

calling the attention of the House to several provisions in the Quebec Scheme, and state my objections to them; whether it will have any influence upon the Delegates I know not; but first let us hear what are the opinion of Canadian statesmen on this Scheme, and how far the people of this country may expect concessions, and get better terms than those contained in the Scheme.—Mr. D'Arcy McGee in describing the Scheme. (Mr. Tilley, When) When the Parliament of Canada approved of the Scheme, and asked Her Majesty to bring it into effect by Imperial Legislation. (Mr. Smith then quoted from speeches delivered by Messrs. D'Arcy McGee and John McDonald, to show the Scheme was unalterable.) We have also the testimony of Mr. Brown, and Mr. Galt that it cannot be altered. When Mr. Allan and I were in England Mr. Cardwell intimated that some alterations might take place. We asked him could representation by population be altered? No. Could the representation in the Legislative Council be altered? No. Could the provision of eighty cents per head be altered? No. Thus we found no material part of the Scheme could be changed, and any delegation which goes home will have to accept the Quebec Scheme in its entirety, unless they receive instructions from the people of the country. If they go there clothed with restrictive power, which says you may go to a certain extent and no farther; then, when the Canadian Delegates know that they cannot deviate from the letter of their instructions, they may consent to some alterations.

The debate was then adjourned until to-morrow. Mr. Smith to resume at half-past nine.

The House then went into Committee on "A Bill relating to the administration of Justice in Equity," which created some discussion, when progress was reported and leave asked to sit again.

The House was then adjourned until 9 a. m. to-morrow.

T. F. D.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29th.

The House met pursuant to adjournment at 9 a. m.

A number of Bills received a second reading.

The Bills passed through Committee yesterday were read a third time, and passed the House.

Leave was granted to bring in certain Bills, and petitions were received in support of the same.

Mr. CAIE gave notice of a motion asking for the Correspondence which had taken place on the appointment of Chief Justice Ritchie, and also for all Correspondence which had passed between His

Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, and Mr. Justice Wilnot on the same subject.

Mr. SMITH asked if it was the intention of the Government to submit the correspondence which had taken place between His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, and His late Council, with respect to their resignation. Without decision.

HON. MR. TILLEY would give an answer to-morrow.

Mr. CAIE asked for the suspension of the rule, so that he might have leave to bring in a Bill to erect a portion of the Parish of Wellington in the County of Kent, into a separate town or Parish. He had filed the certificate of publication with the Clerk of the House at last session, and was prepared to bring in a Bill, but having received an intimation that a petition would be forwarded against the Bill, he had withheld it till he was too late to bring it in, on account of the prorogation. On enquiry he found that the Clerk had lost or mislaid the certificate, and unless the rule was suspended he would be precluded from bringing in the Bill this Session. He was now prepared to submit the petition against the passage of the Bill as soon as it was read a first time.

Several members opposed the suspension of the rule on the ground that it was a matter of no immediate importance, and as there was a petition against it, it was evident the matter was not considered by the people necessary to be hastily carried. The rule however, was suspended and leave granted, when the Bill was read a first time and the petition presented.

Mr. JOHNSON moved a rider to the Bill relating to offences against the army and navy, on its third reading; to the effect that nothing in said Act should be construed to affect any action now in progress under the old Act, or to affect the penalty already adjudged to such offenders.

At 10 o'clock the order of the day was taken up.

DELEGATION ON UNION.

Mr. SMITH resumed—I have asked the hon. Provincial Secretary if it is the intention of the Government to submit the Correspondence on resignation of the late Government, and what it means. I do not know, but I am told that he will answer to-morrow. I am aware that I can obtain the papers by motion.

HON. MR. TILLEY—You asked if the Government would submit them without a motion, and I replied that I would give you an answer to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH—Well then, I now ask for an answer from the Attorney General to the question I put to him yesterday, whether any despatches have passed between the Colonial Secretary and His

Excellency relating to the resignation of the late Government, and if they are to be submitted to the House.

HON. MR. FISHER—The Governor only returned from Woodstock last week and I have not yet had him on the subject. I will see him during the day and give the necessary information.

Mr. SMITH—The Government do not appear disposed to be very courteous in their replies to questions for information with regard to public papers, and yet they expect respect to be shown to their wishes in the pushing on of the public business. I suppose I must submit to the explanations they give.

When I closed my remarks yesterday, I stated that I believed that it was most important that the House should have time for the consideration of so important a matter as is involved in the Resolutions before the House. I believe that it is the solemn duty of hon. members to bring their judgments to bear on this great question, and deliberately and calmly arrive at conclusions that will be satisfactory to the people of this Province, I stated yesterday, and again repeat it, that as the matter now stands, and from information which I have obtained, the Quebec Scheme, and that alone, without any alteration, will be decided on as the plan of uniting these Colonies. I ask hon. members around the boards of this House if they are ready to adopt that Scheme? Many of them have been returned by constituencies to support a plan of Union on a new basis: I would ask them if they were sent to pass the Quebec Scheme? Were they sent to go it blind? to leave it entirely in the hands of the delegates to say what the terms of Union should be? Or were they sent here to exercise their judgments in regard to the terms of any new plan that may be submitted? Were they sent here to delegate their power to two or three men who are committed to the terms of the Quebec Scheme? I would ask if hon. members are ready to lay aside their right of judging and passing upon the plan of Union proposed to be adopted? This is what the Government ask us to do; to divest ourselves of our powers of judgment, to delegate all our powers to delegates—we are not told how many—who are to meet delegates from other Provinces in London, and there frame a Scheme binding on this country for all time to come, and the people are to know nothing at all about it. I believe that the majority of the people of this Province are opposed to the Quebec Scheme. It was put before them that new negotiations were to be opened, and they, under this impression, sent men here to see to it that the terms proposed should be such as would be for the interest of the