

help them by every means in their power. But now the hon. member says the people were deceived. If they were, why, I ask, deceived them? It was he, and the people know it—and they know more. They know that during the Confederation contest, when the hon. member for West-merland was going about from Ban to Beersheba, trying to show that a Union of these Provinces would bring devastation and ruin upon the people of this country, and when the friends of Union were striving to show them the benefits which would accrue from it, he was challenged by Mr. Tilley to meet him and discuss the matter fairly and openly; but, instead of doing it, he went off to the back slums of Sussex, somewhere out of the way, and would not meet him. The men in opposition to the Government of that day saw the position, they realized the danger to the best interests of the people by a continuance in power of the men who were willing to sacrifice every constitutional right for the privilege of holding on to office, and they knew that the people would rise in their indignation and co-operate with the members of the House in hurrying the Government from power, and they did it. The hon. member has gone into the old story of his differences with Governor Gordon, and now tries with high sounding words to frighten the present Government by challenging them to open up the controversy again. But I tell my hon. friend that if he wants to go into the matter, we are ready and willing to meet him on any point, with the full confidence that we can vanquish him, either here or before the people of this country. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have done what Mr. Gordon could not do, and it is that which makes him so sore; he has been ruled out of Court, and it is that which ruffles so. We have been able to carry the measure of Union most satisfactory to the people of this Province, and one that is truly the precursor of better times. He knows well enough that when we go to the people they will give us a verdict. He knows that many of their strongest supporters, who were opposed to the Quebec Scheme, have come round, now that the most beneficial changes have been effected, and are favorable to the measure. He need not get up here and blow off so much gas, for it can do no good. He would be much better employed, and commend himself to the good sense of the people, if he were to go in and help the Government to put through the business of the country.

Mr. SMITH.—The Attorney General has a happy faculty of taking all the glory to himself for what has been done. But if changes have been obtained in the Quebec Scheme, who, I ask, are entitled to praise? Is it the Attorney General,

who for two years went about the country from "Ban to Beersheba" preaching up the beauties of the Quebec Scheme? No; if he had had his way the country would at this moment have been cursed with that Scheme. If praise is due to any one, it is to those who so boldly withstood the infliction of that measure upon our people, and who, when it was found that the people were desirous for Union, still retained that changes should be made. The Attorney General was fortunate enough to be one of the Delegates, and now he comes back, and with the most disinterested patriotism wants to go to Ottawa and hold on to his office here as well. He says, that I retreated to the back slums of Sussex Vale, but I tell him he had better retire to the back slums of his own political infamy. He says it was I who started the cry of Fenianism, but what are the facts of the case? Every day we received telegrams from the Governor, of the most exciting and threatening character, but which I now believe were not more than two-thirds true. I do not know where they came from, or who was their author,—perhaps the Attorney General can tell us; but it is evident to my mind that they were got up for the purpose of overthrowing the Government. A few men did come down to our borders, and they professed to come to assist the Anns to prevent Confederation. That was it; as if any one could not see that this very statement was sufficient to unite our people against both Government and Fenians. They did not come with any such purpose; but perhaps the Attorney General can tell us why they did come. Did he know anything about them? Was he in communication with them? I can't tell, but everybody knows that they were the cause of the defeat of the Government, and, strange to say, the moment the Attorney General came into power it was all over. They did turn up again on the Canada border some time after, and disastrous consequences followed, but they did no damage here. But I want to know what the Attorney General means by the back slums of Sussex? Has he been there? Doesn't he know there are no back slums in Sussex Vale? What does he mean?

There are back slums here, I believe; for I have often heard it said that the Attorney General would go through the back slums from his office to his house to avoid meeting his constituents face to face. But I think he does not know what he is talking about, and had better use more propriety in his language, for I won't bear it. He has been in London for some months past, and probably has had experience of such places, but that is no reason why he should cast a stigma upon Sussex Vale. The story he tells has been denied over and over again, but he still

brings it up; that I promised to meet Mr. Tilley and discuss the question of Confederation, in the Hall connected with the Academy at Saskatoon—a statement which is as untruthful as can be. I waited on the Secretary of that meeting, and was told that I could go, but would not be allowed to speak—consequently I did not go. But I did get a challenge. It was at the close of a meeting at which I had been speaking, when a man called out, "I will meet you here to-morrow night and discuss the question with you." I had an engagement that night twenty miles away, and the man knew it. I did not know that I was afraid to talk on the matter, or to let people know my opinions. I went to Saint John, and, Mr. Speaker, I think you can vouch that I had a good reception.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The people of Saint John always receive strangers who address them with every consideration.

Mr. SMITH.—I do not know that it is worth while to prolong this discussion, but if the Attorney General is going to use slang phrases and unparliamentary language, I am ready for him. I think I can talk about back slums as well as he, if he is anxious for it. I now want to hear from the Surveyor General in reply to my question, and from the Attorney General about his speech which he made to the people in the Hall here after his return, wherein he is reported to have said that he was strongly in favor of going to Ottawa and holding on to his seat in this House.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.—I never said it.

Mr. SMITH.—Then you were reported wrong. But now if the Attorney General will put on that Court Dress, of which we have heard so much, and which it is said has been brought to this country—a dress that, report says, cost about £60—and come upon the floors of the House in it, I will willingly forgive many of his political sins, and the curiosity of the members of this House and of the country, which has been wrought up to an extraordinary pitch by the accounts given in the papers, will be satisfied. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. FISHER.—I am aware that the expression I made use of was uncalled for and unparliamentary, but it dropped from my mouth in the heat of the moment, and now I am not ashamed to retract it. I am not in the habit of making use of language which is condemned by the rules of this House, but still I must tell my hon. friend that it is no use in his coming here to blow off his gas, but if he wants to fight the matter out, let us have a fair field and no favor, and I am sure that I can show that the position he takes with regard to the whole question at issue is wrong.