

the salary of the Solicitor General. Mr. Fraser then went on to show that the crown law expenses under the late Government were not confined to the salaries of its officers; he took up the public accounts of 1862 and proved that the late Government, when they had a Solicitor General, employed gentlemen to conduct the business—quoting a case where Mr. Charles Fisher had been paid \$187 for attending to the criminal business in Carleton.

Mr. Fraser then referred at length to the course Mr. Fisher had taken during the election of York, and denounced his attack on Mr. Hatheway as cruel and unkind. Mr. Fisher had attacked every one of the three gentlemen who represented York, and who had been returned by large majorities over himself, and all, he believed, for the express purpose of raising himself at their expense.

Mr. Fraser then proceeded to say the mover of the amendment, Mr. Fisher, had made a grave charge against the Government in reference to Minute of Council. He had called it an insulting document, and said that any one who would answer a courteous letter in the spirit of that paper, he would call a low fellow. He could not agree with Mr. Fisher, he said, and he did not fear boldly to express his opinion. There was no insult to that dispatch to Her Majesty's Secretary of State. He thought that the gentlemen who signed that Minute had taken a bold and independent stand. Could Mr. Fisher say that they had no right to differ with Mr. Cardwell on a matter of policy so nearly affecting their interests? Would he say that Her Majesty's Ministers could not be approached with remonstrance? that they were never censured for their policy in the Imperial Parliament? What, he would like to know, did Earl Derby state, the other day, in reference to Mr. Cardwell and his Colonial policy? Mr. Cardwell was, like any other man, liable to error and mistakes of judgment, and open to censure. While he had the highest respect for the Queen's Secretary of State, he thought, on the question of Confederation, he had a right to his opinion, and that he had the better judgment of what would be best for the country. Mr. Fisher had displayed a new-born reverence for dispatches, but what did he say in 1854? Why, that the Government should not be governed by dispatches from Downing Street. But Mr. Fisher only cared for dispatches when it suited him. The Government had been charged with neglecting the defence of the country. He had no hesitation in saying that it had been the hon. member of Carleton (Mr. Connell) who had raised the alarm about the unprotected state of the frontier. He did not wonder at the alarm in Carleton, and that weak women and children should be frightened; but he believed it was got up that some political purpose might be served. He had not the slightest doubt that the Government would look after the defence of the country, if for no other reason than that their own lives and properties were at stake. Mr. Fisher had referred to the cost of the delegation to England, and said that the money had been absolutely wasted. But he thought that delegation had done good. By it Mr. Cardwell got some information as to the feeling in this Province regarding the Quebec Scheme, that might be useful to him. With regard to the question of Confederation, he was not, he would say, opposed to the abstract prin-

ciple of union, but he would never consent that the Quebec Scheme should be inflicted upon the country. He would go down with the ship first; and he would never consent to any scheme unless it was first submitted to the people.

