

THE NEWFOUNDLANDER.

gallery knew that it mattered very little to him and to the country whether the present five or six office-holders or the same number of gentlemen from the other side were in the enjoyment of place and a pension, but such a man was quite capable of understanding, and how members might depend upon it the public were intelligent enough to distinguish between what were earnest solid arguments and the tactics of politics. The hon. and learned member, Mr. Hogsett, supports this amendment of Mr. Talbot's, and reproaches the hon. member for Harbor Grace with not speaking to the motion, and not giving expression to his views. He (Mr. P.) could easily understand that a young member but a few days in this House, and who had never entered the Building before, might be indisposed to deliver himself of frequent speeches; but he was at a loss to conceive how the charge of suppression of his opinions could be made against the hon. member, who had expressed himself so clearly and decisively on the first day of the session, and about whose views upon the address there could be no mistake, as it bore his, (Mr. Gedden's) name at the foot of it, as Chairman of the Committee that drew it up. Members may say, with an assumption of grave sincerity, let us educate and inform the people on this question. This was the very course the Government side proposed to take, and it was engaged in urging; and this was the tenor of its resolution, while the terms of the amendment are calculated, and, as he believed, designed to prevent the very education and information they professed to be so anxious about. The opposition will not allow us, if they can help it, to inform the people. The hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Talbot, contends that we are in a position to help ourselves, to develop our own resources and industries. He asserts this and utterly fails to prove it. But, he adds, does Canada say she will help us, that she will come down with a sum of money for the improvement of this country? Now he (Mr. P.) took up the hon. member on his own ground, and replied that is just one of the things we want to find out, by adopting the course proposed in the address. That hon. member again says, how are we to get out of our isolation, and into the current of civilization by confederating? We shall be, and remain an Island, says he, unless some convulsion of nature throws us into the main land of Canada. He (Mr. P.) thought and believed, with every man who had common sense to understand what they were talking about, that the very fact of our being an Island and remote from our neighbours, was the very reason for desiring efficient and speedy means of trade and intercourse, and by such means and their consequences, we should get into the more ample current of civilization. As it was, he admitted it, we had the means to continue local society itself. We had already begun to feel the first fruits of Confederation, by the fact that an opportunity would be afforded to 800 heads of families, if employment could not be got here, to obtain Rail-way work in Canada the coming summer, steamers taking them and bringing them back, if they chose to return. That was a small example of what union would do. The union of the two Canadas was cited as an unfortunate one. True, there had been some political disaffection, but the material progress of those flat countries had not been interrupted, in population, public works, railways, &c. It showed how little our people need care about the political changes, if the substantial blessings of life were to flow from the proposed union. The hon. and learned member then proceeded to show that so far from being the fact, as Mr. Talbot had said, that Sir Hugh Hoyles had not been favourable to Confederation, he, Sir Hugh, had been the very strongest advocate of it, and would have adopted the Quebec scheme without hesitation, but for the less bold policy of his associates and the members of the House in general. Here Mr. Pinsonet cited at considerable length from the speech of Attorney General Hoyles in 1865, a speech which he designated as one of the most powerful ever uttered here upon the subject. That speech was in connection with the only Resolution ever passed by this House in the matter of Confederation, and the closing language of that Resolution, proposed by Mr. Holles, seconded by the present Receiver General, Mr. Kent, then in opposition, and carried unanimously, was "that a final determination upon this important subject be deferred until the next session of the Legislature." The session there referred to was the first session of this very present Parliament, so that if that resolution had been acted upon, as it might, in all consistency have been, the question now before us, for consideration only, might have been finally determined three years ago, without any further appeal. But on account of the desire generally expressed, that it should not be so decided upon, but that better terms should if possible, be secured, and the conditions ascertained for the information of the people, he had promised of the promptness there should be no final determination until the improved terms had been first submitted to the people—for these reasons, of course, the one now being pursued. It was taken into Mr. Pinsonet's head a long extract from it, as he said, a fine speech, and that was says a great deal, ever delivered by Mr. Renouf in the Assembly, in which, in 1865, he supported Mr. Hoyles's resolution, and pointed out in forcible terms the propriety of taking the course now proposed by the government, before sending the question to the people, also extracts from Mr. Gien's speech of that time to the same effect, and part of an editorial from the *Patriot* printed by the hon. member, Mr. Parsons, in Roman letters, which could almost be read from the gallery, to the effect that no sane man could for a moment think of rejecting the consideration of equitable terms. He (Mr. P.) never could bring himself to believe in the sincerity of Mr. Parsons's subsequent opposition. It must have been from fear of loss of that popularity of which he was so fond, and which he so deservedly enjoyed; but that hon. member would do wisely now in turning with the tide, which had evidently set the other way. The hon. member (Mr. Pinsonet) then showed that there was a fair comparison to be made with the Irish union, some of the terms of which every liberally minded man now condemns, and endeavours to renounce. There were no obligations of that kind to Confederation, which contemplated perfect equality, and civil and religious liberty in its highest development. Would intelligent men be deluded by the proposal to take off all dues on the staple necessities of life this session, as a partial alleviation of the burthen of the people, when the financial condition of the government and the state of the people were such as they are now, and with a debt considerably exceeding half a million of dollars to be redeemed in four or five years? Hon. members who suggested such measures must be aware of their impossibility, and the bankruptcy and ruin which must be consequent on their adoption as we are now, while by an alliance with the Dominion those objects they so much desire to accomplish will be effected. As to the probability of our future absorption by the United States of the Canadian Dominion, there was no such present probability, and if such were to be its ultimate fate, those who hold annexation tendencies are much more likely to further their designs by promoting that, the first step to further Americanosity. This assumption

