

Street said about my hon. colleague in the same primer, when speaking of the School Law. He says: "He (Mr. Street) was glad to hear it, and therefore inferred that the hon. member approved of the law; but other hon. members of the opposition had censured it, and he (Mr. Fisher) had made sweeping charges against the Government, and against him (Hon. Attorney General) in particular, stating that he had not a modern idea in his head, and knew nothing but law. He would reply, that if to possess modern ideas, it was necessary to square with the sentiments and opinions of the hon. member, he would pray from such modern ideas and opinions 'Good Lord deliver him'; and as to the hon. member's opinion of his legal attainments, he would only remark, that the success which he had met with in his professional career was the most satisfactory proof of the opinion of the public on that score, and that he should feel much humbled indeed if he had nothing better to support his legal reputation than the opinion of the hon. member (Mr. F.)." This was the character of my hon. colleague, as portrayed by Mr. Street at that time. He says: he (Mr. Street) had not a modern idea in his head, and (Mr. S.) whom he now speaks of as a shining light, must in those days have been a dark lantern. Then we have the Hon. Mr. Street's opinion of my hon. colleague. "What, he would ask, could any Government have done more for the furtherance of Railways, and the internal government of the country at large. This was at all events more progressive than anything the hon. member (Mr. Fisher) had been guilty of and yet that hon. member had the audacity. Well, if the word was unparliamentary, he would use a softer one, and say the hon. member had the presumption to say the Government was not progressive, and that he (Hon. Attorney General) had not a modern idea in his head. The hon. member (Mr. Fisher) no doubt had some modern ideas in his head, and one of his most brilliant conceptions was that of trying by cunning and manoeuvring to step into his (Hon. Attorney General's) shoes. This was the hon. member's great desideratum, and one of his progressive movements." This was a splendid movement, and he thinks the same thing should be done now. He wants to move out the Hon. Mr. Smith and get in his shoes, but I doubt if they are large enough for him. Then the Hon. Attorney General winds up by saying, "He did not pretend to be a great politician, but if low cunning manoeuvres, political tergiversation, and a readiness to accomplish his ends by any and every means constituted a politician, he (Hon. Attorney General) was both glad and proud to say that he was not one, although his successor (meaning Mr. Fisher) in that sense might be." That was the opinion of the late Attorney General (Mr. Street), and if that opinion is worth what my hon. friend says colleague stand to-day. If that great light, before he died, pronounced that eulogy upon Judge Wilmut, I would ask my hon. colleague, when he re-reads this primer, whether he does not feel that his position was wrong in accepting the testimony of that great light, and give up this matter. I will now say a few words in regard to the Delegation, and then speak on the main point, which is Confederation. This Delegation which went home to England this last season, cost seven hundred and odd pounds.

My hon. colleague and another gentleman went home on a Delegation to make some arrangements about Railroads, and that Delegation cost £787 18s. 4d. If the Confederation Delegation had jolly times, the Railway Delegation must have had jollier, for they spent £87 more. I thought this was a large sum, but I find there is a certain allowance for their pay, so much a day for one of them. If the Province sends a Delegation home, they should put them in a position that they would not be called upon to spend their own money. I have made a calculation of how much money my hon. colleague has received from the Province in these twenty-four years he has been here, and I find he has received fifty thousand dollars, therefore I think the country has paid him pretty well for his services. I think if I had it I would be as mean as possible in saying anything about delegations. The delegation to Quebec cost the Province \$3337.97. This delegation was unauthorized and uncalled for, and it was not right to take that money out of the public chest. It was a public robbery, and they ought to pay it back, and if I had the power I would hold on to them until they disgorged it. Whatever it cost for the delegation to go to Prince Edward's Island they had a right to, but they had no right to one cent of the other. The only fault I have to find with the present Government about money matters is, that they are not generous enough. It is no wonder the late Government could have friends, when they spent \$3337 without authority, and without a vote of this Legislature. There was a time in the history of this country when expenses of this kind were put under the head of shovelling snow; but days of greater light have come in, and an account has to be given of every cent of the public money, to whom it is given, and how it is expended. This House ought to pass a resolution, calling upon those delegates to refund every shilling of that money. My hon. colleague (Mr. Fraser) referred to an important fact with regard to the Jackson contract. My hon. colleague (Mr. Fisher) and Mr. Robertson went on that delegation, which cost £800, to make an arrangement with Jackson, Peto & Company. The original contract was not made by the Tilley Government, but the moment they got in they thought they found some flaw in the contract, and they thought they would not be able to carry it out. This contract was drawn by Judge Ritchie, and revised by Messrs. Grey, Street and Hazen, the ablest lawyers in the Province, yet this cry was got up, and those delegates were sent home to make arrangements with Jackson, Betts, Brassy, Peto and Company. When they returned, their report was laid before the House on the 11th day of March, and this matter was under the consideration of the House until the 27th of March, when it finally passed, and it was a singular fact that the original contract was in some pigeon-hole in the Secretary's office, and was not found until the whole thing had passed through the House. (Mr. Fisher.—The paper was laid in the Provincial Secretary's office, and the Government got from Mr. Gibbs a certified copy of the original contract.) I now ask if any of the members who voted for annulling that contract, knew from the statements of my hon. colleague

that if they had allowed Jackson & Co. to extend the time of their contract for three months, they would build the Road. I have heard Judge Allen say that he never heard it, yet a Bill was hurried through this House to give that company £30,000 of the people's money and release them of their contract, and £290,000 was spent in building that road above what it would have cost if it had been built by the Jackson Company, who only required the extension of the time of their contract for three months. This was an outrage perpetrated on the people of this country, resulting in the loss of £290,000.

My hon. colleague made some other charges against the Government, and the one he considered the most important he reserved until the last; that is, regarding the Export Duty Law. This was a mistake, placing \$50,000 in jeopardy, but it was not half as big a sell as the "pigeon-hole." That mistake cost the Province £290,000. After all, this mistake about the Export Duty Law amounts to nothing. It is a tempest in a teapot, for there was not a dollar lost to the revenue. I do not know who wrote the letter to Mr. Lingley in St. John. If he had received that letter a day sooner, he would have been a gainer, but the country would have lost. We say no wrong has been done; forgive us. And the House said, we forgive you, when they enacted the law to remedy the difficulty.

I will now come to the main point, which is Confederation. My hon. friends from the North say this is a pure question of Confederation, and if this Government had foreshadowed and come down with a scheme, they would have supported them. When they take that ground, I believe it is simply and purely a question of Confederation, and that if the present Government is turned out, the Government that will come in to supplant them will be formed on a Confederation basis of the worst kind. If a majority of the House say they have no confidence in the present Government, they never need look to me again for support, if they do not dissolve the House and go to the people. I came to this House pledged to go against Confederation; and knowing that under the present Government we are safe in this respect, I am prepared to sustain them at all hazards and risks. They say the Government have foreshadowed a scheme in the Speech, but no construction of the English language can justify them in coming to that conclusion. This Confederation scheme was originated by an unauthorized delegation, and the resolutions were sent home by Lord Monck to the Colonial Ministers, and was agreed to by the British Ministry. It was stated we had to take it word for word. There could be no alteration made from the beginning to the end; and it is pronounced now that that objectionable part, representation by population, is unalterable—that we will never have Confederation on any other basis. Mr. Cardwell did not fancy it was unalterable. The Imperial Legislature may legislate for us, and I may alter what we do not alter. We have got to swallow it down, body, bones and all, but they can change it and make it more palatable to them. What kind of doctrine is that for free men holding the right of self-government to proclaim to the world?