

the delegates: some of these instructions suit my mind and they ought to be given them, but not given in the way provided for by this resolution. I stated on Friday last that I would give the delegates certain instructions to be a guide to them so far as they could be guided, but I would not go for making them positive, but would leave them a margin to act upon. Having heard the opinion of the House, and knowing that if the delegates went to England fettered by instructions which they could not deviate from either in the letter or in the spirit, I did not wish to give them specific instructions, unless I knew that what they had been instructed to procure could be obtained. It has been said I was for giving them positive instructions; in this I have been misunderstood. I was for having those instructions presented in the form of suggestions in order that they might be informed of what the House wished, and they would have a discretionary power to act. In regard to my position upon this Quebec Scheme, and the position I have taken before this Legislature, I have heard it remarked here and have seen it stated in the public prints, that if I held the views that I enunciated here I ought to have announced them before the last election or not announced them now. I dissent from that view for this reason. I stated here on Friday that I was so much in favor of Confederation that I would agree to give this power to the delegates, and would agree to be bound by what they should decide upon, but I claimed the right to discuss the matter and give the delegates certain instructions. We are not sent here bound to accept the Quebec Scheme, but we were sent here to deliberate upon the best Scheme that could be devised in order to secure Confederation, having been so returned to deliberate and discuss the measure, I claim the right, and I think it is the duty of the representatives here to go generally into the matter, and to be heard pro and con in order that the best views might be elicited upon the question. When the delegates met in 1864 they had the advantage of discussing the question with closed doors, and they could express their views some one way and some another, and only the result of their deliberations was made known to the country, but here the telegraphs carry the news over the country almost from our lips, therefore we stand in a worse position than the delegates did. When I urged my proposition upon the Legislature, and made my objections, I was telegraphed over the country as if I was opposed to all Confederation. I was set down as being an Anti-Confederate, notwithstanding that I stated that it did

not require Fenianism to carry Confederation, but was carried by its own merits. Stronger language could not have been used, but notwithstanding that strong language had been used, I have been misunderstood, as bringing those remarks as a side-wind to kill Confederation. It is a serious thing to have my motives so impugned after running an election so recently upon this question, and it is calculated to do me the greatest injury. My motives have not been understood in my proposition for discussing this question. The question of Confederation had been affirmed at the polls, and the people had declared they were in favor of the principle. They sent representatives here in order to deliberate fully upon the matter. I made those objections at that time in order that the delegates might consider them. I wish to be understood. I state here the second time that no man in the country is more in favor of Confederation than I am. In season and out of season since the first election I have contended for it, in every position, and shall it be said now that I wish to procrastinate the question in order to defeat it. I said I was so strongly in favor of Confederation that I was willing to sink all other things. The question of Confederation being entirely out of danger, I claim yet we have the right to discuss it, and make suggestions, and talk the matter over, in order that the delegates may know wherein the Scheme is considered deficient by the members of the Legislature. In regard to the resolutions before the House; the first says that each Province shall have an equal number of Legislative Councilors. I would be content with having two added to Nova Scotia and two to New Brunswick, thus making the two Provinces together equal with either of the Canadas. This is a suggestion for an improvement in the Quebec Scheme, and because I make this suggestion should I be branded as having run an election upon false pretences. I contend here for the right of discussion. I know there are other hon. members who think it would be better not to discuss it. I do not say they are not correct, but I take the other view, and say we have a right to discuss it, and for so doing I should not be said to oppose it. I spoke of the representation in the Senate of the United States, and said that each State sent an equal number of representatives, and then I threw in a suggestion saying that inasmuch as those States are represented equally in the Senate, would it not be worth considering when the delegates come to deliberate upon the Scheme, whether or not we should have a more extended representation in the Upper House. The fourth

resolution I am entirely in favor of, that is the establishment of a Court for the determination of questions and disputes that may arise between the Federal and Local Governments as to the meaning of the Act of Union. If I were a delegate I would ask that this fourth resolution be adopted, and I would struggle for it, but if I could not get it and the Scheme would be endangered by struggling, I would prefer a Scheme without it. Then the sixth resolution providing that 80 cents per head be on the population as it increases and not to be confined to the census of 1861, meets with my entire concurrence, and I would press it upon all concerned, but would not make it *a sine quo non*. Some of my hon. friends' resolutions I would like to see carried out in the Conference, but I would not put them as positive instructions not to be deviated from. After my speech on Friday last, some of the hon. members in the House said, and it has been circulated over the country, that just previous to making my speech I had an interview with the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Smith) in the Speaker's room, and on account of that interview I made the speech I did. I do not know what put that in their minds. We are on the best of terms, but as long as I have been in public life I have never agreed with his public policy at all, but this had never affected our personal intercourse. He had no more idea of what I was going to say than a man on the other side of the universe. I do not know to what extent those insinuations have gone, but I know how damaging they are against any man holding a public situation. I am glad to have had an opportunity of setting these matters right, and maintaining my position before the country. I saw it stated in one of the newspapers that I sustained the resolution of the Government because I was elected to sustain it, but I sustained it against my own convictions. That is a misrepresentation. I sustained Confederation from convictions of my own, and my mind was made up after mature deliberation. I came here to see that nothing should be done to retard Confederation. I came to consider upon what terms we should enter into Union, and I will sustain the principle that we should discuss this question in order that we might agree upon the best Scheme to be adopted; having discharged that duty independent and fearless, if I am still to be misrepresented, I cannot help it; but such is the position I occupy.

Mr. JOHNSON—I thought when the question for appointing delegates was before the House that it had been so fully discussed that it was unnecessary for me to take up the time of the Session in speaking upon it. In regard to this re-