would never be until the Dominion had been either
entertained into strength and power, and declared its
right so to do, or until Great Britain had elected to
throw off the burthen of Colonial dependences.
At present an alliance with the United States could
only be sought with enormous public debt and tax-
ation amounting to an annual burthen of \$30 per
head. The hon. and learned member then proceeded
to argue that if the policy of the Statesmen of
Great Britain to annex this Island and the sister
provinces, was Confederation, this was a strong additional
reason for submitting to it, and he pointed out several modes in which an indirect pressure might
be brought to bear upon us, even if the parent state
did not directly force it. He deprecated the
inconsistency of hon. members who, in the same
speech, spoke of Britain as a cruel stepmother, and
had allied itself with us as so much preferable
in closer connection with the sister Colonies. He
argued that our voice in the Dominion Councils
would be fairly present. It was not to be supposed
that all, he rest, were to be bound against us. Was
not the voice of the hon. and learned member for
Labrador Main of considerable weight and importance in this House? And it bore the same
relation to its numbers as our number of Representa-
tives would to the Central Parliament.
The hon. member proceeded to take up other
objections and positions put from the other side,
argued that the amendment was unfounded in fact,
inconsistent in intent, and opposed to the principles
on which gentlemen opposite contended too. He urged
that the course proposed by the address, far from
being any interference with the rights of the people, was
what the country was anxiously looking for, and
what it might know on what to decide. Members
on the side of the House proposed to take the
proper preparatory measures before submitting the
question to the people. They were prepared to
stand or fall by their policy. He felt that they
were candidly and honestly discharging their
duty to their constituents. If they were rejected,
then the basis of terms was submitted, then the
consequences lay with the people; and their present
representatives would have acquitted themselves of
the grave responsibility of rejecting or dangerously
delaying this measure. He gathered from the
course proposed by the other side, from the very
language of their amendment, that their policy was
to go again before the country upon indefinite
speculation, to be in a position to assail the govern-
ment as having offered nothing preferable to the
Quebec Convention, and then to be in a position to
deal with the matter themselves, without submitting
their own future plans to the country. He concluded
by again summing up the advantages to be derived
from union, and describing the nobler character of
that new political and commercial life into which we
shall have entered under Confederation.

