

if he did not vote with the Government. A cry is now raised, that if they vote against the Government the House will be dissolved. I never was into a Government, and do not care about going in. I do not care much about having a seat in the Legislature. When I was first requested to offer, some person said I would not get three hundred votes, but the event proved he was wrong, and if the House was dissolved to-morrow, I am ready to run again, so they need not think dissolving the House will have much effect with me. There is another thing ought not to have been done—that is, speculating in land. I consider that the greatest sin the Government have been guilty of. I believe no greater evil can be inflicted upon a community than allowing one man to monopolize the lands of the country. I will quote a report of the Earl of Durham, who was at that time Governor General of British North America. At the 159th page of his report he says:—

"In Upper Canada, a very small proportion—perhaps less than a tenth—of the land thus granted has been even occupied by settlers, much less reclaimed and cultivated. In Lower Canada, with the exception of a few townships bordering on the American frontier, which have been comparatively well settled, in spite of the proprietors by American quarters it may be said that nineteen-twentieths of these grants are still unsettled, and in a perfectly wild state."

"No other result could have been expected in the case of those classes of grantees whose station would preclude them from settling on the wilderness, and whose means would enable them to avoid exertion for giving immediate value to their grants; and, unfortunately, the land which was intended for persons of a poorer order, who might be expected to improve it by their labour, has, for the most part, fallen into the hands of land jobbers of the class just mentioned, who have never thought of settling in person, and who retain the land in its present wild state, speculating upon its acquiring a value at some distant day, when the demand for land shall have increased through the increase of population."

This coincides with my own views in this matter. I am opposed to any Government who will allow men to purchase large blocks of land, which the poor man has to go through and make roads, as this interferes with the prosperity of the country. Why should a poor man be compelled to make roads through another man's property; that land having been obtained for two shillings, and kept until it is worth four dollars an acre, in consequence of the settlements around it. It has been said here that when they sold land and put the money to interest, it brought them in more than they received from timber licences. I contend the country would be a gainer if no man got land without the principle of actual settlement being attached to it, for it has been calculated that every settler is worth three dollars a year to the revenues of the country. This said the late Government blame each other in regard to this, but I do not care who is in the Government, I should blame them for this, (Hon. Mr. Smith.—Which Government was most to blame.) All the late Government did was to order the survey. (Mr. Wetmore.—Was the money paid.) The ex-Surveyor General said it was not

said. Why did the Government make the conclusion that the Inter-colonial Railroad was given up, when the survey was made only ten months ago? If there was any reason why the public lands should be sold to others than actual settlers, notice should have been given to the Deputies. I know that men made application for land in my County, and could not get it. I believe in equal rights for all. It was not right that a few men should have been informed of what was going on, and the rest kept in ignorance. There was five thousand acres purchased in fictitious names, and then the resolution was rescinded, and he got ten thousand more; previous to this he got a three years license to cut the lumber on it, and if any one else had bought it he could cut all the lumber off of it. Then again they said, by doing away with the political character of the Postmaster General, they would make a great saving. If the political head of the department was abolished, would not the chief business be done in St. John? It was said Mr. Howe would be the General, but it was hinted outside that a gentleman in St. John had the promise of an office to be called Post Office Inspector. He would have the salary and pickings, without the privilege of having "General" attached to his name. This was the saving that was to be effected by doing away with the political head of the department, and to carry their measure, they got a third rallying cry of Confederation. I was almost discouraged, but I believed that "he is twice armed who has his quarrel just." I am glad there are some hon. gentlemen now who will look after the interests of the country and not be drummed up with the cry of Confederation and anti-Confederation.

In regard to the appointment of Judges, my hon. friend referred to what Judge Wilmot had said and done, and how he had voted, thus admitting the truth of the charge brought against them that they had made politics their rule for their appointments on the Bench. I do not believe in Judges interfering in the political questions which are before the country. They should arise far above that; but this was a question whether we were going to maintain our connection with the mother country or not. Confederation is a question that has occupied the minds of men for sixty-five years. Judge Wilmot held those views when on the floors of this House, and he is a credit to the country which gave him birth, and I contend it was unfair to pass over him and appoint a junior Judge to the office. I do not know much about the gentleman who has been appointed Puisne Judge, but it has been said that they might have found a person qualified without going to Insurance Offices. He was appointed on political grounds, which is a principle they have carried down to the officials on the railway, and I don't know how much further they would have carried it, if His Excellency had not interfered. It has been said that they are going to change their base, and take another course on Confederation. If that is the case, it is not right for me to say anything, for they may come round all right. I think by what is foreshadowed in the Speech, that they are going to get up another delegation and have another pleasure excursion, for the Attorney General says he is willing to go for some Scheme. He said when we advocated a Scheme of Union, that we were "political schemers" and "conspirators."

Now they are going to get up a political scheme, but I do not know whether they are going to "conspire" or not. They called a man that was going to carry out the wishes of his Sovereign a "conspirator." I heard it stated on good authority, and I need not go off the floors of this Legislature to prove it, that the Chief Commissioner, on being asked whether he had read that Minute of Council, said he was sorry it did not go further, that they had not made use of stronger language, using an expression I am ashamed to repeat. These are the loyal men, and we are the conspirators. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilmot) said in Canada, that he was not opposed to a union, but he was not satisfied with the Quebec Scheme. Mr. George Brown said there were some things in the scheme they did not like either, they would meet him half way in considering a union, for they did not wish to take any unfair advantage of their fellow-colonists. I am in favor of a union and I do not see how any British subject can be opposed to it, but to agree upon a scheme of union, we must all make some concessions or we will never agree to any terms. My hon. friend (Col. Boyd) made a speech in Canada in favor of union. (Col. Boyd, not in favor of the Quebec Scheme.) I did not say it was, but I heard him speak strongly in favor of a union; but he is one of those men who believe nothing good can come out of Nazareth, and that a man must belong to certain families or he will not be fit for office. I believe in freedom and equal rights for all. There are a great many things in the scheme which are complained of in Canada, and it is doubtful, if we get a new scheme, whether we could come off as well as we did before. They complain that New Brunswick is to get \$63,000 a year for ten years. (Mr. Needham.—That is contingent, that unless we run into debt to the extent of \$7,000,000 we were not to get it.) If we built our railroads under the Subsidy Act, our debt would soon reach that amount, and Canada does not come in with a debt equal to ours, if we take the population of Canada into consideration. We would have more money for local purposes than we have now, and have the Inter-Colonial Railway and Western Extension built besides. In a time of war we could come to the assistance of each other, and would not require half the number of troops that we do now in our isolated position.

DR. THOMPSON said he had taken no notes, and would, therefore, make but a short speech. At the last election two-thirds of the people in this Province declared they were opposed to Confederation. It has been said that, by signing this Minute of Council, the Government have insulted Her Majesty's Ministers. He did not believe that, and he had as great a respect for the United Kingdom as any other man in the Province. At the same time, he did not like to bow in slavish obedience to whatever set of men was put in as rulers of that country, and if he had his say, the present rulers would not be sustained in their position very long. Since the great man (Lord Palmerston), who was at the head of the Government, is gone, they have scarcely a man fit to retain office. In regard to Confederation, it is not going to benefit us, for we would have to be at the expense of keeping up two Legislatures, besides this great Parliament. If they must unite together, they had better unite under one Legislature, which