

County were owned by private individuals, with the exception of about three square miles, and those owners of private property have to submit to the duty upon the lumber which they export. But as this duty was absolutely necessary, the Government having no other means of raising a revenue, he would not make any opposition because this money was necessary for the roads of the country. There was another point he would refer to. A man who had paid £700 into the Treasury of the Province, without any law, may think that this money belongs to him, and as the Government have thought proper to pass an *ex post facto* law to take away what he thinks is his right, he may petition the Governor to withhold his consent and the bill go home with a suspending clause attached to it, and not become law at all. It was for this reason he had proposed dividing the bill into two parts, but the Government, having thought proper to unite them, he should vote for it.

MR. HILL would not take up the time of the House, if it were not that he should vote for this Bill, while he did not believe in the policy of an export duty. It was utterly wrong, and there was scarcely a civilized nation which had adopted the principle, not even the United States, although it is proposed to put an export duty on cotton and tobacco, because, they say, they are products in which other nations cannot compete with them. It is wrong in principle, and has been given up by every enlightened financier in the civilized world. He would rather see a stumpage collected, by which he thought the revenues of the Province would be largely increased. In regard to an *ex post facto* law, it was common to pass such a law in the United States, and the principle was not unknown here. If ever there was an *ex post facto* Bill that should be passed, it was this one. He should vote for the Bill, although he did not believe in the principle.

The House divided upon the Bill, upon which the Chairman reported the Bill as agreed to.

The House then took up the order of the day, viz:—

THE ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE SPEECH.
MR. FISHER'S AMENDMENT TO THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH.

HON. MR. SMITH resumed.—"The House listened to me yesterday about an hour on this 'Bill of Indictment.' I hope the indulgence of the House will be extended to me for a short time, for I will be as brief as the consideration of what is due to myself and the Government of which I am a member, will allow. The House, in passing the Bill which has just been passed, do nothing to justify the Government. They did not introduce that Bill in this hurried way to attempt to relieve themselves of that responsibility, that censure, if they were entitled to censure, that odium, if it ought to fall upon them for this unfortunate occurrence. We are prepared to take all the responsibility of our conduct. After we have offered an explanation to the House, we stand prepared to receive their decision. I hope I shall not fall into the same error which the hon. mover of the amendment did yesterday; that is, he simply gave a re-hash of what he said the day before. It is well known that the election which took place last winter was one of the most anxious active conflicts which has ever taken place in this country.

The issue was of more importance than any other issue that has ever been brought before the people. I complain that the dissolution of the House upon the question of Confederation, last winter, was an act of tyranny perpetrated by the advisers of His Excellency. That question had never been brought forward for the consideration of the people—never been discussed before Parliament, and according to the Constitution the people are here by their representatives. The whole country was convulsed by this election, which took place in midwinter, and involved in its results the independence, the rights and liberties of the people, which were to be surrendered up by the Government to the rule of the men of Canada. The dissolution was an act of base injustice to the people, as many of them were engaged during the winter season in lumbering operations. In the County of Charlotte a considerable portion of the population were far away in the wilderness engaged in that employment, and it was impossible for these people to be at the polls. If the day had happened to have been stormy, the aged people who, by their industry, have made this country what it is, would have had no opportunity of going to the polls, as many of them had to travel twenty or thirty miles, and giving their vote upon this great question. At the election the people told the Government in a voice that could not be misunderstood, that they had forfeited the confidence of the people, and they had to tender their resignation to His Excellency, and a new Government was formed the 1st day of April, and then some of the members had to return to their constituents for re-election. Some of them were returned on only one or two days before the House met, and they had scarcely met forty-eight hours before complaints were made that we had submitted no measures. I appealed to the justice of this House, and the reply was that we could not be expected to have measures prepared at so short a notice. We all know that the Provincial Secretary, though he had been for some time in political life, was inexperienced, and had no time to prepare to meet the Legislature, as he was only here two days before the House met, which gave him a very short time to prepare the estimates. We were compelled to call the House together at a time when it was inconvenient for the members to leave their homes, and were anxious to return. Those are the circumstances under which the Government was formed, and I think they justify us in calling for an indulgent consideration and sympathy in view of those circumstances. It was the duty of the Attorney General, now Judge Ailler, to see what laws were expiring, but he was pressed very much by the duties which devolved upon him, and this Act escaped his notice. We have no desire to shrink from the responsibility, for we are all liable for whatever act is committed by any one member. We all know that it is human to err, but "it is divine to forgive." I was surprised to see the malicious joy, the delight, which seemed to beam from the countenance of the learned mover of the amendment, when he stated this oversight. I do not imagine he embraces all the learning and policy in the country. I do not intend to use the language which he did, which I consider to be insulting. Was it right for him to evince a satisfaction yesterday when he thought this country would be

thrown into confusion? He pretended he could not make up his mind regarding this law, retrospective in its operation, when he has known the circumstance for weeks. How different the conduct of the hon. member for Kent, (Mr. Gale.) He rose and said he had paid \$1200 into the revenue, and he made up his mind at once in favor of the Bill, although the first he knew of it was last night. He was ready to render assistance that would preclude him from getting that money back. It is the privilege of any member to move a want of confidence in the Government; but I think it is the duty of every hon. member here to watch narrowly and look closely into the motives of the men who seek to oust the Government, and see whether they are actuated by a spirit of patriotism or not; whether it is the good of the country they are seeking, or their own aggrandizement. When the hon. member boasts of the way in which he was returned to this House, without ever leaving his office, for the people rose omnipotent in their power to place him here, we know something of the agencies employed to bring him here. An attack was made upon me; it was presented to the people of the County of York that I was their enemy, that I was anxious to remove the seat of Government. In corroboration of that it was said, he has taken the Post-Office away, and that is the first step towards removing the seat of Government. It was told them at the last general election, that by going for Confederation they would forever secure the seat of Government at Fredericton. I will ask whether, in debating a question of so much importance to the people, it was proper and right to bring forward this argument: "If you do not go into Confederation, the seat of Government is in peril." This great question should be discussed on broad principles, and reasons given why a change in our condition would be for our good. We find the advocates of the Quebec scheme saying, it is a beautiful scheme, there is no darkness upon it all, and there are no reasons in the world why you should not go into Confederation. We were told by the hon. mover of the Amendment that he made certain objections to this scheme of Confederation in Quebec—that there were exceptions to it which he thought was not right. Did they tell the people that there were exceptions to the scheme and they wanted to submit those exceptions to them? Did they say, do not go into this Union until you have fully considered it? No. Everything was said in favor of it. It seemed they entered upon this contest as paid lawyers advocating the interests of their clients all on one side without looking at the other at all. If the hon. mover of the Amendment was seeking the benefit of the country, he would give us fair play; that is all we ask. Give the Secretary an opportunity of presenting his accounts to the House and I do not hesitate to say they will be presented in a way that will give satisfaction to the House, for he has made an improvement in the way in which the public accounts are kept. He can now show that the revenues are in a prosperous condition, and in consideration of his having been in the Legislature twelve years, and never held a seat in the Government, it would be no more than right that he should come before the House and show his account of what he