

THE NEWFOUNDLANDER.

people would not effect what we cannot. Any one who read the debates upon this question in the Imperial Parliament must be struck with the entire ignorance of the subject evinced by those who took part in that debate. We actually found a Minister of the Crown saying that there should be mutual concessions, that we should concede to the French the right of fishing all along our coast. Did not all about this matter? He considered that it was a first subject of complaint that when we sent petitions to the Imperial Government, we should receive no reply—He knew that it was the usual course to send a reply in such cases; and upon a matter of such vital importance he thought it was right for us to express our views contained in the amendment.

The original motion was then put and carried, on a division;

The Committee then rose and reported progress. To sit again on Thursday.

The House adjourned till Thursday at 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY, Feb. 11.

The House met at 3 o'clock, pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Mr. GODDEN, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, on the further consideration of the Address in reply to the speech His Excellency, Mr. KNIGHT in the Chair.

A motion of Mr. GODDEN, the fifth section of the Address was read as follows:

"We fully concur with your Excellency that the time has now arrived for us to take action on the great question of Confederation; and we can assure your Excellency that we shall give our earnest attention to the consideration of our Union with the Dominion of Canada, on such fair and equitable terms as may be calculated to serve the interests of the Colony, be approved of by the Government of Dominion, and which we trust may prove acceptable to all classes of the people, when submitted to the constituents, and also receive the approval and ratification of Her Majesty."

Mr. TALBOT did not understand the section had just been read, and thought it was involved in a good deal of mystery. It was very desirable such a matter should not be misunderstood, did not agree that the time had arrived, and did not think it was well to say so. It is to be said that time has arrived, it must have reference to some agreement to the fact that it was stated that action had been taken at some future time, which time is now arrived. But Mr. T. was not aware that such had ever been said. If he understood the language of the hon. and learned Attorney General, time could arrive to this present House, for the first time, in the first place, to be referred to the people, who were to be asked if they approved of the Union. It had not been put before the people that light, or in any way beyond that general view which was given by candidates, who in fact themselves to nothing, and led people to believe that it was a mere question spoken of and passed speculatively. If this section be accepted, it would appear to him, assert which was not true. The elections were approaching, and so it might be said that the election when the people should be asked their approval of the principle. After that

House could meet and state certain conditions, and these conditions could be again referred to people, he thought that would be the proper time to act, or at least that it would be in accordance with the general understanding of hon. and learned Attorney General's proposal. His paragraph be passed, it will be an agreement for the consideration of the conditions, which would be a strong presumption of a pre-approval of the principle. The wording of the paragraph was not clear, and if it be decided that the House should affirm the principle, it ought to be so expressed in clear and definite language. Two years ago, the Government attempted by a clause in the address to the principle, but the House refused, and some consideration and difficulty, amongst gentlemen opposite, the clause was withdrawn, and one of a doubtful character substituted, that it was said the substituted clause used the principle, and the present Judge Ward, who then represented Harbor Grace, gave a great row about it, and said that he for did not intend to affix the principle at all. The House now asked to affirm that principle. If we look at this paragraph, and ask if it be the case, we are met by a confusion of which neither says yes nor no. It certainly is an affirmation of the principle. That is an advance towards its affirmation. What is the next? None inhere, but now we concur that time to take action. The first step should affix the principle, and that that be done and conditions cannot be considered. Why distinctly that this time had come for the action of the principle and consideration of it? The section implied that affirmation, but without a manner that it did not meet illus' approval, and he would be very sorry to do it. There is a loophole left here for the members of the Government, by which they may right by the neck, and bound as they pass. They are now asked to wheel about like lions, and say to-day what they refused to say a day ago. That was not treating them properly. Their attention should be directed to the point, and they should not be asked to do with their eyes banded. For himself, Mr. T. did not affix the principle at all. He had reflected upon it and seen of it, he clearly opposed to the principle, and did not see the Union would, under all its circumstances, coincide, and they then knew what Union and under what leading principles they did. If the Union had not taken place, it still in embryo, and they did not see it, there might be a doubt as to whether the cause was good or not. But now that the Union was established, the question was—is the of that Union such as they could approve? Mr. T. said it was not. No matter what the propose, they cannot deviate from the principles on which the Colonies are founded, and the Mr. T. did not approve principles, and did not see what advantage a Union could be to the country. It does not make us better off, because from the things, it was impossible it could. What meaning of this Confederation? Remove glare and glitter, and what was its naked? Just this, that by our own act we give absolute power and control over our over our liberties, and prosperity and . That is the exact meaning of Confed-

