

here and go through the force of legislation. The Island would divide down to the position of a small cotten bottom. These are two of the strongest objections I have to the Quebec Scheme. I do not find fault with gentlemen for adhering to what they agreed to in Canada; but I do not think it was fair for the Canadians to come here and say "We will not entertain the question unless you acknowledge this principle." The Leader of the Opposition said he would rather see the middle paragraph struck out of his Resolutions. So would I; but I said they were here for the House to deal with them, as it thought proper. The Resolution says:—

"This House cannot admit that a Federal Union of the North American Colonies, that would include Prince Edward Island, could ever be accomplished upon terms that would prove advantageous to the interests and well-being of the people of this Island; out of and separated as it is, and must ever remain, from the neighboring Provinces, by an insurmountable barrier of ice for many months in the year; and this House deems it to be its sacred and imperative duty to declare and record its conviction, as it now does, that any Federal Union of the North American Colonies, that would include Prince Edward Island, would be as hostile to the feelings and wishes, as it would be opposed to the best and most vital interests of its people."

Now, that is the strong part of the Resolutions; but what is meant is that we presume that no terms could be got from the Canadians, that would be just and acceptable to the people of this Island. But once make an admission that we are favorable to a Union any way, it is a probability of our being dragged into it in such a way that we could not well extricate ourselves from it. As I believe these Resolutions represent the views of the majority of the people, I have, so far, very little objection to them. I am prepared to vote for them as they are; and, if the House should choose to strike out the middle paragraph, I would care very little about it. The Resolutions of last year were strong, and the first Resolution yet, because all that is required to confirm them; which, for me, would have been strong enough. I said, Sir, on rising, that I did not intend to prolong the debate, and it may be considered presumption in me to criticize the amendment of the hon. member for St. Peter's (Mr. Whelan); but I do not think I can give him credit for it being a very able and straightforward Resolution. It says:

"Resolved, as the opinion of this House, that the Confederation of Her Majesty's American Colonist possessions would be—while in conformity with Her Majesty's frequently expressed desire—beneficial to their welfare, separately and collectively. . . . But inasmuch as the people of Prince Edward Island do not appear to be prepared to regard with any favor the project of Confederation, it is unnecessary to press it upon public attention, as the discussion is only calculated to produce excitement and apprehension, without a reasonable cause."

Now, I consider it to be the duty of a representative of the people, if he considers that any measure would be for their benefit to bring it before, and urge it upon them; but to say that although, in his opinion, it would be conducive to the welfare of the people, yet, because they do not think so, it should be pressed, is not a good argument. If I considered any matter to be for the good of the country, I think it would be my duty to advocate it, whether the people were satisfied with it or not; and if he believes his constituency would be benefited by Confederation, he should use every means in his power to bring the people up to it, instead of saying because the people do not think so, he fully to press it. Then if he admits that the people are not in favour of it, the proper way would be to go against Confederation in any shape. I take it, that a gentleman standing here should represent the views of his constituency. If he is satisfied that any measure is for the good of the country, it is his duty to go to the country and stand or fall by it; and if he cannot make the people believe that it is for their interests, he should either keep his opinion in abeyance, or, if he will, let the people choose another who would represent their views.

Hon. Mr. COLES: The Hon. the Leader of the Government said that the Delegation should not have consented to the principle of representation by population. They did not consent to it, for, after the Canadian Delegates came here and stated their case, the first Delegation ceased, and another

was appointed. Therefore, it was for the Government to consent to the matter.

Hon. Col. GRAY: The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition was not present when the Canadian Delegates declared that they would not entertain the question unless the principle of representation according to population were conceded to.

Mr. McLENNAN: It was my intention to have addressed the Committee at an earlier stage of the debate; but as the big guns wished to fire off first, I was prepared to listen to their report, if not to feel their shot; and as the remarks I intended to make have been already expressed, I shall not now detain the House by repeating them.—When the question of the Quebec Scheme was before us last year, I said that anything I might say would not hasten or retard the Union. I am of the same opinion still. Whatever change may have taken place outside, it is evident that there is some change in the members of this House since last year. It is certainly a very important question, and the hon. member for New Glasgow (Mr. Longworth) said, yesterday, that we should be very guarded for it would be legislating for our children's children. That I admit; but at the same time I would not say that there never could be a scheme of Union proposed which would be a benefit to the Island. I have no desire to misrepresent any member of this House; but I believe there are some who are extremely strong anti-confederates; and without doing any injustice to the hon. member for Murray Harbour (Mr. Duncan) I believe he would bid his children and children's children never to take any action in Confederation; but I have no desire to do that. I stand here as the representative of an independent, progressive and intelligent constituency as there is on the Island; but I have no desire to bind them, or their children, not to go for Confederation. The hon. and learned member for Charlottetown (Hon. Mr. Brecken) said, yesterday, that the British Government was determined to carry Confederation. If so, anything I can say will not prevent it. It is at the same time admitted that we would be in a great deal stronger if we were united. I was glad to hear him say so, for I am of the same opinion. I would be satisfied to remain as we are, if the other Colonies would do so. I believe we have progressed, according to our means and resources, as much as the other Colonies for the last few years; but, if they will unite, the great question for us to consider will be, whether we will go with them or remain as we are? I want to leave it an open question, and, for that reason, I will support the amendment introduced by the hon. member from St. Peter's (Mr. Whelan). Many things have been said about bribery; that those in favor of Confederation are bribed; as well might we say that those against it are bribed. I believe that those in the other Provinces who have the most means are against Confederation, and why would not they be as likely to use bribery as those who are in favor of it. I consider the conduct of the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, to be as inconsistent as that of any member of this House; and, in fact, I believe it is getting like the land question. I did not think, when the Conference was held at Quebec that this question would be settled in such a short time. We hear some members express some very extraordinary ideas. The hon. member from the East (Mr. McGehee) would tell the British Government to take away our Constitution. And then it is said we will show our loyalty by placing the whole Revenue at the disposal of the Government. What would our whole Revenue do towards defending us, if the British Government should cast us off? We acknowledge Great Britain as our parent, and we know that parents, when their children disobey, will cast them off; so will she do with us. If I were to support the Resolutions of the hon. the Leader of the Government, I believe I would be advancing or advocating Confederation more strongly than in supporting the amendment. We are not going to say to the Mother Country "We will not listen to your suggestions." We are not going to say "They may withdraw all their troops, but then see how loyal we are!" What would our whole revenue do? It would not equip and command one good gun boat. We talk about our Militia and Volunteers. I spent some time in connection with the vol-