

but that I presume must be a mistake. I take it, it is meant to put on a duty of \$1 for every 100 pounds. So then we are to have a duty on flour, a charge which I have always resisted. This is intended to prevent our importing from the States, and compel us to use the grain and flour of Canada. Free ports are to be abolished, and then twelve and a half cents is a pretty heavy duty to pay on a pound of tea. I ask if these changes are made when the Parliament of Canada are not expected to meet again, shall we pay less when we are united to her?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—Yes.

Mr. SMITH.—He says yes, but it is known that the expenses of the General Government will be very great, and that on this account the taxes must largely increase. The people here use more tea in proportion than they do in Canada, and this item is but a forerunner of what must follow. Even with their present duty on tea, we should have to pay \$10,000 more for the quantity we use than we do now, and even this is to be increased. And then at last he goes on to say the Government will issue \$3,000,000 of legal tender notes to meet the immediate requirements of the country. And yet we are told that they have a surplus of funds. It is evident they are driven to the last extremity to meet their liabilities. The power and influence of Canada is felt in this country even now. I felt it in the late Government. It seems incredible, yet it is a fact that they attempted to influence the time of the meeting of our Legislature, and I believe that the Secretary is under the influence which the Canadians wield.

Now hear what Mr. George Brown says:

"Hon. Mr. BROWN regretted that the hon. gentleman had made such a speech as he had done at the present juncture. This was certainly a very bad time to make such a proposition, as he had laid down in the Budget. He ventured to say that when that Scheme (that is the financial statement of Mr. Galt) was before the country it would produce the wildest commotion. He was greatly surprised at the magnitude of the excitement. The hon. Finance Minister had stated that he would not have submitted the Scheme now had he thought it would throw any obstacles in the way of Confederation. He (Mr. Brown) certainly considered it most unfortunate that such a thing had been done on the eve of the consummation of the Union of the Provinces. The Scheme in many important particulars was bad. He considered that taking off a tax and putting on another was a way of robbing Peter to pay Paul. So far from mending matters they had been made worse. He (Mr. B.) intended to meet the proposition, at length at another time. He held that the Scheme of the hon. Finance Minister would throw the country into a political commotion which the Government had been formed to set at rest, and that putting forward such propositions at this

time was little short of madness. By this, too, no one could say that the House would rise for months to come."

Now these are the remarks of George Brown, one of the Quebec Schemers. You see he says that there is no knowing that the House will rise for months to come. At the opening of the present session the members of the Government were terribly anxious to bring on the business, and get the delegates appointed. I believe they intended to have sailed by the steamer that sails from Halifax tomorrow. But now there seems to be some hitch, they don't seem to mind how long the session lasts.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—Our lives are not a burden to us at any rate.

Mr. SMITH.—Then they ought to be. I put it to him if he was not in collusion with the Governor, and assisted the back-sair's Government in undermining the late administration. Mr. Speaker, at that time we were like a man surrounded by enemies, who did not know which way to move lest he should be endangering his life. We were surrounded by an unscrupulous Opposition, and by secret influences which were at work to overthrow us, and at that time I did feel that life was a burden. But I would ask the Provincial Secretary if he approves of the action of the Governor? Last winter was spent by him in looking after politics; day after day he was in this House watching the proceedings, and he seemed to have little else to do. I say if he thinks the course pursued, the wily influences used by this back-sair's Government, the Talleyrandism, right, then his life ought to be a burden to him.

His Honor the SPEAKER asked Mr. Smith to confine his remarks to the subject before the House as much as possible.

Mr. SMITH.—It seems, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of the Government may be allowed to go out of their way to make attacks on me, but I am to be strictly confined to the bare subject in hand.

His Honor the SPEAKER hoped the hon. member would not think that he would not act as justly and impartially with him as with any other member of the House.

Mr. SMITH.—I should be sorry to think, Mr. Speaker, that any such course would be adopted, but the hon. Attorney General was permitted to wander away into the action of the late Government, yet I am not to be allowed to reply to the charges he put forth.

Mr. WESTMORE.—I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Westmorland has stated that the Opposition in the last House was unscrupulous. Now I was in the Opposition last session. I want to say that my opposition to them was neither factious nor unscrupulous,

but the fact was the Opposition had an unscrupulous Government to deal with.

Mr. SMITH.—There it is. The hon. member for St. John takes great umbrage at my speaking of the late Opposition as unscrupulous, but does not hesitate to speak of the late Government in the same terms.

Mr. WESTMORE.—You first made use of the expression, and I certainly had a right to return the compliment.

Mr. SMITH.—I have challenged the Secretary, and I do so again, to show that the late Government were unconstitutional in any of their acts, or that they were guilty of mal-practices or mal-administration. To return, I was reading the financial statement of Mr. Galt, to show that the fiscal condition of Canada is very bad. Now I will refer to the constitutional part of the question. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Johnson) in his speech yesterday said, and he read largely from a book, to show that the people of the United States were not appealed to in the preparing of their Constitution. But let us look into the matter, and first see the care taken in the organization of a State. I shall quote from the same work as he did,

"When a new State is proposed to be organized, the people elect delegates to a Convention, for the purpose of framing a Constitution. After that instrument has been adopted in Convention, it is submitted to the vote of the people, and, on ballot, they declare 'for the Constitution,' or 'against the Constitution.' If the affirmative receive a majority of votes, it is adopted; if the majority vote for the negative, the Constitution is rejected. Whenever the people desire it, another Convention is called. In the old States it is difficult to effect a revision of that instrument."

It is usual for the Legislature to pass a law to take the vote of the people whether or not a Convention shall be authorized to meet for the purpose of revising the Constitution. The people ballot directly upon the question—"For a Convention," "against a Convention." If carried in the affirmative, the next Session of the Legislature passes a law authorizing a Convention to be convened, and its members to be elected. The delegates are then elected and the Convention assembles according to law, and proceed to revise the Constitution. This body sometimes continues in Session several weeks. When the revised instrument has been completed, the Convention orders its submission to the vote of the people, and then adjourns. The people cast their ballots either "for the Constitution" or "against the Constitution." If adopted, a new Government is organized, but if rejected and the effort to change the Government has failed, the old Constitution is continued in force.