

Mr. MORTIMER. I think it would be better if the hon. member from Georgetown (Mr. Hayland) would propound some feasible scheme of Union than to work himself into such a flaring passion. It is a very bad sign of a man when his advocates lose their temper. Indeed the advocates of Confederation appear to be very thin-skinned. I never accused them of being bribed, but I have no doubt but they may have seen something looting in the database which dazzled their eyes. I do not say it was gold; perhaps it was something else. I suppose those gentlemen who sold Ireland for £600,000 were just as sensitive touching their personal honor as the gentlemen who held the floor at Quebec. The Hon. Sol. General made allusion to the stand the Catholic Bishops have taken, but I do not believe they understood the situation of the question; and if they think to get us bound to Canada, they are mistaken. The people who hunted the Prince of Wales from town to town as if he was a wild beast escaped from a menagerie, are not the people with whom they would be willing to be united. I wish the advocates of Union had propounded some scheme instead of scolding us; and, as they have not done so, I still adhere to the opinion I expressed yesterday.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN. In reply to the Hon. Sol. General, I would say that when I was young there were very few public schools, and when he was going to school, I was probably looking the plough or working in a shipyard. I do not pretend to be able to use very elegant language, but if I can make people understand me, that is all I want. Though I have not had a liberal education, yet I have some natural ability. Nature has not been so niggardly to me that I have not been able to provide for myself; and I did not need the help of a father to set me a-going. I feel the want of education—I do not deny it; but I would call the attention of the House to the amendment which says—“The House believes that a plan of Confederation might be so planned as not to involve the sacrifice of any material interests on the part of any Province.” Now, if that is the case, who is the party to frame it? I know the gentleman who drew up that Resolution has had a good education, and he has drawn it up to a very nice point. Perhaps he will not deny that there is some price in the distance. The Resolution implies that it is possible to frame some plan of Union which would be acceptable to the people, and if we make that admission, just when the House is voting, it will be an excuse for appointing a Delegation. I believe the man who votes for that resolution votes for a Union of some sort, and he must do so either ignorantly or intentionally.

Hon. SOL GENERAL. I must reply to the hon. member from Murray Harbour again. He says that if we agree to this amendment we will be selling the rights of the people—that the Governor will be bound to appoint a Delegation to Downing Street. Do we not know that Governors who come out here have previously served an apprenticeship in the House of Commons? And if one should come here who is a stranger, would we not enquire if a majority in the Legislature would support a delegation? If not, he would say we could not appoint one. The hon. member has made a great blow off respecting his position, which he has obtained altogether in consequence of his own merits. He has thrown out an insinuation—and I take his challenge—that I hold my position in consequence of the assistance of my father. I say, before this House and the country, that I owe nothing to my father as regards my political or pecuniary position. Though I have a father who is well off, he has kept his money to himself, and left me to fight my own battles. The hon. member boasts that his talent has placed him where he is; but what I produce is my own, and free from outside influence. What I present against is, that members of the House do not announce their own views, but are placed in their hands by back-street influence outside of the Legislature. This I say deliberately, and hon. members are at liberty to take the constitutional course re-

have to the statement I have made. But I am not going to stuff myself with regard to this question. It is my interest to advocate what I consider to be for the interest of the Colony. I have three sons and three daughters who were born here, and that shows that it is not a hidden matter of moonshine with me. Hon. members may say what they like about gold, but let them prove their base insinuations.

Mr. HOWLAND. No member used the word “gold.”

Hon. SOL GENERAL. I say it was used.

Mr. HOWLAND. If any person used it, it was the hon. member from St. Peter's.

Hon. SOL GENERAL. I have heard a member of this House use it outside of these walls.

Mr. HOWLAND. We should not say anything here about assertions made outside.

Hon. SOL GENERAL. It is my firm belief that it has been used, but if the majority say it was not, I will bow to their decision, yet I will not bow to the individual opinions of the hon. member from Coquitlam. The hon. member from the East Point may say that I speak in an excited manner on this subject, but when I hear the hon. member from Murray Harbour (Mr. Duncan) attempt to put a construction upon the Resolution which it will not bear, I must speak as I have done. And when it says that no action should be taken till an appeal is made to the people, and he says that it will authorize the appointment of a Delegation—that the country may be sold—and such like assertions, I say he does not understand the Resolution, and he must believe that every man in the Government is as corrupt as he can be.

Mr. HANSEN. I think such insinuations are quite uncalled for, and are highly improper. I have heard the term “Canadian gold” used, but I cannot believe that any hon. member of this House would be so corrupt as to accept a bribe to sell his country.

Mr. DUNCAN. I said that if the Government would not do so, others would.

Hon. Col. GRAY. The hon. member from Murray Harbour (Mr. Duncan) insinuated a great deal, such as a member by his vote being guilty of treason to his constituency. What does he mean by treason? If a gentleman goes down to a constituency at the request of another, and that gentleman turns round and throws out a groundless insinuation against the gentleman who supported him, what connection does that have with treason? Or will he say how far my supporting the amendment will be treason to my constituency?

Mr. DUNCAN. I do not know what the hon. and gallant Col. means unless it is that he returned us to the House of Assembly. I so, I was not aware of it, and if it is the case, I must thank him, not my constituency; but they did not give me to understand that they were voting for Col. Gray. I thought they were voting for James Duncan. I am still of opinion, that if we pass the amendment, the Governor will have it in his power to send a Delegation to Downing Street.

Hon. J. C. POPE. He can do that at any time.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Should we vote for the amendment would it not be voting in favour of Confederation?

Hon. Sol. GENERAL. We want no action taken till it is decided at the polls, and no action to bind the Colony would be proper without an appeal to the people. If the hon. member would read the Resolution carefully, I think he would form the same opinion.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have read the Resolution carefully, and the opinion I have formed is that it is adopted. This House will be voting in favour of Confederation.

Hon. Sol. GENERAL. It merely admits that practicable union could be devised, and it is impossible to lay down the principle, that no terms could be devised, which would be beneficial to this Colony. We admit that such terms could be devised, but in consequence of the extraordinary feeling in the country against Confederation, it would be injudicious to go on a matter till after a general election.