

country. When these charges were made against my predecessor, Mr. Brown, he was ignorant of the fact that fictitious names were used, but there was no ignorance about these. The survey was made for Mr. Gibson, but the application was made in the names of other parties, so they cannot screen themselves in any way.

MR. FRASER.—Did you not make an order for the survey of 10,000 acres for Mr. Gibson. What did you intend by that order.

MR. McMILLAN.—I can explain that, I did make an order for the survey, upon the application of Mr. Gibson, but I do not recollect the number of acres. I submitted it to the Council, a majority of whom were not prepared to rescind the Minute of Council, but ordered the survey to take place. It was the intention of the Council, if the Government remained in power—and there was no prospect of the Inter-Colonial Railroad being built—to rescind that Minute of Council. In regard to the appointment of Judges, I do not feel in a position to touch upon that point at all. I believe that a great injustice, by an unjustifiable act, has been done to Judge Wilnot. With reference to the other vacancy which took place I do not pretend to be a judge whether it is properly filled or not. When a vacancy takes place upon the Bench it is natural to suppose that the Government would take a view of the leading men of the Bar, and from them make selection of a man to fill that high position, which is one of the highest in the Province. Have they done so? I said I was not a judge, but those that are judges think they have not done so. I doubt the propriety of having to go to "insurance offices" to select a man to fill one of the highest positions in the Province. They should have full confidence that the person so appointed will be looked up to.

The Attorney General's excuse for allowing the Export Duty to expire was, that no government ever had such difficulties to contend with as the present Government. What were the difficulties? Were they not returned to the House by an immense majority. In the history of New Brunswick there never was a time when the Opposition was so small. What Acts had they to bring in, and what opposition was given them to take their attention from seeing what laws were about to expire? Even the members of the Government who went back to the country for re-election were not opposed in a single instance, and they were supported by a two-thirds vote in the House of Assembly. Why then do they try to excuse themselves in that way? There is no foundation for this excuse whatever, for they had no difficulties to draw their attention from looking into these matters. The arguments advanced by the Attorney General are peculiar; he would say the Attorney General was responsible when he was not here. It was not part of the Provincial Secretary's duty, but he says it was his predecessor's duty to know it, and he should have come to the Provincial Secretary's office and told the Provincial Secretary that this law was about to expire. The principle is, that the previous Provincial Secretary ought to have come to the present one and told him what his duties were; thus admitting at once their own incapacity to administer the affairs of the country.

HON. MR. SMITH.—I stated distinctly that the whole Government were respon-

sible. It was the duty of the Attorney General, as he had undertaken to see what laws were about to expire. I said the Provincial Secretary was a young man and inexperienced in the duties of his office, and if his predecessor knew of the fact of this law being about to expire, he should have communicated it to his successor.

MR. WETMORE.—When he wanted to get the Bill through the House he said the whole Government were responsible, but as soon as he got that through he tried to throw the responsibility upon the previous Attorney General, and the former Provincial Secretary's name was lugged in.

HON. MR. SMITH.—I will leave it to the House. I said we were all responsible.

MR. McMILLAN.—If he wishes to withdraw the statement that the Provincial Secretary was not responsible.

HON. MR. SMITH.—I did not say so.

MR. McMILLAN.—He charges the late Government with being guilty of an act of tyranny and despotism, because they appealed to the people at an inclement season of the year; but he now says, if the Government are defeated he will appeal to the people. He will be guilty of the same thing he condemned in his predecessor, in order that he may hold office a little longer. No man in this country pretended to be so careless about offices as that hon. gentleman, but we find he holds on to them most tenaciously. In viewing the political career of the leading men of British North America, I am not aware of one individual who has made more political summersaults than that hon. gentleman. Look at his position in reference to railroads, and in reference to military matters. He left the late Government because they would undertake a greater responsibility than twenty thousand pounds per year for the Inter-Colonial Railway, and in the Opposition he advocated the Western Extension as a Government work, which would involve an annual liability of over sixty thousand pounds per year. When a Bill was brought before the House to appropriate \$10,000 for this purpose he moved an amendment that the money be appropriated for Bye-Roads. Next year he brings down a Bill to appropriate \$30,000 to the Militia service. If in one case he was sincere, in the other he must have been insincere. If he is in the Government he is for certain measure, if not he is in opposition. When in opposition he was not only against the Quebec Scheme, but against a Union of any kind. Now he has fore-shedded in the speech a Union of British North America. I asked him if he was not going to support something in the shape of appointing a Committee, a delegation, or something of that kind, for the purpose of carrying a scheme of Union of some kind, and he would not answer me.

HON. MR. SMITH.—I stated to Mr. Brown that we were prepared to consider the question of Union, but not the Quebec Scheme.

MR. McMILLAN.—If that is so, how does he endorse every word of that Minute of Council which says, "they desire no closer union." If he is sincere in one case, he must be insincere in the other. It has been stated by the Canadian and New Brunswick Press, and stated by Mr. Wilnot in Canada, that they were prepared to meet the members of the Government of New Brunswick—and not of sac-

cially Mr. Smith—to discuss a Scheme of Union.

HON. MR. SMITH.—Mr. Brown had no authority to make such a statement. He distinctly declined a conference altogether.

MR. McMILLAN.—Did he not write and make a proposition?

HON. MR. SMITH.—Mr. Brown distinctly declined another conference when he was here.

MR. McMILLAN.—We have Mr. Brown's and Mr. Wilnot's statements for it. The Government formerly denounced a union of any kind, and now, having gone half over to a union policy, they occupy the position they do under false pretences. I ask him again, if he is prepared, either by a resolution, committee, address or delegation, to support any scheme of union that has representation by population in it. I repeat, I take it for granted he is.

HON. MR. SMITH.—Don't take it for granted.

MR. McMILLAN.—You have answered every other question. I will take it for granted.

HON. MR. SMITH.—He seems determined that I shall answer all the questions he has a mind to put. I stated distinctly my views in regard to the principle of representation by population, as contained in the Quebec Scheme. I would never consent to it, unless there are other protections to counterbalance it. I attempted to explain the effects of representation by population, as contained in the Scheme, but I do not know how to provide checks, and if checks cannot be provided, I never will give my consent to representation by population.

MR. McMILLAN.—I think the country and the House will give me credit for getting half an answer from the Attorney General, and I believe, from the answer, he is prepared to support a scheme (hear hear) that contains the principle which he has denounced throughout the country, viz: representation by population, counteracted by something else. The most important part of the whole scheme he is prepared to go far; having a large representation in the upper branch is not so much protection. The most important body is the people's representatives who have control of the people's money. In order to hold his office, he is prepared to swallow all this. He has swallowed the whole pill now, and he will swallow the whole pill to hold on to office. I hope the expression drawn from him will open the eyes of the Anti-Unionists. The members of this Government have proved recalcitrant to their professions. They professed to be "Anti," and then when it is drawn out of their leader, he is going to support a scheme of union on the principle of representation by population. When the Quebec Scheme was introduced the cry throughout the country was, we are going to be swamped; only fifteen men in the Canadian Parliament. He is not prepared to go for a similar scheme with only fifteen members?

HON. MR. SMITH.—I never have been, and never will be.

MR. McMILLAN.—Does he withdraw that too? No, he will not withdraw it, for I believe he is committed to it. I believe he has not told his supporters that he is prepared to submit such a scheme. It is treason. He was elected to oppose a scheme, and he will come forward and support it without any appeal to the people. If that is the case, it is a disgrace.