

ees In 1863 we find a similar expression of his opinions in this resolution "that on the eve of a general election it would be as unwise as it was inoperative to press the resolution now before us."

Here again the thought it was a sound principle to allow the people to decide for themselves. I might go through the letters and speeches of Messrs. McCully and Archibald, and shew that they expressed the same desire to let the people rule, but I will not trouble the House with further remarks on that branch of the subject, and will come down to the action of the delegates in England in England. Here I may say it becomes necessary that there should be put on record the fact that when politicians undertake to tamper with the rights of a free people they must suffer, as the just consequences of their acts, disgrace, shame, ignominy, and consignment to private life. This view of the case should be put plainly forward.

We find after the delegates went to England something stated in the Queen's Speech, which no honest man in this Province will endorse: "that the delegates represented all parties and opinions in this Province." I think there is no man with hardihood enough to assert that Archibald and McCully led at that time the old Liberal party in this Province. It is true that years ago when the party lines were drawn they did lead the Liberal party to a certain extent, but they did not in England represent the opinions of that party. The Confederation scheme destroyed all party lines in this country, and when to-day I look around these benches and see Liberals and Conservatives joined hand in hand to free the country from the Confederation Act, I feel that all party ties are broken, and that the people have come together for a common protection. The statement therefore that the delegates represented all parties was untrue. If I am asked for further proof of my assertion, I point to the history of the Quebec scheme.—The delegates went to Quebec and prepared their scheme in secret,—they returned, and by the action of an honest Prince Edward Islander, the people became aware of its nature. As soon as the public got hold of it, meetings were held, the scheme was condemned, and Archibald and McCully were likewise condemned as the prominent men of their party. And yet after that they dared to go to England, and claim to represent the opinions of the old Liberal party in this country, and caused such a statement to be put in the Queen's Speech. It was patent to every one that the Quebec scheme was condemned as not being what the country wanted. I will next turn attention to what occurred in the House of Commons, and with all respect for that body that it deserves, with no desire to use a harsh expression concerning any man, I must say there is a responsibility resting upon every one of us to call things by their proper names, and to speak our true feelings. We look at what took place in the British Parliament, and stand aghast at the statements made and means used to pass this Act. Does any man pretend to say that there the truth prevailed, or that our delegates discharged their duties faithfully? Who was Dr. Tupper? Was he

not as it were our sentinel—the representative of our Government, bound by the ties of duty to speak the truth, nay sir, to speak the whole truth and *nothing but the truth*? What, then, was the truth which he was called upon to state? In the discussion in the House of Commons the fact came out that the question had not been submitted to the people at the polls. Mr. Bright enunciated the principle that before so material a change in the constitution could be made, tearing up our old constitutions and forming new ones, the people should in justice be consulted. That announcement struck the ear of Mr. Watkin, who was supporting the measure, as requiring an answer, and although he was trying to press the bill through at all hazards, caring little for us and much for Canada, he thought it necessary to consult Dr. Tupper about the facts. Dr. Tupper's statement of the matter at Truro was something to this effect: "Mr. Watkin left his seat, came over and spoke to me, we went aside and conversed, &c." It is plain that Mr. Watkin desired to know whether the measure had ever been before the people or not, and he should have had a prompt and candid reply. According to Dr. Tupper's own statement, Mr. Watkin got from him an answer, and it is not pretended that Watkin even conversed with any other person on the subject at that time except Dr. Tupper. After consultation, he returned to his seat, and made a statement which we all know to be *untrue*.

The SPEAKER suggested that it would be better not to discuss the proceedings in another Parliament.

MR. PURDY continued.—The answer which Mr. Watkin gave is on record, and any man can read it for himself. I shall be clearly in order in saying that Dr. Tupper should have been there as the guardian of our rights and interests, bearing our commission, and in the discharge of his duties if he heard a man state an *untruth* he should have corrected that untruth—he should have stated that the question *never was submitted to the people at the polls*.

(The usual hour for recess having arrived, the House adjourned and resumed at three o'clock, when the debate was resumed, and Mr. Purdy continued.)—It has been contended that Dr. Tupper's answer to Mr. Watkin was based on a lecture delivered in St. John by the former; that lecture, then, has some prominence on this question. I cannot say what its contents were, for it was never published or circulated in this Province. I find, however, in referring to the *Colonist* of that period, some extracts from the press of New Brunswick which show pretty well what the views entertained there on the subject were. The *Colonist*, which was the exponent of Dr. Tupper's opinions, copied this extract from the *St. John Morning News*:—

"The lecturer was a fair type of the displeased or disappointed Conservative. It was evident, from the moment he stepped off neutral political ground, that it was his intention to have a dash at somebody, and if he could not succeed in the tournament to unhorse his adversaries, indulging in certain foolish political notions of their own, he would at least be able to shiver a lance over the backs of his audience,—let people know at all events what he thought of demagogues, governors, and colonial slavery. The burthen