Mr. RENOUCHE.—Notwithstanding the bitter
scolding which the Opposition had just received,
we would not be deterred from supporting the
amendment of the hon. member, Mr. Talbot.
The hon. member who had just spoken, and
exposed this side of the House with inconsistency,
should have recollect the old adage relative
to the peculiar liability of those who live
in glass houses. In 1855 the hon. member was
in the Legislative Council, and had there given
notice that he would move the following
resolutions:—

First.—That Newfoundland enter into a Con-
federation with the British North American Colonies, on
terms proposed in the Report of the Quebec Conference,
would be detrimental to the best interests of this Colony,
and ought to be resisted.

Second.—That a humble Address be transmitted to Her
Majesty, embodying the views of the Legislative Council
upon this subject, with their reasons for the adoption of
these views.

Third.—That a Select Committee of this House be ap-
pointed to draft the said Address.

But as no further record was to be found of this
resolution, all must conclude what was known to
be the case, that the hon. member thought better of abandoning it. In 1856, he gave another
notice, which he also dropped like a hot potato. Then this is the man who talks to us of inconsis-
tencies. He says we have done nothing to raise
the country. But what has he done? Last
year we had his great bill for the reduction of
the public expenditure, which never even went
to a second reading. Then there was his pamphlet
upon Confederation.

The Committee then rose, and the Chairman
reported progress. To sit again to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until 3 o'clock,
to-morrow.

FRIDAY, Feb. 12.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Committee of the Whole on Address. Mr. Knight
in the Chair.

The paragraph relating to Confederation having
been read,

Mr. O'REILLY said.—So much had been said on
this matter, and so many diverse opinions offered,
that the subject might be well said to be worn
threadbare. While hon. members accused each
other of inconsistency he at least could lay claim to
consistency upon this question, and if he could
not point to any record of lengthy arguments
which he had employed, he could at least flatter
himself that he had no shifts or backslidings to
account for. His position was still precisely the same
as that which he and his hon. colleagues had assumed
at the hustings in '55, with this difference, however,
that whatever difficulties he had then seen in the
way had now entirely disappeared. The confederate
cause had been gaining ground over all the Island,
and though the Confederate party were continuing
faithful to their pledge, that the question should be
submitted to the two currencies, public opinion from
Cape John to Cariboo Bay was calling aloud for a
change. The principle of Confederation was now
under discussion. Who denied the principle?
To use the joint language of the hon. and gallant
Major, and the hon. member, Mr. Talbot, "the
highest and most gifted minds acknowledge the
principle." There was not the beginning of a differ-
ence with regard to the principle between hon. mem-
bers on this side and on the other side. Hon. mem-
bers opposite were all confederates, and the only differ-
ence between them was upon matters of detail.
Surely then upon the question of details hon. mem-
bers could well give over their party differences.
As to terms there were few hon. members who would
be more difficult to please than himself, and
when the debate upon the subject came on
he should be prepared to contend that express
provision should be made for the encouragement of
the fisheries. Exception had been taken to the bold
character of the telegram received by his hon.
colleague offering employment to 800 or 1,000 people.
He might easily say that all that skepticism was to be
found within the doors of this House. Those persons
who were most to be affected by it had full faith in
its reality and they regarded it as a perfectly illusory

means suppression. While the abstruse argument of hon. members opposite might be thrown away, the people would be able understand when they were spoken to in this manner. The only thing hon. members opposite had done was to endeavour to mystify the people. If their real opinions were worth anything the people must go without them. On the question of terms he (Mr. O'R) should be prepared to press what he considered to be essential conditions, no one would attempt to deny that he was an outspoken Confederate, but he should always be jealous of this country's interests in connection with the question of terms.

After some remarks from Mr. HOOGSTETT,

Mr. PARSONS said that he had been waiting for some hon. member opposite to enlighten the House upon the question before the chair. He had expected to hear some vigorous oration upon this all important question of Confederation. It w'd appear that there was not much unanimity as to the meaning of the word, the hon. member, Mr. O'Reilly, says that it means employment for the people. Well, that certainly was a new meaning to him (Mr. P) and was one which w'd hardly be found in any dictionary. It that were really the meaning of it—it it would procure that, the Opposition would hail Confederation with one voice. But he learned no such meaning would be placed upon it. We do not want to go abroad from this colony to seek employment because we had it within our own borders. We did not want to transport 800 of our stalwart fishermen into the wilds of Canada. We would keep them here and give them better employment than Canada could afford them. What! expatriate the hardy natives of this colony and make them seek employment amongst strangers? Why it was a policy that no parental Government would entertain. The hon. member then proceeded to show that we had within ourselves resources which if fostered and developed by the Government were more than sufficient for our population. He considered the bringing of this question of Confederation before the House now was a breach of faith on the part of the Government, that there was no evidence before this House that the public desired any change. He referred to the Petitions which had been presented former sessions against Confederation, and contended that the opinion of the people was the same now, and that no step should be taken by this House before an appeal was made to the country at the next general election.

