

way. But the hon. member is aggrieved because it was not put down in the Act that it would not be permitted. We were all unanimous on the subject, but had no power to deal with it, and even if we had possessed the power, it would not have been expedient to do so.

Mr. SMITH.—It is a novel idea that the Delegates had not the power. Why, they were acting as the representatives of the House of Commons, and had full powers to decide on any question affecting the interests of the Dominion. The Secretary says he is going to bring in a Bill to alter the Tariff, and says it can be done. When I asked him the other day to take stock in Western Extension he said it could be done, but I find that it is denounced in the other branch, and that consequently the Government are not going to do it. So they have changed their policy on that question, it seems. He says that we have four hundred thousand men enrolled as Militia, but I ask him what our revenues are to keep up these men in time of war, or how long they would last to keep up a standing army of one hundred thousand? Our people are thoroughly loyal, but I do not believe they are willing, at a time when things are in such a bad state, with flour at \$11 or \$12 a barrel, and distress prevailing everywhere, to keep up a large body of standing Militia. Now he takes credit to himself for what was done in England; but I say if changes were obtained in the Quebec Scheme, the present Government cannot take the credit, for they pronounced that scheme faultless. I find that some changes have been made for the better, but many more for the worse. He has now made public the fact that the Delegates had two interviews with Her Majesty; I thought there was but one. He says it was no honor done to him, but to the people. Well, if that is the case, I think we ought to see the dress in which he appeared—they say it cost £60. I saw that while in England the Secretary was presented with an address, in which he was lauded to the skies for the sacrifices he had made. It gave the whole of his political history, and it seems strange how they became acquainted with it all. The papers state that he was so choked with emotion that he could scarcely reply. I suppose it was all right, although I should like to know something of the great sacrifices which he has been called upon to make.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The debate has taken a much wider range than I thought it would have done, and some remarks have been made that I feel called on to allude to. Meterefer has been made to Confederation, and a gentleman has been named who does not reside in the Province, and if I remained silent it might be thought that I concur in what has been

said. Mr. Howe has been from my earliest infancy my tutor. I always have looked to him as a leader worthy to be followed, and if now he is attacked, it must be remembered that it is Howe attacking Howe. When I first came into public life I met Mr. Howe at Stubbs' Hotel, in Saint John, and my hon. friend who was present will remember the man with the high shirt collar. Well, we had some conversation,—but I will not say what it was. I will speak of him as a Colonist, and when I heard and read what he said to the British Government, I thought it strange that a man who had gone to the United States and had to sleep in different beds every night to escape detection, I say I thought it strange that he should say to the British Government that we should not go into Union lest the United States might take umbrage and take measures to annex us. When he, as a Colonist, pandered to the men who, for the commercial advantages which might arise to England from prolonged peace and amity with the United States, were willing to prevent our uniting together, I thought it very strange, and I felt that though troubles arose from it, and this were the battle ground, the people of this Province would boldly and bravely stand up for the defence of their homes and hearths against the United States in such a cause. I do not think the United States Government want to annex us, but there is a power behind them urging them on. Howe said that if we were united it might give offence to a foreign power, and I felt, as a Colonist, that England would consider us wanting in that pluck and self-reliance which has ever characterized the English race. My hon. friend from Westmorland has said that it is intended to make us all soldiers, and that it will be no better than it is in Prussia. But I would ask him if he can show me a nation more high in patriotism, in position and prosperity than Prussia? If the making us all soldiers will make us like that country, we need not be afraid of it; I believe in making a man fit to fight, even though he may not have to do it. On the principle of the Bill my hon. friend and I concur, but as reference was made to Mr. Howe I thought it best to make these remarks. I do not think it is judicious to bring him into discussion; but if he is, and is lauded, all we have to do is to show what his past life has been and what he is now.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—The question has been asked me, why it is that the hon. member for Westmorland takes up so much time in denouncing Confederation? Of course, it is expected to have some effect. We all know that it is the policy of the opponents of Union to get as many of their number at Ottawa as possible, and these speeches now will save a good deal

of time at the hustings, as they are all reported in the papers and Debates. My hon. friend asked, What has Confederation done thus far? He says the people are poor and the times are bad. We have not yet entered into Confederation, and therefore it cannot be expected to have done much for us, but thus far even it has had the effect of giving confidence in the capabilities and resources of the country to be developed under Confederation to persons who would otherwise have left the country. He says I changed my views, but he knows that I was willing to get the very best terms possible, and if we could not get any changes made then I was willing to take the basis of the Quebec Scheme. And he asks, Who should take the credit for the changes made? Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly not those who have been from the first opposed to Union on any terms. If my hon. friend had changed his position, as many others have done all over the Province, and which he says he has not done, then he might have taken some of the credit to himself, but not now. He says we are all to be made soldiers, and asks where the revenues are to come from to support a standing army? But it is not intended to call them out and keep them up, but only to place the Militia upon a good footing. He says I indulge in a good deal of self-glorification, and referred to an address which was presented to me by my Temperance friends, asking how they got their information. Well, they did not get it from me. I am not the man who talks in the House or on the platform of the personal sacrifices I have made. He says I was choked with emotion. Well, I did not know that I was able to do much that way, but that is a forte possessed very strongly by my hon. friend. I remember when I was lecturing on Union in Westmorland some one said to me, "You should come the pathetic as Smith does," and hon. members well know that peculiar tremor in his voice, so fitted to create an impression on his listeners, when he feels deeply on any subject. Seeing that my hon. friend is not free from this, I may be well pardoned if, on an occasion like that, I should find a difficulty of expressing myself, and my friends may have thought I was more deeply affected than in reality I was. As to the expressions of praise I have remarked that as a general rule our friends pile it on a little too much one side, while our enemies do the same thing the other side. I have to apologize for taking up so much of the time, but it was called for by the hon. member for Westmorland travelling out of the record to make Confederation the cause of the distress and dullness which prevails, when in reality we are looking forward to Union to remedy it.