

says again that Fenianism had much to do with this change in the people's minds. I agree with him: It had much to do with it in this way: Mr. Killian and his brother would tell the people within the neighboring border, that if the people of New Brunswick did not wish to go into Confederation they had only to call upon him, and he was ready to come, with his band to do the bidding of the disaffected. This sunk into the hearts of loyal people, and if ever New Brunswick did honor to herself, she did it when she threw aside all considerations of mere dollars and cents, and said that rather than join herself to them, or sail in the same boat with those that held their doctrines, she would sacrifice a great deal and go in for Union under any circumstances. I have heard people say, that now the elections are over we will hear no more of Fenianism in the Province. If we do not, its death blow was struck when we showed unmistakably that we were in favor of Confederation. Another reason for this change was the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty. We found that we were to be placed at the mercy of our neighbors across the border, and that our supply of flour and breadstuffs might easily be cut off, but if we were united we would be independent of them. We found that many of those people in the Province who had annexation proclivities and desires were most violently opposed to the Scheme, while those who desired to maintain British connection were in favor of it. The ex-Attorney General alludes to back-stairs influence in carrying these elections, and speaks of what he calls the treachery and unconstitutional conduct of the Governor. Any man who brings a charge against the Queen's representative ought to see that his own garments are perfectly clear. The Government found they must adopt a Union policy or resign their seats. When that confidential memorandum came out, we found that the Government had had several communications with the then Premier of the Government, and that His Excellency was desirous of expressing his views on Union at the opening of the House. This correspondence discloses what the policy of the Government was, that these despatches were to be submitted to a Committee who were to report in favor of Union. The Government did not desire to take the responsibility upon their own shoulders, but that they might more easily effect their purpose and relieve themselves from embarrassments, they were going to throw the responsibility upon the House. They call themselves constitutionalists, because they say the Governor acted in an unconstitutional manner

in not consulting with his Council. If he had consulted his Council, and they had not endorsed his reply to the Legislative Council, they would have had to resign, and His Excellency would have had to dissolve the House in consequence; but if they had endorsed it, this Union policy would have been carried out, and the leader of the late Government would have received honor for it. When Sir Robert Peel, who occupied a high position at home, found it necessary to alter his policy, and stood forth ready to sacrifice place, power, and position for the time being, conscious of his own rectitude, there never was a time when he stood higher as a statesman than when he came manly forth with no covered scheme and no desire to shirk responsibility, but took it upon himself, with a few followers, to advocate his changed policy. Had this been the policy of the late Attorney General, there is no doubt but that he would have made himself one of the foremost men in the Province; but instead of this he adopted what might be termed a cowardly policy. We came here not to act in that cowardly spirit, but determined to advocate Union, and to carry out the principle of Union in all its integrity. We have been cautioned to act with solemnity, and not to surrender our judgment to the guidance of others. I think it was scarcely necessary to ask us not to surrender our judgment and follow a leader who would leave us wandering in an inconsistent path, one who was opposed to this Scheme of Union, and whose policy was a vacillating policy. We will follow these statesmen on the floors of the House who have been an honor to the country, and the country have honored them, and are only climbing that steep ascent where their names shall rest when they are no more. We are told that our Local Legislatures will dwindle away. Are we to remain as we are, and never increase in population? Has it not been shown that there would be very few bills that we would not still have to discuss here? Suppose our Local Legislatures were to fall into comparative insignificance, must we sacrifice this grand idea for the sake of a Local Legislature? Are we to sacrifice the interests of three millions of people for the sake of a Local Legislature. All we want of it is to manage the affairs of the Province. It was said that the Legislative Councils would reside in Canada. Could they imagine that men with a property qualification of \$4000 would remove to Canada and reside among men whom they termed French Canadians and reckless and corrupt politicians. A man would not take all his equipage and remove to Ottawa

for the sake of being there three months with a paltry salary of about £250. There is another objection made to the Scheme which really has much force to it. It is said we should have an increased representation in the Legislative Council. This, if it can be obtained, would provide the necessary checks against any action taken in the Lower House detrimental to our interest; but as it is, the terms are more favorable to New Brunswick than to Canada, because, according to population, we have two representatives in the Upper House to Canada's one. It is said that in the United States each State sends an equal number of representatives to the Upper House, and that it should be the same here. The Senate of the United States exercises the functions of an executive body, and therefore the same reasons for an equal representation does not apply here.

Were we elected to support Union in the abstract, or Union under the basis of the Quebec Scheme, hoping to get improvements? The main question which agitated the minds of the people of New Brunswick was this: was it Imperial policy? If we cast our vote, will we not be casting our vote for or against that policy? The people believed the Queen and the British nation desired it, and they said they would not cast their votes against the policy of the British Empire, lest the construction might be put upon it that they were disloyal to the British Crown. The cry has been raised throughout the country that the Quebec Scheme was not a good Scheme. Many people said they would agree to Union, but could not agree to the Quebec Scheme, and when I asked them to point out their objections to it they could not do it. This was an easy way of letting themselves down; they had formerly opposed all Union, and now they would go for Union but would oppose the Quebec Scheme. They do this because they think it degrading to change their views. Why should a man be always crying out against a building when he has the power to remove it, and build a better superstructure if he can. Any fool can cry down but it is the part of a wise man to build up. If the ex-premier does not like the Scheme why does he not bring in a better. If he would bring in a Scheme we should bind it round with silks and ribbons, and crown it with a high cocked hat. If he would only bring it in and present it as his first-born, in the present emergency we would render it due obeisance. It may show itself but until, it comes we will take the liberty of dealing with the one we have. We have been told that if we went for this Scheme of Union we would be cutting the last connecting link which binds us to the mother country. If it is simply the appointment of our Lieutenant