Upon motion the Committee then rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on Monday.

The House then adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock.

MONDAY, Feb. 15.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

Upon motion of the Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on the Address of Thanks.—Mr. Knight in the Chair.

The hon. the SPEAKER said that he considered it to be his duty, occupying the position of Speaker of this House, to refer to certain remarks contained in the *Chronicle* of this morning, in which he had been charged with uttering language derogatory to Mr. F Bennett. He must contradict that statement, and call upon the House to endorse what he now said, that he neither directly nor inferentially referred to Mr. Bennett. Had he so done he would have been guilty of a violation of the rules of this House, and he thought all would do him the justice to say that since he had the honor of pres iding here he had always endeavoured to sustain the dignity of the House and adhere to the rules governing our debates. Had the remarks in this paper in-rely referred to himself personally, he would have deemed them unworthy of notice, but when they referred to his position as the Speaker of this House, he considered that in recognition of that duty which he owed to that office and to this House, he was bound to take notice of this matter and contradict it. He would again declare that he had neither directly nor inferentially referred to Mr. Bennett in the speech which he had made.

The hon. Receiver General, Mr. Prowse, and the Colonial Secretary also sustained the assertion of the hon. and learned Speaker, and bore testimony to the dignity with which he had always upheld his position.

The RECEIVER GENERAL remarked that the official Reports were confirmatory of what the Speaker had declared.

Mr. TALBOT could not say whether the words had been used or not, but he denied that the official Reports were any authority upon the matter.

Mr. GALT was glad to see that every one read the *Chronicle*, it shewed that it was the true exponent of public opinion. He thought that it was carrying this matter too far when he heard that the Editor of the *Chronicle* had been ejected from the Clerk's room by the order of the Speaker. The Opposition were attacked in the most outrageous manner every day, but they paid no attention to it.

The hon. A. SERA was sorry that the hon. and learned Speaker had taken the trouble to occupy a moment of time with a matter so paltry. Suppose he had said Mr. Bennett was the Head Centre of the Anti-Confederates? What then? Was that gentleman ashamed of being so called? What then was there in it that any man should feel skinched about? But the hon. Speaker had never mentioned Mr. Bennett's name. How then could he have spoken disrespectfully of him? He (Mr S) had referred to Mr. Bennett in this House and would do so again when he deemed it necessary, but he had never spoken disrespectfully of him. He was sorry any importance had been attached to this matter. He would now refer to the paragraph before the Chair. This section then affirmed that the time had arrived for considering this question of Confederation, so that it might be referred to the various constituencies. Now the hon. member Mr. Talbot the other evening in a speech of considerable length, denied this. He (Mr. S) admitted that the hon. member had discussed the matter with a great deal of ability and in language that was certainly entitled to respect, and he made this admission freely and readily, altho' both in the premises and conclusions of the hon. member he entirely disagreed. The hon. member had asserted that the time had not arrived for dealing with this question, and that this House had no authority to deal with it. He thought that the time had fully arrived for this question to be considered, and further, that was in accordance with the existing state of public opinion. Why, what was the reprobation that had been uttered against us after time? That we did not bring down the terms, so that the people might be fully instructed upon them, and now, with a strange and marvellous inconsistency, they tell us that we have no right to go into the discussion and investigation of those very terms, for which they had so often asked. Now how would it be possible for us to go into the discussion of terms, unless we assented to the section before the chair. There was not a man in this House, who might not vote for this Section, and when the terms are brought down with perfect honesty and consistency dissent from any of them. If one member opposite had twisted this section in a certain manner, he (Mr. S) had

