

which were elected by "men of property," and therefore, in my opinion, to be members of the Federal Council, have more than any, the Government of Canada, which has nothing about the Island, and cared less.

Hon. Sir GENERAL. The hon. member himself has laid down the principle that the members of Council should possess a property qualification, not real and personal estate, as was placed in the Constitution at the suggestion of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He showed that, if it was confined to freehold, it would not be fair, because many tenants on the Island were well qualified as freeholders. When he threw out that suggestion the other Island Delegates were in favor of it; and it should be remembered that they were to be chosen by the Federal Government, not by the Canadian Government. If members of the House and the people would look upon it independently of party views, and if they were asked, whether they would have them chosen from the Council or have the whole Island to choose from, I believe nine-tenths would pronounce in favor of the mode adopted in the Report.

Mr. DUNBAR. I was not opposed to a property qualification, either real or personal; but I said, and I think it is very strange, that they should be taken from the Council in the other Provinces, and this Island be made an exception. The views of both parties were to be respected; but it is very possible that they had little prospect of finding persons favorable to their views on the Council of this Island. Whatever it was, I hope it will never be put to the test; for I hope we will never have more to do with them in that way than we have at present.

Hon. J. C. POPE. It is not my intention to occupy the attention of the Committee for any length of time; but, regarding the remarks made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I must object to the principle that some members of the Government disagreeing with others, should resign. On the contrary, I think they should state their views on this great question freely and independently. We know that the hon. member agreed to the Report of the Delegates at Quebec, as well as members of the Government. Therefore, having been assented to by both sides, it could scarcely be expected that it would be brought down as a Government measure; and suppose it had, there is a majority in the Government opposed to the Quebec scheme, who do not think that Prince Edward Island should go into Confederation with Canada. And how is a Government to be carried on in the country? Suppose some members favorable to Confederation should resign—the Leader of the Opposition was favorable to it himself, and how would a Government be formed? Under all the circumstances, I do not think a resignation was called for, and it was so understood when Resolutions were introduced by myself last year. It was plainly stated that it was a free and open question, and that members could do as they thought proper. Allusion has been made to some pressure brought to bear upon the Government.

Hon. Mr. COLES. I only repeated what the hon. the Solicitor General said.

Hon. J. C. POPE. I do not acknowledge a pressure from any quarter so long as I represent the views of the people and the majority of the Legislature. If a pressure was brought to bear upon me, I would not hold the position which I occupy to-day. If the question were put to me I would, perhaps, say the Resolutions are stronger than I desire, but at the same time, there is a possibility at present to make them strong, so that there can be no possibility of

withdrawing what the views of the Legislature are. I have been told that Confederation could not be carried without an appeal to the people. In Nova Scotia, it was submitted to the people. In two or three places where elections were held, the friends of the Scheme were rejected; but now there are Delegates to be sent to England in strength, a Delegation of Confederation, and that Scheme is the Quebec Scheme. It would be useless for a hundred Delegates. This Island is so small in comparison with Canada and the other Provinces, that they would have no influence beyond the proportionate extent of country they would represent. I have seen the Governor of New Brunswick has taken an interest in the cause. The Quebec Scheme was rejected in the polls; and how could the Governor carry on the business of the country with a Government opposed to the wishes of the people? Therefore, it belongs this House to pass strong Resolutions than it would; perhaps, otherwise not, because I do think that if Nova Scotia and New Brunswick join the Union, this Island must, sooner or later, go into it. At the same time we will not be told by the British Government that we must go in, but a pressure will be brought to bear upon us, and we will be made to feel that it will be for our own interest to go in. The reason the Resolutions were made as strong was that a large majority might support them, for if they were not strong, while there is such a strong feeling in the House and in the country, stronger Resolutions would be introduced, and parties would be split up. One or two more, perhaps, may declare in favor of Confederation than voted for it last year; but the course pursued by the Colonial Secretary last year was such that members were deterred from voting on the abstract question of a Union of the Colonies. I dare say some will be prepared to vote against the Resolutions; but as I believe that ninety-nine out of every hundred of the people are against Confederation, I think we, as their representatives, are bound to represent or express their views, even though the matter has not been submitted to them at an election. And as to the Government not being composed of members who are all favorable to the Quebec Scheme, if so, the Leader of the Opposition would support the Government; and we would have no Opposition at all. Now there are two or three points in that Scheme which I particularly object to, though I do not intend to go into the details. Representation by population is not fair as regards this country. Where there are large towns there are not so many different interests as there are in a country like this. Therefore, I do not believe in it as a principle. It is not favorably looked upon by reformers of the present day. Even Earl Russell does not believe in representation by population. As was said here last year, by that noble Lord, would have more representatives than Scotland, if I had asked as a delegate when the delegates from Canada were here, and when they laid it down that they would not entertain the question at all, unless representation by population were accepted, I would stopped there and said so. I will not agree to it and I blame the Leader of the Opposition and those other delegates who agreed to it. They should not have done so; for it is one of the strongest objections to that scheme. The Solicitor General says he was opposed to Legislative Union; but in my opinion, that is the proper Union for us to have if we choose. If we have a Parliament in Canada, what do we want with a Governor and Legislative Council and House of Assembly here? It is considered the next thing to a "farther north." We are looked upon as too small to have a Government and Legislature. The thing would be absurd. If the Colonies were confederated, and we had our local Legislature, you would not get a man of intelligence and independence to come