Mr. Fraser quoted from the Canadian News, to the effect that it was said the British Government were going to appoint Hon. Mr. Tilley Governor of British Columbia and Vancouver's Island—a report that the News hoped was not true, for Mr. Tilley had yet good work to do, and in doing it he would serve the British Government and the Colonies. What was that good work, he would like to ask? Was it not to work up the scheme and have it forced upon the Province? Mr. Tilley, in doing this, might be serving the interests of the Imperial Government, but was he serving the interests of the Province? He believed the British Government were deceived as to the unanimity of feeling in favor of the scheme. They were told that men of all political parties wished to carry it out. But, he would ask, who represented the Opposition of this Province at the Quebec Conference? The Hon. J. H. Gray: Did he represent the Opposition? No. Did Hon. E. B. Chandler, one of the greatest politicians this country had produced—did he represent the Opposition? No. Somehow he was generally found supporting the Government of the day. Did his hon. colleague Mr. Fisher represent the Opposition? No. He would tell his colleague, when the Tilley Government turned him, they turned him out. But it was no less true that, after he was turned out, he invariably gave that Government his support. When the British Government were told that men of all parties supported the scheme, he maintained they were told what was not true. He would refer to another delegation, the delegation to Washington with reference to the Reciprocity Treaty. (Here Mr. Fraser quoting from an American paper, referred to a debate that had taken place at some meeting in Washington, at which Mr. Merrill & Co. on the American side, and the Hon. Messrs. Galt, A. J. Smith and Henry, delegates of the Provinces, were present, and showed that the Hon. A. J. Smith was reported as arguing strongly in maintenance of the right of lumbermen to raft their lumber down the head waters of the St. John River.) Should they say, after this, that the Hon. A. J. Smith, who, it had been said, was hostile to this section of the country, was the man who was going to sacrifice the interests of the people on the St. John River? Or would it be said that the delegation to Washington was useless when, though the treaty was abrogated, that right was not lost? A great deal had been said about the cost of delegations. How much, he would like to know, did the delegation of Mr. Fisher and the Hon. J. Robertson cost the Province? £350,000, because the country lost that sum when they bought out Jackson & Co. He heard that his hon. colleague kept back the contract, and it was a singular thing that the memorandum attached to it, in which Jackson & Co. professed willingness to build the Railway upon concession of time, could not be found. (Mr. Fisher denied this.) The contract was kept back. He would refer to his hon. friend, Mr. Kerr, if that was not the fact.

Mr. KERR did remember that the contract was missing at the time, and that it was never seen till after the debate on

the question was closed. The Attorney General (Mr. Fisher) said that it had been mislaid in a pigeon-hole of some desk in the Provincial Secretary's office.

MR. FISHER.—It was a singular thing that the original contract was never produced during the debate. But there was a duplicate of it. It was also a singular thing that, after the debate, the original contract should have turned up in the Secretary's office. He would rather be called a liar to his face than to have these insinuations thrown out. His colleague (Mr. Fraser) would find the whole words of the original contract in the Journals of 1856, page 62, with the memorandum.

MR. FRASER.—If his hon. colleague would show, he would withdraw his assertion. (Here Mr. Fisher produced the Journals, and showed the copy of the contract, and pointed out that the memorandum for extension of time was in the body of the agreement.) Mr. Fraser.—But it was a distinct memorandum. He had heard the present Judge Allen make the statement on the hustings. With reference to the cost of the delegation of Hon. A. J. Smith and J. Allen, it had been said that it cost £800. Then, he said, the delegation of his hon. colleague (Mr. Fisher) cost £350,000; for who could say, if they had not been bought out, if they had got an extension, that Jackson & Co. the wealthiest railway contractors in England, who had built a railway in the Crimea and made a present of it to the British Government, were men not able to build the Railway? But, apart from this view of the case, it was said that the delegation of Fisher and Robertson cost £900. One thing more he would touch upon. An observation of the hon. member (Mr. Fisher) had fallen on his ears and given him a great surprise, when he said that the troops of Her Majesty would not be sent to the borders of the Province because they would desert. Were they not sent two or three years ago? And when the disturbance on the Railway took place, sent to the border, and had they heard of one desertion? It came with a very bad grace from him (Mr. Fisher) to cast this slur upon Her Majesty's troops. (Mr. Fisher denied that what he had said could bear the interpretation Mr. Fraser had put upon it.) That slur that had been thrown upon Her Majesty's troops he would throw back as a slur upon the hon. member.

MR. McCLELLAN referred to his friendly relations with the members of the present Government, had a high regard for each separately, but they had lost their individuality, and as a political combination he (Mr. McC.) hoped their politics would be confounded, and their fantastic and knavish tricks frustrated.

Contrasted their boasted strength of last Session with their acknowledged weakness of this.

Delegations extravagant and useless. Burial of Confederation, and its resuscitation now.

The Government acknowledge guilt on the Export Duty. Count, and throw themselves on the mercy of the court. They are unwilling witnesses on their own trial;—refuse the records, and, therefore, have all the advantages. Defeated in Legislative Council, but refuse to rescind Address for fear of consequences.

The Press, and the platform—the elec-