Tion. Throw what dust you like about it, put the glittering colors you choose, but like reality, and that is what it means. He thinks, because after the Union was established, they would have no liberty to rule themselves, and could make no laws without the satis-

sition of the Dominion; property, because the Dominion Parliament could tax them internally and externally, to any amount they pleased; lives, because the same power could take our people when they pleased and use their lives for their own purposes. Such was Confederation. It would be a very nice thing to congratulate themselves on it, but he (Mr. T.) did not think the people would be content with it. Was it wise or advisable to yield up their right to legislate for themselves, to place their property at the mercy of a foreign power, to tax as they pleased, to submit their lives to the men from 18 to 60 years of age, to repel any attempts made upon them by the great Republic? Of course, the dust will be raised and the picture painted, and they would be told that though what he said in light of Confederation, per se, yet we would derive advantages from it which would counterbalance all of it; that new channels of trade will be opened, and the country raised in the scale of civilization, that agriculture will be awakened, and blood in all the luxuriance it exhibits in the other Provinces. He (Mr. T.) could not understand how Confederation was going to effect all this, and did not believe that the Contingent rates themselves really understood it either. Would Canada bind herself on your parchment agreement to promote our commerce, agriculture and manufactures? No, she could not do it, for remember the law is already passed; Confederation established, and she cannot give more than has been already arranged amongst themselves. All the arguments advanced to prove the advantages of Confederation had reference to Commercial treaties and arrangements, and had nothing at all to do with the political aspect of the question. If trade were to be benefited by an equal tariff, it could be done by some Commercial arrangements. If our mines were to be worked, it would be done by the capitalists and not by politicians; and they would work them; not because we were confederated, but because they would be profitable. It will be said that if we confederate we will have our bread flour, pork, &c., free of duty. That was a plausible argument. It certainly was strange that in all these arguments the political question was mixed up with commercial matters. The real question was blotted, so as to throw dust in the eyes of the people. These articles could be made duty free by commercial regulations, without Confederation. Such was the case before, and why should it not be again? He (Mr. T.) wanted to show the knick by which the supporters of Confederation attempted to blindfold the people. They keep the political question in the background, and drag forward a very different matter, that is the question of commercial arrangements. It appeared very strange to him, but perhaps it was because he was innocent and not up to the tricks, the labyrinthine wisdom which sometimes maze one. That House had in itself the power to admit bread, pork, flour, &c., free of duty, but it would be said the country was in debt, and could not afford it. He (Mr. T.) replied, let us retrench, reduce the expenditure, and so be able to strike off these vices. Another argument was that without Confederation we can't have reciprocity. Why not? What is reciprocity? It simply means the mutual exemption from duties of articles the peculiar produce of particular countries, on mutual terms. Was it not in our power to make such terms now? To be sure it was. Then what had Confederation to do with reciprocity? It was a separate matter, which should be tried on its own merits, and not mixed up with the question of Confederation. Politically, Confederation meant only that Canada should have the absolute control of the liberty, the property and the lives of the people of this Colony, as challenged in detail of that. That was not what Confederation meant, then he was ignorant of its meaning. He (Mr. T.) could see the truth though. We must, it seems, have Confederation; without it we can't get on at all. We are in such a crippled state that unless some other country comes, and in mercy picks us up, we are gone; for we cannot exist by ourselves. But this argument upsets the other argument, for it goes to show that the great good of Confederation will be to save us from ourselves. It never appears to occur to hon. gentlemen that any other mode of governing the country could be devised, but that which they themselves adopted, and have pursued for the past four years, which was to make a great many offices, and fill them with a great many people, and make large salaries for them, and then, in order to get these salaries, put on heavy taxes on bread, flour, pork, &c., and then, because that does not succeed, we must confederate, as the country cannot be ruled by its own people, but depend upon it they will not suffer such to be done. The people value liberty, and do not then sell it for a mess of poise. He feared that he already trespassed too long upon the House. His desire was to show that we should not adopt the section as it stood. Its language was too vague. If we adopt it, we adopt the principle of Confederation. This the Government could not do without believing their former pledges to the country; with this view, then he would put forward the following amendment:

"That the only terms upon which we have been asked to go into Confederation are those of the Quebec resolutions, which have been rejected by the House and the country. We therefore submit that in accordance with the pledge given by the Premier, no further action be taken until the principle of Confederation be submitted to the people."

ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The gentleman on the other side of the House, known as Her Majesty's Opposition, had just put their best leg foremost, and had selected their man to make a speech upon this occasion. That hon. gentleman was certainly not a bad actor. He was able to take his part in a play with most men. He had a good deal of the comic element in his nature. He (A. G.) was led to believe that the speech which had just been delivered had been recently recited before the whole party, and unanimously approved of by them. That special notice had been given that he was selected to play this part; there had been a full attendance, and the recitation had been deemed excellent. It was received with wonder and admiration, that any man could express all these pretty things which the hon. member undertook to do. Their advice to him had been, whatever you do, don't indulge in argument, because you know we hon. members of the West end have already committed ourselves to an opinion upon the matter. Draw of their attention from that. Be as logical as you can, and if you only succeed in drawing off the attention of the Government from that, we may be able yet to outwit them and possibly leap into their seats. But he (A. G.) would inform them that they would find their mistake. The Government thoroughly understood and was prepared for them, but hardly appreciated soundly of their tactics. His observations were too transparent to succeed in influencing the mind of any man, or to carry any weight with them. He (A. G.) found a difficulty in meeting the observations of the hon. member, because he did in doing so he was only buffeting with the wind. If the hon. member had put forth any facts or given us any data, he (A. G.) could easily meet him. The hon. member however, had failed to do that, and had merely indulged in a lot of clap-trap and in some old Irish songs, and thinks that such a serious and important matter of this kind should be turned off by a proceeding only worthy of men sitting down over a glass of beer. He (A. G.) had been a little surprised because he had not before been aware of the versatility of the hon. member. If the object of the hon. member was merely to excite mirth, his success had been very indifferent. But more that one old song was required in the discussion of so important a subject as the present. One could imagine that the hon. member had entertained a hatred for Confederation during his whole life, that he had never expressed an opinion favorable to it, and that what he now says must carry conviction to every unwilling mind. He was playing his part so that he might if possible get into power and enjoy some of the sweets and emoluments of office. He was trying a popularity dodge. He says "will you give up your liberty, your lives, and property to Canada?" Why one would fancy from such expressions that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Canada, had no liberty, no property, and no lives? The hon. member must recollect that long before we had Responsible Government, that hon. member had been conferred upon Canada, that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had also received it before us, and yet one would fancy from the argument of the hon. member that they had given up everything that Britons valued, and when these Colonies had Confederated and were impressed that it was for their interest and good, could we have

any doubt upon our minds that we would enjoy with them the same benefits and advantages which they at present possess? Why, what was the object of Confederation? Was it not the consolidation and strengthening of British interests? Was it not the consolidation of liberty itself? Here when disunited, each separate Parliament was making laws adverse to the interests of each other. We had different tariffs, a different currency, different laws, yet all expressing to be governed by the constitution of Great Britain. This then was seen and with one desire we met together in full liberty and freedom to prepare a measure which had been commanded by British statesmen on all sides and as having emanated from enlightened men and statesmen. When that measure went before the British Parliament, was it advocated only by one side? All—whatever you might call them, Radicals, Conservatives, or Whigs, praised and sustained it as a measure which they believed was calculated to advance the prosperity of all the colonies together. Newfoundland has hitherto been isolated from the outer world, and according to the hon. member, it was to remain so. Were we to be cut off from all civilized countries? Were we to stand still or retrograde that we should never enjoy the advantages and progress of civilization? But the hon. member would find that the people would be no longer cajoled by his absurdities uttered here merely for the purpose of being tuned to political purposes on the hustings. Would they prevent the people from having more extended enjoyment, from earning a fair days wages and keeping them within the present narrow area of employment? That may please hon. members opposite, who might chuckle to see the people in the street's unemployed, wretched and starving. Ours says the hon. member, will the Canadian manufacturers for us—who were erecting manufacturers now? Who was giving remunerative labor to the people? Was the hon. member doing it? Would talk do it? Did he believe that we possessed any means to alleviate their distresses or to remove burdensome taxation? Believe it? No! and he never did believe it, and there were no men now in this House more in favour of Confederation, than the hon. member Mr. Talbot and his colleague, Mr. Renouf, and they had recorded their opinions upon the question. These two gifted minds as they styled them to be, were four years ago in favour of Confederation, and in a celebrated address which they published, they had stated their opinions upon the subject. Had they changed since then? Have they had to recant? Have they been converted by the hon. member Mr. Glen? Have they by the hon. member Mr. Hoggart, who all along was in favor of Confederation, and who now says we shall know his opinion at the prime time? What however, did these two gifted minds say? Here was their celebrated letter addressed to the electors of St. John's on the 6th of November 1853, in which they state. "It is true that the principle of amalgamation like that of Confederation, cannot be a subject of controversy. The highest, the most gifted minds acknowledge it." In the details, that is to say in the application of the principle all the danger lies. These highest and most gifted minds acknowledge then that there can be no controversy upon the principle of Confederation. But how we find the hon. member Mr. Talbot getting up and moving a resolution repudiating the doctrine which he paraded in 1853 as the emanation of one of the most enlightened minds either among us or anywhere else. Now what is the question before the chair. That this House will at a proper time take into consideration the details—thus perfectly coinciding with the views of the hon. member. Here in their address they insisted on what should be done, and what we are about to do, and yet now they repudiate their own words. They say "you rejected the question of Confederation." (A. G.) would ask, when? He denied that such had ever been done by this House, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova Scotia was turbulent, and when the amendment of the Solicitor General had been put forward, the hon. member himself conceived it to be in favour of Confederation, and said that it could be viewed in no other light than as an admission of the principle. If so, the question was not rejected, but confirmed, and this the hon. member admitted at the time. Again he says, we, the delegates, were not authorized to go to Canada to take any part, but merely to speak. The delegates had been fully authorized to enter into the discussion of the question, but not to bind this colony, and that they never had professed to do. We had reserved to the local legislature the final determination of the matter, and on their arrival had been called upon to discuss this question long ago before this House, but for the position which one of the other colonies had assumed. Nova