never intended that it should be regarded in that light. We merely tell you and the country by this section that we will enquire into the matter, and see if terms favorable to the interests of this Colony cannot be agreed to. Why the hon member McGlen, says if we get terms satisfactory, he was ready to go in for Confederation, and yet the hon member would debar us by his proceeding from ascertaining what were satisfactory terms or not. It could not be too well known, he thought, that no proceeding was contemplated by this House by which this question would be finally determined. We simply desired to shew the country what the terms were—so that they might give them earnest consideration, and be in a position at the general election to say whether they were acceptable or not. He could not, therefore, agree to this paragraph being amended, and he could not agree to the amendment, because it contained a statement that was untrue. The question of Confederation had never been rejected by this Legislature or by the country, because it had never been submitted to either. This House would certainly be open to ensure if it permitted such a statement to go unchallenged. Hon members opposite a few years ago, when there was a paragraph in the address relative to Confederation, said, if you pass it, you affirm the principle of Confederation. The Government declared at the time that that was not a right interpretation to place upon it, and the section was one which pronounced no opinion, and went merely for delay. But so assured were they that it affirmed the principle of Confederation, that they proposed an amendment to it. (Hears the hon member read the same.) Now if that amendment had been carried, the hon member would have been borne out in his statement that the question had been rejected. But the fact was, that that amendment had been ignorinously rejected by a majority of eighteen to six. How then could it be said that the Quebec session had ever been rejected by this House. Now he (Mr S.) did not claim that that majority affirmed the principle of Confederation, he merely claimed that it rejected the amendment against the principle. He was indeed somewhat surprised that the hon member Mr Talbot should deal with so important a question in the manner he had. The trap about our lives and liberties was not worthy that gentleman's position or ability. Then he appeals to the natives not to sell their country. That question of sale could never arise in this case. But assuming for argument sake that it did, he (hon Mr S.) knew of few countries that had sold that had not been the gainers. Look at Louisiana when she was purchased by the United States from France—that was a sale, and money paid for it, and see how prosperous Louisiana had been since. Had she not been a gainer by that sale? He merely referred to this in reference to the question which had been raised, and to shew that selling a country was not after all so terrible a thing, but was a proceeding by which many countries had been benefited. The hon member then referred to Irish encumbered estates Act, and shewed the advantages it had conferred, regarding it in the light of a forced sale. The hon member Mr Talbot tells us that the Irish Union was caused by bribery, and that some three millions were spent for that purpose. Well, that was true. But who was it that received that money? Why the Opposition, who then occupied that position in the Irish Parliament which hon gentlemen opposite do now. It was to purchase their votes that this money had been spent.

MR. LITTEL.—Are you going to give us some?

