

get one by degrees. The member of York had highly enlivened the United States, and had quoted from a New York paper to the effect that Government would protect the Colonies from invasion. He had also flung back the charge that the Antis were disloyal. Now he questioned the obedience of that child that would not obey its parent—loyalty was of the heart and not of the pocket, and no men could be loyal unless they obeyed the Government. He would quote also from a New York paper. (The hon. member read extract.) Here we found that they were opposed in the United States to the Union of the Colonies and the Intercolonial Railway, and the Antis were opposed to them also. He thought that there was some connection between disloyalty and anti-Confederation. Mr. Lindsay went on to quote from the *Freeman*, an extract from a letter signed A. I., and commented upon it, denying that he, as there charged, had ever said that the Fenians belonged to one denomination. He had never tried to set denomination against denomination, or class against class; he believed every man was entitled to equal privileges and freedom. He then went on to deny the truth of the statement made to the hon. member of York (Mr. Needham) that there were six or seven companies in Woodstock well armed and equipped; there was only one company. He thought something should be done for the defence of Carleton and the frontier. If the object of the raiders was plunder, they were more likely to attack small towns and villages than cities.

MR. WILMOT asked, was the country prepared to go into an army and navy, and support them out of the ordinary revenue? He thought the Government ought to tell the House what steps they were prepared to take to raise the ways and means.

MR. FISHER supposed the object of the Bill was to meet the present emergency. As the House had already given the Government all power necessary to meet it, he could not see how they could refuse to pass the Bill. He was not disposed to let his hon. colleague (Mr. N.) laugh this matter off. He believed that there was ground for serious danger. The time had arrived that had been looked forward to with apprehension for years. When the war of the Union over, the difficulty would arise when a lawless mob, accustomed to the use of arms, and indisposed to industry, would be thrown out upon the country, ready to engage in any raid or desperate undertaking, and enlist in any cause so that they could indulge their taste for rapine and plunder. This Bill did not refer at all to the Fish ries. We had, for that protection, flung over us, the powerful arm of the British Empire—an Empire, before whose power the grandeur of Rome in its palmiest days paled. Mr. Fisher then quoted from the Memorandum from His Excellency regarding the defence of the Province, to prove that this alarm in the country was not a mere matter of moonshine. It lay not in the mouth of any man to laugh this thing away.

MR. WETMORE said he had looked over the Bill, and he had found in it a great number of blanks. It was evident the Government were determined that the House should get no information in this or any other subject. He thought it was his right that he should get the information he wanted. It was extraordinary that the Attorney General was not found

in his place now. All the available resources of the Province had gone for military purposes, and now the country waited the mercy of the Government. If the Government expected to retain the confidence of the country, they must in their turn, be more confiding. Mr. Wetmore then read the Bill, and commented upon it, and said he found it a perfect blank. He did not intend to oppose the Bill, but called upon the Provincial Secretary to give some information respecting it.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY. The hon. member did not intend to oppose the Bill, but he caught at every opportunity to say something derogatory of the Government. He had told them he asked the House to pass the Bill, that the Government might have full authority to take the necessary steps for the defence of the country. He had told them that there was reason to fear that some danger would approach the Province by the sea. The Bill explained itself and it did ask for more money than had already been granted. The hon. member of St. John (Mr. Wetmore) had made allusions to the Attorney General being away. It was no proof of talent to say these saucy things. He could say them if he liked, but he was better bred. If the hon. member intended to pursue the course he had taken, it would be necessary to meet him in his own manner. He would assure him (Mr. W.) that the country saw through the low, mean insinuations he was continually making against the Government.

MR. WILMOT. Where are the ways and means to come from? That was a political question at any rate.

MR. WETMORE. One would think from the ferocious manner in which the Provincial Secretary attacked him (Mr. W.) that he was sufficient in himself to drive out all the marauders that would ever attempt to come into the Province. He could thoroughly understand why the Provincial Secretary was so sensitive about any reflection upon the Government. With regard to the Government, the existing opinion in the country was, that they had no mind of their own. They had not even power to appoint to office and, it was said, that the chief head was not a member of the Council at all. He would like to get the information he asked for, if the Provincial Secretary was permitted to give it.

The Bill was then passed.

AFTERNOON.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS.

MR. WILMOT said, he was now called upon to explain the position in which he stood with regard to the present. He had received permission from His Excellency to say anything where his colleagues and himself had been in conflict. It appeared that he had been charged as being entirely in error, when he had said he was in favor of the abstract principle of union. There was a distinct difference of opinion between them with regard to the Minute of Council; and, when the gentlemen who signed that memorandum, said, that he never expressed an opinion in favor of union, he had the authority of Judge Allen to say, that he repeatedly heard him state an opinion in favor of union; and he was allowed by His Excellency to

say, when that celebrated Minute was before the Council, that His Excellency referred to him (Mr. W.) as not opposed to the abstract principle. When those gentlemen who signed the Minute said, that he expressed no such opinion; he said, it was not the fact. He saw Mr. Fraser in his place. He happened to be in his (Mr. W.) house when the question was talked of, and he (Mr. F.) knew whether he was in favor of the abstract principle or not. (Mr. Fraser. There was not the slightest doubt about it.) He had expressed the same opinion to hundreds of persons. He had the satisfaction of knowing that when he was called a traitor to the cause of anti-Confederation, that the Governor had endorsed his opinion. He would ask the Government if they were opposed to union? What did the paragraph in the Speech mean? [The hon. member here quoted from the Speech.] If these gentlemen were still disposed to union, he would ask again, how was it they agreed to put that paragraph in His Excellency's Speech? [The hon. member quoted the paragraph relating to union in the Reply to the Address.] He would like to know if he was entirely wrong—if the Government were entirely right? When he stated his opinion in Toronto, it was in reply to a speech made by Mr. McDougall, who said, that not only the people of Canada, but the people of the Lower Provinces, were in favor of the Quebec Scheme. In reply, he (Mr. W.) stated, that, certainly, the Quebec Scheme had been put before the people at the polls and they had condemned it. But though they had condemned that scheme, there was a vast number in favor of the abstract principle of union, and that it was only a question of time when a union would be carried—why, it was carried now. He had, he supposed, had more foresight than his former colleagues in this question.

Mr. Wilmot then went on to say, that the paragraph in the Speech certainly foreshadowed some Scheme of Union, and he thought the Government ought to come down with it. But he would tell them that any Scheme of Confederation, they might submit, must involve those two principles:—one, the Federal principle, the other, Representation by Population. Lower Canada would insist upon the first, in order to protect her rights, and Upper Canada must have Representation by Population. [Attorney General. That was unfair.] Fair, or unfair, no Scheme could be carried that did not involve those two abstract principles. He had strong feelings against these two principles before he went to Canada. But when he attended the Convention there, and heard the whole question of trade opened up and discussed, he came to the conclusion that Union must take place. He foresaw also, that the Reciprocity Treaty would be repeated. There was one subject brought forward at that Convention that impressed his mind with the necessity of Union—the Mother Country was prepared to give those Colonies the right to make Commercial Treaties. When he considered that there were six different Governments, and six different tariffs, and all the difficulties in the way, he concluded there must be one General Government to carry them out.

It was stated in the papers, that it was because he could not get the Auditor Generalship, or some office, that he left the Government. He would require to