

alarmed at a dissolution than any other member of the House. It might be annoying, for there were very few willing to have a dissolution without some good cause; but I can assure you I do not feel at all in fear of a dissolution in giving my vote. I believe that as an anti-Confederate it is my duty to sustain the present Government, not under any circumstances, but under present circumstances. Before the election in York, there were several dispatches published in some of the papers, about "Fenian raids," and the excitement in the country. This had its effect on the election. After the election was over, one of these papers, after giving the result of the election, puts in a paragraph as a postscript: "Fenian rumors all contradicted." It turns round and laughs at the people of York after it had gained its own ends. I believe that if a majority of this House vote against the present Government and defeat them, it would be the greatest step towards carrying the Quebec Scheme which could be given. A great deal has been said with regard to the delay of the meeting of the House. Why do not the hon. gentlemen give us some information about the delay in calling the Canadian Parliament together; possibly they could throw a good deal of light upon that. There have been questions which have from time to time come before the country, upon which Governments have been defeated and Governments formed. But there has never been a question before the country involving the same amount of interest as this. It is not only a question that affects our rights to-day but it affects our rights for all time to come, and the rights of those who come after us. If that scheme is adopted, the time will come when it will be looked upon with horror, and then they will think of those who tried to ward off the blow. No Government introducing a scheme for the union of the Colonies under the system of representation by population would advance the interests of this country. There could be improvements made in that scheme, if a scheme was absolutely necessary, but I do not say it is necessary. I will throw out these suggestions, which will have the effect of showing how inconsistent that scheme is regarding representation by population. I contend that upon entering into union with another country we should secure equal rights and privileges, and have equal power to maintain them. We cannot go into an Assembly with fifteen votes against one hundred and forty-seven which Canada has, and obtain equal rights there. Suppose a union of these Colonies was decided upon, and the details of that union had to be considered, the first steps which should be taken, in order to give fair play, would be to blot out all lines of distinction between these Colonies, and bring them together as one Province. Then we might be in a position to say to Canada, we will go into union, but give us equal representation. They contend they have done this in giving the Maritime Provinces a fair proportion in the Legislative Council. But have they not left the division lines, and taken us as three or four small Colonies, each with our representation in the Legislative Council. If we could have equal representation in the Legislature at Ottawa, we might be in a position to advocate our interests; but with fifteen members it is perfectly absurd. It has been stated by several members of the House, and in

the press of this country, that the people have changed their minds and feelings that this Government had not the confidence of the people of the Province, nor of any one County of it. If a dissolution took place to-morrow, and the question of Confederation had to be tried over again, I am not prepared to say whether I should be here. But I do state boldly that the County I represent would send representatives pledged to sustain the present Government.

Mr. NEEDHAM rose for the purpose of explaining the remark made by the hon. member for Kent, referred to by the last speaker. The hon. member in referring to the injustice that had been done to the County of Kent, said, that although an anti-Confederate, he felt he would not be acting as a man of spirit, if he did not pursue the course he was pursuing at present.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

HON. MR. SMITH laid before the House a message from His Excellency the Lieut. Governor, desiring to call the attention of the House of Assembly to the expediency of furnishing means to enable him to provide more effectually for the protection of the frontier of the Province from possible insult.

Also, a memorandum stating that the amount required for the ordinary militia service, and the sums paid in connection with the prevention of deserters from Her Majesty's forces, might be estimated at about \$40,000.

MR. FISHER. The Government would find them united as one man on this occasion. He was disposed to provide the Government with all the means they wanted, and would hold them responsible for the way it was disposed of.

DR. THOMPSON said, the Attorney General should prepare a resolution so it could pass the Legislature to-day.

MR. ANGLIN remarked, they should be prompt in this matter, so as to show to the people of this country that the Legislature was determined to strengthen the hands of the Government in providing means of defence, as far as they possibly could, by an act or vote of this House.

AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS RESUMED.

MR. McMILLAN. I feel, that in declaring I have no confidence in the general conduct of the Government, that I am giving expression to the feeling of the country. Before I attempt to meet the points in the speech of the Attorney General, which is composed chiefly of declamation and special pleading, let me say I disapprove of the course pursued by that gentleman in making attacks upon members of the House, and persons out of the House, who cannot reply to them. The most eloquent part of his speech was made up of attacks upon the hon. mover of the Amendment. He says, "Was he influenced by patriotic motives? Look at his motives—is he not looking at his own interest?" and going on in the same strain, "I know that gentleman well; he and I know each other well—" would say nothing to hurt his feelings. Do you suppose if he had anything to injure him politically he would withhold it? This course is beneath the dignity of a gentleman assuming the position of the leader of the Government. I raise my

voice to condemn such a course. Then he brings another charge against another gentleman who is not on the floor of this House. He states, the late Provincial Secretary has been going through the country, from schoolhouse to schoolhouse, poisoning the minds of the people of the country. Is it not a mean thing for him to bring those charges against a gentleman who is not in a position to answer him. He made a charge against the hon. mover of the Amendment that he had assailed the Government when he was not present to meet him, but he thinks it is a perfectly fair thing when he is guilty of it himself. He said that when he had an interview with the Colonial Secretary, he never forgot the fact that he was a man. I ask him now, if it was a meanly act to attack a man who was not in a position to answer him?

HON. MR. SMITH. If he makes it his business to go through the country and attack the individuals who compose the Government, I am not precluded from answering any attacks made upon us.

MR. McMILLAN. Would it not have been more manly for him, when he attacks this great Quebec Scheme, to have met Mr. Tilley when he challenged him to meet him and discuss that scheme? A man having the right side of a question, even if no great debater, is superior to a first class debater who has not the right side. If he felt that scheme was going to be the ruin and destruction of the country, why did he not accept the challenge? I put this question to him last year, and he denied that he was challenged, but I have heard him admit it since. It would have been more manly to have done so than have attacked a man occupying the high position Mr. Tilley does in the hearts of the people of this country. Haman like, he will never be satisfied until he will get Mordecai Tilley strung up; but I hope the fate of old Haman will be the fate of Haman Smith. The first charge made against the Tilley Government is, that they were guilty of an act of tyranny upon the people of this country. Was it an act of tyranny for the leading men of British North America to meet in conference and consider, week after week, a scheme to consolidate the British North American Provinces? Was it an act of tyranny for the Government of New Brunswick, after considering that scheme and feeling it would be a benefit to the country to adopt it, to appeal to the people of the country, and say to the independent electors of New Brunswick, here is a scheme, we think, is for your advantage, politically, commercially, and financially. Instead of forcing it through the Legislature, we ask you to judge for yourselves, whether you will adopt or refuse it. I ask you again, is that an act of tyranny, to appeal to the people themselves and let them judge, whether to adopt it or not?

If I am any judge of what is foreshadowed in the speech, I believe the present Government is prepared to force upon the people of this country a Union Scheme without leaving it to the people of the country to judge whether they will adopt it or not. The Attorney General laughs at this. He has condemned the Quebec Scheme, the most important principle of which is representation by population. I had a great difficulty in making up my mind upon that point. I felt the point was this. Suppose we departed from the basis of representation by population, where were we going to land at? I ask