

you now, whether you will, in this House, by delegation, by resolution, by a committee of the House, or by any other means, agree to force upon the country a scheme which holds the principle of representation by population without submitting the details of their scheme to the representatives of the people in this House, or to the people themselves? The hon. Attorney General refuses to answer this. I will then take it for granted it is the intention to do so. The Speeches from the Throne, no matter in what way they come—by the command of Her Majesty, or any other way—are the policy of the Government, if I understand the principles of Responsible Government. The hon. member for Kent asked him what side he was on. I ask him not whether he is Anti or Confederate, but I will give my opinion by a peculiar operation: he is just a cross between the two, and after a few more crosses I expect to see the Attorney General come out the pure breed, and a splendid specimen of a Confederate. The Government opposed the scheme for a union of the Provinces, to save the country, and now they have got into power, they have adopted a principle of union, not, probably, to save the country, but to hold their offices. The Attorney General said he would not take office unless the emergencies of the country required it. I am not aware of any emergency having arisen, and I believe any other legal gentleman in the House would have filed the office as well and as satisfactorily as the Hon. Mr. Smith. He said they should not be condemned without being heard. Give us an opportunity to submit our reports; give us an opportunity to defend ourselves; before condemning us, let us be heard. I maintain they have been heard, and they have had an opportunity to show what their capacities were, both in an executive and administrative point of view, and the country, I believe, condemns them after a trial of twelve months. In 1854 he did not think there was anything wrong in him condemning the Government without being heard. Had the Government of that day any opportunity of showing what they had done? Was it right for them to condemn the Government without being heard? Why, then, is it wrong now? It is right to move this amendment, and it is the proper time, for the acts of the Government are foreshadowed in the Speech, and by that we are supposed to know what the acts are to be. The next point is that very got up about Fenianism. He tries to make it appear that the hon. member from Carleton is trying to make difficulties in the House on religious grounds. No person would regret it more than my hon. friend from Carleton. I would feel as indignant as any hon. member in this House at an attack being made upon them on religious grounds, for the Head Centre, Stephens, is a Presbyterian. I have always had a sympathy with the Irish people. They have grievances to complain of, and if an Irishman, I would take every constitutional means in my power to relieve these grievances. But it is not right to get up religious feelings in this House, for which I will put the responsibility upon the Attorney General. He stated that he endorsed every sentiment in that Minute of Council, which states that they do not desire any closer relationship between the Colonies than now exists, and he is now prepared to go for a scheme of union on such terms as he considers for the good

of the country. I maintain that if there is anything the Government of the country should take the responsibility of, it is a matter affecting our Constitution. The Government decline the responsibility for the sake of their offices. They decline the responsibility of maturing a scheme but will bring forward the papers, and let the representatives of the people do as they like with them. Responsible Government, which the people of this country so long fought for, is a complete farce in the hands of such men. They will submit to anything as long as you allow them to hold their offices. If the Government act recreant to the duty of the people who put them in that position, it is sufficient to condemn them. I maintain that whatever the decision of the House may be, if an appeal is made to the people, the people will decide against them. The very Antis will reject them. Let them appeal to the people, and they will find themselves in a great minority as we found ourselves last election. There is no great danger of the present Government taking any responsibility as long as they can hold office. Look at the position which they occupy in regard to Western Extension. One member of the Government denouncing it as a Government work; another member in St. John, having committed himself at the hustings, having declared there that he would oppose any Government that would not advocate Western Extension as a Government work. If there is anything the Government are responsible for, it is anything affecting the finances of the country or the Constitution, and they throw both these questions upon the representatives of the people. He has declined to answer my question concerning Confederation. I believe the course will be to submit the papers, and appoint a Committee of the House to report upon them, pass an Address affirming the principles of union, and then send a delegation home to confer with the British Government, while they are passing through the Imperial Parliament, refusing to leave the details to the people of this Province. They have denounced the Confederation scheme, and our act, in leaving it to the people, as an act of tyranny. How, then, will they justify themselves? How will they meet this country and this House again, and those Antis that are around these boards? The Hon. Attorney General, in a speech delivered on the hustings, in Westmorland, informed the electors of the feelings of emotion which almost overcame him when he was signing the contract for building the Railway to connect New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. He was overcome in signing that contract. I suppose conscience was nipping him, for if he had succeeded in 1864 in his opposition to the Bill in aid of building Railways, he would not be in a position to enter upon that contract. I hope these feelings arose from the pricking of conscience, for "While the lamp holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return." He states that when he explained this great scheme to the people of England, they were astonished that men of ordinary intelligence could agree to such a scheme. Only two had ever read it. He charges the British Government and the Colonial Secretary with ignorance.

HON. MR. SMITH.—I do not think any hon. member has a right to make a statement, and say I made a statement I did not make. I did not charge the Colonial Secretary with ignorance. I said,

outside of the British Government only two persons had read the scheme at all.

MR. McMILLAN.—Notwithstanding the British Government had given the scheme all the consideration that they always do to these questions, and pronounced it good, and paid the highest compliment to the delegates that met in Quebec, the people were astonished. It was from the manner in which he explained it that caused the people of England to express astonishment. He said, in the formation of the Government was the County of York neglected? No, it was not neglected, but other Counties were. Only one man, who had no political experience whatever—the very first day he took a seat in this House, he was taken into the Executive Council. This man was to represent the four Northern Counties in the Province. But he throws out a bait now. He says, upon the basis upon which the Government was formed, they could not take a member in but one of their own Anti principles. They really desired to take a member from the North into the Government. Look at the position the Northern members occupy, and ask him if he is sincere in that statement. There were two members from Kent and two from Gloucester who supported the Government on Anti principles, so there was no necessity for doing injustice to the North in having only one member for four Counties. Upon that ground alone, if I had no other grievances, I would condemn them.

There is another bait thrown out in the Solicitor Generalship, and I ask my friend on my left if he was not induced to believe he would get the office. (Mr. Fraser.—No.) Then I have been misinformed. The next point is the Crown Lands. There may be difference of opinion as to whether the Minute of Council should be rescinded, which says no lands shall be sold except for actual settlement. If their course was such as to prevent the Inter-Colonial Railroad being built, they were right in repeating it, for the object of it was to prevent speculation pending the negotiations for that Railway. But it was their duty to have informed the public of the rescinding of that Minute of Council the moment it was done. I maintain they were wrong in thinking this Railroad would not be built, for I have no doubt it will be built by one route or the other. I ask the Hon. Surveyor General if he is not aware that his deputies did not give right information. Persons who applied for this land were told they could not get it, the Deputies not being aware that this Minute of Council was cancelled. If that be so, what a spectacle the Crown Land Office presented; the Department guided and regulated by one regulation, and their Deputies by another. See the confusion to which it led. The very moment that Minute of Council was cancelled, it should have been published in the Royal Gazette. I do not say anything against Mr. Gibson, for I consider he is a credit to the country. His enterprise has no doubt been an advantage to the section of the country where he resides, and it was in his name the Attorney General says, these lands were published, and any person could oppose him. I deny that. The first application was not published in Mr. Gibson's name, but was published in the names of A, B and C, and no person would know Mr. Gibson was connected with it. This was carrying out the principle which has been so much denounced throughout the