

without a strong expression of their judgment on the subject before us. I have heard it stated that the delegation is to leave on Tuesday next, and that Dr. Tupper and Mr. Archibald, of Nova Scotia, have gone on to Canada on the matter of the delegation. Why, I would ask, this indecent haste? Why prevent a calm and deliberate discussion of the question? Hon. members are not to be allowed to see the Scheme or pass their judgment upon it. Was ever a plenipotentiary so empowered before? This may be right, but in my opinion it is entirely wrong. If my predictions are verified, I shall have the satisfaction of knowing that I have cleared my conscience. I put it to the Hon. Attorney General, I put it to the Hon. Solicitor General, and to the Hon. Provincial Secretary, if it is right to appoint delegates to go to England—3,000 miles away—and there frame a Scheme of Union, binding upon the people of this Province for ever, without their ever seeing it, or knowing its provisions. I have, in making these remarks, had no selfish end in view, and as I have said I do not suppose they will have any weight, but I have freed my conscience and myself before the country. I will now conclude with the following amendment to the resolution:

“Provided that no Act or Measure for such Union shall have force or effect in New Brunswick until it shall be approved by the Legislature or people of this Province.”

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—The hon. ex-President of the Council in his opening remarks taunted the Attorney General with not entering at length into the terms of the proposed Union, and with that solemnity which the subject demands. Mr. Speaker, if we had entered upon it with the spirit of levity, the eloquent appeals and the deep sentiments which characterized his remarks could not have failed in producing quite as solemn a feeling as even he could desire, and I say, sir, that I can express the pleasure I have had in listening to his stirring appeals with as much sincerity and with as much power as when the hon. ex-President of the Council, fourteen months ago, said he was sorry there were none of the delegates to the Council held at Quebec then on the floors of the House to whom he could put a few questions. His remarks produced almost as great an effect on the House at that time as at the present. But to-day, sir, he stands here with a less majority than the friends of Union did then. The hon. member says that if this question were delayed, a great reaction would take place in the minds of the people. Why, Mr. Speaker, the great reaction has taken place, and on my recent visit to St. John, when the hon. member was also there, I found it hard to find a disunionist. No, sir, there are few to-day who

oppose Union. He attributes the change in public opinion to Fenianism, and the “treachery of His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor.” I am not going into the question of dispute between the Governor and his late advisers, but if any body was guilty of unconstitutionality I say it was the late President of the Government. Talk of unconstitutionality, why the acts of the late Government show who was guilty in this respect, and yet they went back to the people with the constitutional plea, when they had violated every principle of responsible Government whilst they were in power. There was the removals from office of certain parties obnoxious to the then Government. I heard one of the members of that Government (Mr. Hatheway) state openly in his place on the floors of this House that he had advised His Excellency to make certain changes, and His Excellency told him he would not do it, and further said, if the Government did not like it they could resign, for Tilley could form a Government.

Mr. SMITH—I know nothing of what might have been said by His Excellency to any members of the Government on the bank of the river, but this I do say that no recommendations were made by the Government to the Governor with regard to removals from office, but he complied with. There was no difference between us on that ground.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—I only state what I heard an hon. member of the Government declare to his colleagues and the members of the House. When the hon. ex-Attorney General rises here and declares that the charge in public opinion on this great question has been brought about by “the treachery of the Governor,” I should be recreant to my trust, my position to my duty if I did not take it up. The hon. member says that no recommendation was made but was complied with. That memorandum may never have been again presented to His Excellency, but it is none the less true that the hon. member of the Government stated that the Governor would not make the required changes. The hon. ex-President of the Council said that these things could not be attended to because Confederation stood in the way. Mr. Speaker, if there was “treachery” anywhere it lies at the door of the hon. ex-President of the Council and his Government. I admit that we had an advantage in going to the people with this question at the late elections, but it was an advantage given to us by the late Government. I know something about the matter of “treachery,” for I was in communication with Mr. Mitchell at the time when he was in conjunction with the late President, preparing for a change on the subject of Union. The hon. ex-Attorney General

says he would like to see hon. members rise above party on this matter, but who stood up during the late House and claimed for party and nothing but party? The hon. ex-President. During the arrangements between the Governor and Mr. Mitchell, I had nothing to say to His Excellency. Mr. Mitchell came to me and told me what was being done, and I said if the then Government would go for Union, I would, although not a member of the House, use all my interest and influence to carry the proposed measure. I knew that Mr. Mitchell was working with and for the government party. It was also the wish of His Excellency to carry the Union by means of his then existing Government. Go to the Country on the Constitutional question! Why the hon. member knows as well as any body that the matter was all prepared for, and in perfect consonance with the Speech at the opening of the last Session, the answer to which was prepared by the Government and put in Colonel Boyd’s mouth, and in favor of Union. The question of Fenianism may also have affected the late elections in some measure, inasmuch as some of the friends of the late government were supposed to have some feelings of sympathy for them.

I believe with the hon. ex-President of the Council that this subject should be discussed without abuse. I have used more hard words in the last ten minutes than during the whole of the late campaign. I have been very careful not to make use of any language that could be charged as personalities, and I wish the ex-President of the Council had done the same thing. He has said that the action of the Legislative Council was prompted by personal motives, but the late elections have shown that they, six weeks ago, spoke the feelings of the people on this question. The hon. member has striven to throw around the subject a veil of sophistry, and to frighten the hon. members of this House, but, sir, they are on a platform that cannot be shaken. Let us go back to the origin of the affairs in connection with Union, and see how it arose. The hon. ex-President came down to Saint John, and told the people that it arose out of the troubles and necessities of Canada, and asked them not to speak too hastily, but to assist the other counties in the defeat of the Scheme. But, sir, the question was not new to the Government of this country. As early as 1858, a proposition was made to us to go into a Union with the other Provinces. It was not deemed advisable on certain grounds, and even though of late it may be that, as the hon. member observes, the renewed proposal for Union grew out of the dead lock which had taken place in the government of Canada, was the mere fact of her necessities urg-