

and sent over the country to have an effect upon the elections.

The Paragraph in the Speech attaches no constitutional responsibility upon the late Government. The answer to the Legislative Council was the subject of much debate. His Excellency wished to put something in it in reference to Union, but we said No, and he gave way. They say we were committed to Union. I say I stated in my place in the late House that I was for Union provided we could get a Union advantageous for this Province, for it was my country and I would consent to no Scheme of Union that did not give protection to the rights and interests of the people of this Province. This is also stated in the correspondence, and in all my intercourse with the Governor I always maintained the same principle. When the Provincial Secretary said that I had pledged myself to Union and consulted my friends upon the subject he did not do us just ce. I ask him if he knows that Mr. Mitchell was sent for a few days before the House met. (Mr. Tilley. I do.) The first time he was sent for I was in the United States, and not a single member of the Government knew that he was sent for. The second time he was sent for the Provincial Secretary knew of it. Does that look as if the Governor was acting *bona fide* with us, when he concealed from us the fact that he had sent for a member of the Opposition? Was such conduct justifiable? I protested from time to time against the Governor's acting with the members of the Opposition. The Provincial Secretary knew every thing that was to take place and every thing that did take place. When the Governor sent for me about twenty minutes before three, he had his answer prepared for the Legislative Council. I told him that he had violated his agreement. He said he did not know that the Legislative Council were going to present this address. No said I, but we are not responsible for the Legislative Council, he did not pretend to deny that he violated the arrangement, but tried to justify it. He then told me he would give me half-an-hour to consult my colleagues. I told him no, the debate on the want of confidence motion was going on, and they would have to be in the House; he said "he would send the coaches down for them to come up." I said they could not leave the House. He replied, "I suppose not," he then left me but before he did so, he said very coolly, if you do not like the answer you can relieve yourselves of the responsibility. I asked him if this was fair. He said had we not better resign, and get it out of the way. I am informed that the Clerk of the Executive Council was there ready to swear in a new Government. It was a proposition made by this man who boasts of his

good name, that we should resign the seals of office and let our enemies come in and take the Government of the country, or in other words that we should prove recreant to our trust, and to every principle of honor which bound us faithfully to fulfil that trust. The Provincial Secretary says I was to consult my friends about Union, he knows that is not correct. He knows that I was to consult my friends about the appointment of a committee to take the subject of Union into consideration. I said I could not pledge myself as to what the Committee were to do. They might authorize another Conference or authorize a Conference of the Lower Colonies. I ask the Attorney General whether it is the intention of the Government to unite New Brunswick with Nova Scotia and Canada, or whether they intend to make it a *sine qua non* that all British North America shall be united. He declines to answer the question. I made certain objections to the Quebec Scheme, viz.:

1. Representation by Population.
2. That each Province should have an equal number of Legislative Councillors.
3. That the Lower Provinces should be exempt from taxation for the Canada's of Upper Canada, and for the purchase money and other expenditures connected with the North West Territory.
4. That the Revenues collected in the Provinces should be for the benefit of each Province when collected, except a certain amount to be given for the support of the General Government.

The Governor acknowledged that the objections were reasonable, but now he is willing to go for the Quebec Scheme. I told him that if I went into political oblivion for ever, I would never consent to representation by population, unless it was neutralized by some checks. This I stated to the House several times during the last session. I told the Governor that I never would go into Union blindfold, and trust to luck as to what kind of Union we were to get, but I must know the terms of the Union proposed before I would agree to it. I will be here at all times to raise my voice in vindication of the people's rights and interests, and I plead for them that the Scheme may be altered, because I think the country is opposed to it. I think it is the intention of the Government to appoint men to proceed to England who were delegates at the Quebec Conference, and as the Provincial Secretary has undertaken to dissipate every objection made to the Scheme, when this is known to the Canadian delegates they will not consent to have it modified. Therefore I ask them to send some men who were not at the Conference at Quebec. I do not think it would be right to take men from the Opposition, but they should take men who were not committed to the Scheme so

that we may get a Scheme under which justice would be done to every member of the Confederacy.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—A large portion of the speech of my hon. friend is more adapted to another time and another occasion. We are not here to discuss the question of the position of the late Government in all its bearings. He complains that the subject was dragged in by the Provincial Secretary. I think he himself was the first aggressor. He objects to the mode of carrying this Union measure, and says it was aided by the treacherous conduct of the Governor. I do not intend to follow him in but very few of his objections. He referred to our position when the House was dissolved by the late Governor Mennessier-Sutton, and compared it with the action of His Excellency, but there is a great difference between the two. He and I were in the Government at that time, and one ground of our complaint was that the Governor had allowed the members to return to their ordinary business before the question was raised regarding the Prohibitory Law; had he raised an objection to it during the Session of the Legislature, the dissolution might have been avoided. His great paramount object was to oust his Government, and the Prohibitory Liquor Law was made the stalking horse to accomplish that object. I am not going to follow him through the mazes of his correspondence, but will only say that after reading it and reading the speech, I came to the conclusion that my hon. friend's Government had agreed with the Governor upon some question of Union. I have not had much to do with the back stairs influence to which he has referred. From the time the Governor came to the Province until I entered this Government, I have never had five minutes conversation with him upon any political question. When I entered the late House my mind was made up that no power on earth would induce me to assist that Government to carry that Union. I came to the House pledged to oppose them. I believed they acquired power unfairly, and their opposition was an opposition to the Government more than an opposition to Union. It was not discussed fairly before the country. Every man was told that his horses, cows, hens, dogs, and every thing he had, would be taxed if he went for this Union. Men went from bustings to bustings proclaiming everywhere that we would be taxed to death.

Mr. SMITH—I said taxation would be increased. I said nothing about taxing dogs and hens.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—Writings putting forth propositions of that kind were circulated over the Province, and that incli-