HON. MR. SHAW.—Don't let the hon. member's mouth water too soon. He would not have gentlemen opposite indulge in extravagant expectations of what might happen here. The Union of Ireland was an exception, and w^ts not one that should be quoted. That was a Union between people not on an equality. It was a Union of a dominant race with a slaves and enthralled one. It was the Union of men who enjoyed civil and religious rights with men who had neither the one nor the other, was it then anything surprising that the dominant class should regard the others as slaves and treat them so? But were the same conflicting elements to be found here? Had we not all civil and religious liberty? Were we not all upon the same footing? Were we not equal in the eye of the Government and in universal law? Would the hon. gentleman say that the Union of the States was a failure? Canadian Union he says was a failure. Where does the hon member get his facts for making such a statement? The result to the country was great prosperity. He had not then at hand the statistics of population, produce, &c., but he knew that they showed sufficient to justify the assertion that the Union of the two Provinces had proved a success. Was the fact that the people of England last year demanded a new Reform Bill any proof that the bill of 1832 was a failure? No it only showed that the time for further changes had come, and just so with the question of Union. The time for change came, and when the question which had agitated the Lower Province, was ripe for settlement, Canada could scarcely believe that Nova Scotia, the cradle of Union, would turn its back on its own offspring. It was stated that the Delegates had condemned the Quebec Resolutions. Such was not the case, neither the hon. and learned Attorney-General nor he (hon. Mr. S.) had ever said so. They never entertained such opinions as would justify them in saying so. Having regard to the time of its origin, he denied that it was a plan which deserved condemnation. It was most favorably received, and commanded the admiration of the ablest and most intelligent men in England. It had since then been slightly modified, but how? Was it not by making concessions all round, on the one side as well as the other? The result of monetary concessions would be that while we might get more money for our own immediate purposes, we would not be benefited to the full extent supposed, because to the extent of the increase received we lessen the money which would remain in the hands of the General Government for general purposes. The only changes made as yet were monetary ones. The framework and character of the constitution, the powers of the general and local government, are still the same as adopted in Quebec, so that in these principal points those resolutions remain intact. In one other point only was any change made, and that was by the British Government in the number of Senators, so as to provide for the happening at any time of a deadlock in the Government. As to the objections urged, the only ones raised by the Anti-slavery party, were that the people would be taxed more than was fair, and that they would not receive enough. To no other point the plan was any objection raised, and certainly if it would be judicial to raise objections to a plan which was so perfect. He (hon. Mr. S.) had taken part in the great work; but he gave it to say that it fell to his part, however humble, to improve that plan. That plan had met with the leading men of England of all positions blind and incapable of forming a subject? A test like that, the well versed in the science of whose integrity and impartiality doubted, who look calmly on it and say that this system of Government to advance the interest and prosperity of these Colonies, and great weight with men who and knowledge of such matters is so large. He did not mean to gen lessons should not exercise themselves on the subject. The duty and the duty with them, and they were bound examine into the matter, for themselves, what was Confederation? It that four or five provinces, having tutions and laws, and owing a common sovereign, should unite to mon benefit. Those who advocate union believed that Union would beneficial results than isolation. by the example of the United believed that such a Union w^t general prosperity and give stability in co-operation each would which individually they could not his (hon. Mr. S.) mind, Confede increased means of employment, that the want of which was most now? Employment. It had been good would this country the expenditure in Canada lie (hon. Mr. S.) replied th advance the value of labor ity, and that would be most the laboring classes; and I though derive such direct advantages as Provinces, yet those which we may will have. Here was a practical he said. He was authorized to en to work at the public works in Canada not the taking of these 800 men of where they new stand up and do to work but unable to find it, a lack of labor? He did not speak for a purpose, and would not be so foolish as to make an assertion which could be contradicted of May next. He agreed that for one that the population should go away, but it would be a greater to have them remain here in the as they were in last year. Not give him (hon. Mr. S.) greater power that the state of the country should enable these men to stay at home had a greater interest in seeing the played than he had, that they should purchasers and not as beggars. Would yield to any in its desire to be pro-ferous and happy? Not one who would be engaged by him would next winter, for half their wages were here for them. While things were sed in the country, he (hon. Mr. S.) this as a gospel. He looked beginning of a system which would country from future deterioration of labor. The fact shows that if is here, it will be taken up for the ot^r. If we have Confederation, we will the Steamers with Quebec and Montreal would enable the people to go a-tint. In this country the labor qualities all others, and anything which advance the interests of the labor also tended to the advance of the country at large. All that was a well employed people, and then would be contented and happy, look on it as at all desirable that should leave the country, but be desirable that when they were so should have some backers. He used to hear it said that our men for this work. Any man who will go, will acknowledge that no human ever left any port. He had any complaint of the men on the Le^r, and did not think the work Railway was any harder. Nor did had been imputed to them by themselves their friends, that were as to forget those whom they had. He thought differently of them, as them to be possessed of some which attached them to those who had legitimate claims on them. Of any of them chose to remain away, it would be better for them, they were in doing so. They would have the coming home if they chose to do so, could be no compulsion. Those who go would go as volunteers. He considered that such matters as these were tasteless to those who were interested down the value of labor. Last year were in such a "wretched" condition, were glad to ship on any terms, desired to perpetuate that state would, of course, be dissatisfied with attempt to disturb it. He thought the of the question which they were not, he might with propriety speak Charles Fox Bennet, who required number of men to work his mines, a course, try and get them at as low possible. He was, of course, right, his interests and the interests of were directly opposed to each other.