

and men to vote against Union. The election in the County of York was the commencement of the "silent rumbling" that hurled the Government from power, and it showed that the minds of the people of the country were against them. My hon. friend speaks of patriotism and party. I say that it was party that decided the question of Union, when it was first brought before the people; the people were humbugged and they felt it. I believe the Government in November last desired to recast this measure of Union, but I believed the people had been cheated, and I said I would go to the House of Assembly to prevent the Government from carrying any Scheme of Union through that House. I said the question should be again left to the people; and the men who inaugurated the principle were the proper men to carry it out. The only pledge I ever made to my constituents in my life was that I would agree to no Union unless there was an appeal to the people. I differ with my hon. friend in regard to the constitutional part of the question. I hold when he put the question of Union in the Speech he committed the Government to Union. He was not obliged to put it in; he could have said to the Governor that there was no necessity for putting that paragraph into the Speech, because those despatches could be laid before the House, but if put in the Speech they would have to endorse them. My hon. friend said his life had been a burden to him. He felt the difficulties that surrounded him; he recommended appointments to office, and the Governor would not make them; he held office without responsibility and without power. He told us the country was in great peril. Who were they in peril of? He had succeeded in cajoling the people only fifteen months before, but during that time the people had time to consider and they went against him by an overwhelming majority. I do not think there is a man on the floor of this House, or a man in the country, that would not say, after reading the address in answer to the Speech, that the Government had agreed to some kind of Union. This paragraph in the address says:

"The correspondence which has taken place between Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor General of Canada, on the affairs of British North America, when laid before us, will receive due attention, and the opinion expressed by Her Majesty's Government will command that respect and attention which is due to suggestions emanating from so high a source."

That is a full avowal of their policy of Union, but in order that the world might know that Mr. Anglin had them in the hollow of his hand, they add the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. SMITH—When the hon. member speaks of Mr. Anglin having the Government in the hollow of his hand, he states what is not true.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—The Government could not live with him, and they could not live without him and were turned out.

Mr. SMITH—It is not true.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—It is easy to say it is not true; but that does not alter the case, for the fact is indisputable. He helped to prepare that celebrated "Minute of Council," and that was one of the things that helped to kill them at the election. The paragraph continues,—"but in any Scheme for a Union of the British North American Colonies which may be proposed." I ask the House what that means "any Scheme of Union which may be proposed." Proposed by whom? By the Government. Did they intend to bring forward any measure? If the Government had been sustained last year on the "want of confidence motion" we would have defeated them on this paragraph, for there were constitutional men enough in the House to have done so. I think that any man with a knowledge of the English language would say after reading that paragraph that some Scheme of Union was in contemplation; and that Scheme would be a measure and that measure would be a measure of the Government. For what purpose? For the purpose of uniting these Provinces, and providing sufficient safeguards for their protection. There cannot be any doubt that this was the meaning of that paragraph. The Government complained of the address of the Legislative Council, and tried to induce the people to believe that they were a body who represented nobility, and were not a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature. They have taken the first action on this question and also have the Legislative Councils of Nova Scotia and Canada. My hon. friend complains that the Governor in answering the address of the Legislative Council, did not give him time to consult his colleagues upon the question. He says "a vote of want of confidence was going on." That was a mighty matter. He had no time to come down and discuss the matter for Mr. Anglin was speaking and had the lobbies filled to order.

Mr. SMITH—The Governor proposed that I should take half-an-hour to come down and consult my colleagues.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—I would have taken the half-hour and sent for my colleagues to Government House and discuss the matter. I do not think they would have been confined to half-an-hour for if they had come he could not have turned them out. It was Saturday afternoon and the House would have been

glad to have adjourned until Monday morning. All he had to do was to tell the House that the Government had important business to transact with the Governor, and Mr. Anglin would have been willing to postpone his remarks, and that would have obviated the difficulty. The Government at that time were holding power against the will of the people. The Government wished to make certain appointments and the Governor would not make them.

Mr. SMITH—The hon. member has made a statement that I have explained half-a-dozen times. The Governor did not refuse to make these appointments. The Governor did not think it desirable to make any displacements before he went to England, in view of its effect at the Colonial office, and this met with the concurrence of his Council.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—It was stated differently by Mr. Hatheway.

Mr. SMITH—I have stated it often, and there is no occasion to refer to Mr. Hatheway for he is not here to answer for himself.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—I was informed that the Government wanted to make these appointments, and it was more than insinuated that his refusal was one cause of Mr. Anglin's resignation. Mr. Anglin in order to sustain the humiliating position the Government was in, said, the country was in great peril, and this corroborates that idea. The Government were afraid to dissolve the House because they knew the feelings of the country were against them. They had an evidence of this in the York election, but they resolved to hold on to power as long as possible. This Union question should rise above all party questions; it is a question of patriotism and its object is to promote the welfare of our common country. My hon. friend says the policy of the Government is a policy of concealment. I should not think he would mention it, after the exhibition the Government made last session. After they came down to the House, they were silent beyond measure on this important question.

Mr. SMITH—My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. We told the House we had no measure to submit.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—I am not entirely mistaken. One great object of my motion was to draw them out upon the subject of Confederation. I tried to get some expression of opinion on the subject from the ex-Surveyor General, but he treated it in the most child-like way. His reply to my question was: Are you for the Quebec Scheme? The present Government have never conceived their action in this matter. They say that any Union proposed must be based upon the Que-