debate, one gentleman, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), objected to the scheme mainly on the ground that it approximated too closely to a legislative union, and that it

would interfere with the privileges which the parties to the union exercise in their respective localities; and if I remember rightly, he said that the plan of the Government would have the effect of interfering with the language and religion of Lower Canadians. It occurred to me at the time he was making his speech, that he was taking untenable ground, and I felt grateful then, and I do so now, that that hon. gentleman is not in a position to exercise more power, at this crisis, than an ordinary member of the Legislature. I admire the ability of that honorable gentleman, and I consider it unfortunate that at this important juncture he did not rise above narrow and limited sectional views, and take more statesmanlike ground. (Hear, hear.) Then the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) objected to Confederation from a different point of view, but he arrived at his conclusions from arguments of an entirely different character. Strange to say, he did not regard this with satisfaction, while a legislative union would meet with his approval. He professed to believe that the Maritime Provinces would combine with Lower Canada, and form a union detrimental to the interests of Upper Canada, placing the people there in a worse position than that which they at present occupy with an equality of representation. As he made that remark, I asked him what difference it could make then, whether we had a Federal or a Legislative union, which he professes to admire, as it would have charge of all the important general interests. His answer convinced me that there was nothing to support his argument. It seemed to me that he took too much for granted in assuming that there would be a union between Lower Canada and the Maritime Provinces as against Upper Canada. It is hardly to be conceived that gentlemen called together for the performance of certain high purposes would attempt to do an injury to one part of the country over another. (Hear, hear.) If such a sectional alliance was possible, it would be much more likely that the union would be formed with Upper Canada, inasmuch as that part of the proposed Confederacy has a much larger aggregate business than any or either of the other separate sections. But I will not dwell upon this, as it appears to me to carry with it its own refutation. This principal reason for opposing this scheme is, I think, founded on the fact that the hon. gentlemen now united together in