

posed it would have done, but as I have no past difficulties to complain of, and no evils to redress, I shall confine the few remarks I make to the question before us. These, as I think, many strong reasons why this Bill should pass. It is probable that the Houses both here and at Ottawa will meet in the winter, and hence if a member held a seat in both he would have to leave one or the other vacant, and we may be very sure it would not be the one at Ottawa. Then it is probable that many questions will arise, in which the General and Local Legislatures will not agree. No doubt laws will be passed here which will go to Ottawa and be there discussed, and those men who were in the minority here might then be able to wield an influence sufficient to have it repealed. It is evident that a man cannot faithfully serve two masters or two interests, and therefore he should not be placed in the awkward position of being compelled to sacrifice the interest of either of his constituencies. I think the rule should also be carried out in Canada, and it is probable that it will be; but even though it should not be, we shall not suffer by it. Neither do I think that because it was not put in the Act of Union any reflection should be cast on the delegates. They did right I think in leaving it to the decision of the people by their representatives, and they expressed the general feeling of the people in doing so. I will say one word as to the militia. I am not one of those who look upon the old system of training for four days as the cause of so much vice and immorality. I have seen quite as much drunkenness—for that is the immorality referred to—at our Agricultural Exhibitions, at our Crown Land Sales, at our Fairs and Races as I ever saw at a training; and to say that we should not prepare ourselves for war in times of peace, is the same as to say that we should not obtain engines till our houses are on fire. I do not fear for the future of this country. I remember the war of 1812, for I was a boy then, and I know the position of the United States then was no better than ours is now. There were troubles all along our borders, but small as we were then, I know that their attacking forces were always driven back, and in some cases whole regiments were captured, and I have no apprehension that we should fall a prey to them, now that we are in a so much better position, even if they tried to subdue us. I do not believe in the Prussian system of taking all the available strength of the country and converting it to military purposes, but I think a plan will be decided on that will prove quite effective without being a great burden upon the people.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—Although the hon. member for Westmorland appeared

very much alarmed as to the future of this country, I thought it was but in appearance, and it must needs be highly satisfactory to the House and country to know from his own lips that he does not feel that alarm and dread which his words would have seemed to imply. As to his forbearance this Session in not opposing the Government, I thank him for it, but with all his forbearance he cannot withhold using very strong language toward us. For example, he has called us a cowardly Government; but I know that we have not shown ourselves to be so. When my hon. friend was in the Government with us, I think we fought out the question of the Inter-colonial Railway, and I am sure we did not exhibit any such spirit in the question of Union. We took our stand and went to the people upon it. If cowardice was shown in Nova Scotia, I am sure there was none in New Brunswick, and I defy him to put his hand upon one act of the Government which will bear such a title. The only case that I know of where there was an exhibition of cowardice, was in the case I have referred to, when within the last fifteen months a Government took a stand on the question of Union by submitting it in the Speech from the Throne and then backed out from it directly they came upon the floors of the House. I deprecated the introduction of expressions of the opinions of Mr. McGee or any one else, and my hon. friend says that he speaks for his Government; but how can that be the opinions of the Confederate Government? That Mr. Howe, as he says, may be in the Legislature at Ottawa, is within the bounds of possibility, but that does not affect what he may have said in Nova Scotia. It is true, his speeches, as reported, have not always been acknowledged, and it may be the case with Mr. McGee. He may have been reported as uttering expressions which he may never have used. The hon. member says he is not for a Legislative Union, but at the same time he acknowledges that he would rather have that than a Federal Union. He charges the delegates with being away a long time and not doing anything. That might very well apply to the delegation of 1865, but not to that of 1866. He does acknowledge that we have got more money than we should have had under the Quebec Scheme; well, that's something we did. But we did more; we decided on resolutions as the basis of Union; we obtained the passage of an Imperial Act of Union; we got the guarantee for the Inter-colonial Railway, and we also obtained concessions on the Bill which many thought we could not get. I think this looks like something more than glorifying ourselves.

Mr. SMITH.—What about the white satin breeches?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—I never saw them. I have heard a good deal about them; but I have not been fortunate enough to see them. My hon. friend is mistaken as to the white satin breeches; you know when he was there, although he had the honor of an interview, it was in morning dress. Well Sir, since the matter has been referred to, I may say that we went by command of Her Majesty. We went once in morning dress and afterward received Her Majesty's command to appear in full dress. But, Sir, we did not feel that the honor was to us personally; but to the people of New Brunswick, and to us as their representatives. The hon. member asks if we are to enact history over again? I answer that, in some cases, the people of this Province are prepared and willing to enact history over again. The old arrangement of training occupied four days, and then we came down to one, and it was not found to be as good; for everybody then said, what is the use of drilling a man one day in the year? he does not learn anything. I believe the people now are ready to move and go into this matter with all their heart, and fit themselves for any emergency which may arise. There are in these Provinces at the present time four hundred thousand efficient militia men enrolled; and suppose we could, in times of danger, call out but one hundred thousand of these, would the knowledge that we had at our command such a force be sufficient in itself to prevent an ordinary aggression? I think the people are prepared to do something more than they have in this direction, and if any measure, with the object of putting the militia on a more efficient footing is introduced, I think it will meet the approbation of the people. My hon. friend has referred to the Femans, and asks if their coming had not some effect on the elections? I think it had, and a most decided one, for when they came and said they were prepared to assist the Antis in preventing Confederation, the feeling in favor of Union at once became more general, for the people saw that in that alone was safety. He talks about the gloomy future, but I am not afraid of our prospects. To-morrow, in order to prepare the way for the assimilation of our commercial relations with those of the other Provinces under Union, I shall bring in a Bill relating to our fiscal and tariff arrangements, by which the duties on certain articles will be reduced four per cent; but I suppose my hon. friend won't support that. I do not doubt, however, but that we have full powers to act in this matter. He says that the Attorney General expressed an opinion in favor of dual representation in public. I did not hear him, but I saw in the papers that he had made some remarks tending that