

Upper Canada, and for the purchase money and other expenditures connected with the North West Territory.

4. That the Revenues collected in the different Provinces should be for the benefit of each Province when collected, except a certain amount to be given for the support of the General Government.

Here was an understanding had with His Excellency immediately after his return from Washington. When His Excellency put the acceptance of Mr. Wilmot's resignation on the grounds of Union, he (Mr. Smith) told him that he would go and consult his friends and colleagues upon the question of Union.

Mr. SMITH—I never was to consult my friends with regard to Union. I was to consult my friends as to whether they would consent that a Select Committee should be appointed to take the subject into consideration after the despatches had been laid before the House. They were to take the whole subject into consideration, and make such suggestions as they thought proper. I stated distinctly in the House that we had no Union policy to submit to the House. This the Governor knew well, and so did every member of the House.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—I think if you were to poll the country North and South on this question of whether the late Attorney General had committed himself to Union or not, there would not be one in fifty but would say that he had.

Mr. SMITH—That impression has been created by speeches which have been made not founded on fact.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—I will take the Speech and the Address in answer to the Speech as evidence.

Mr. SMITH—The Government in preparing that Speech did not commit themselves to Union. The Governor wanted us to put in something that would have committed us, but we did not. The Governor did not pretend to say that we were committed to Union.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—Then we have no constitution in this country. It is the opinion of every one who knows anything about Responsible Government that they were committed to Union. Some years ago the Governor had a despatch from the Colonial Office which he wished referred to in the Speech. The Government objected to refer to it, because it would make them responsible, and they waited upon His Excellency, and had it struck out. This Union was also referred to in the Address in answer to the Speech, which was moved by Mr. Boyd, a representative from Charlotte. In that it is stated that any measure for Union submitted to the House should receive attention.

Mr. SMITH—It is not any measure submitted to the House. It is any

measure that should be proposed. I want the Secretary, when he quotes from these records, to read them.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—Is there any difference whether they used the word propose or submit? The way they dealt with the subject was enough to destroy any Government. To throw the question upon a Committee with the understanding that they should report favorably when the hon. and learned member would be in a position to brow-beat every member.

Mr. SMITH—I will not take such insinuations, for they are false. That language is unparliamentary. I have ever treated this House in a respectful manner.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—If what he says was correct that at Washington he was told by members of the Canadian Government that no important change could be made in the Scheme, what position would he occupy entering into a negotiation for a change, when he was told no change could be made? I do not want to create any ill-feeling, but I want to put the matter just as I understand it. Was it treating His Excellency with candour to negotiate for changes when he knew those changes could not be made. I think they can be made. When I read the correspondence relative to the resignation of Mr. Wilmot, I felt the blood rushing to my cheek to hear his motives impugned—to hear them say that they never heard him say anything about Union until he went to Canada. But to come down farther in Mr. Smith's speech. He says:

The Council met at Fredericton about the third of March. His Excellency in the meantime had returned from Canada. He told me that he had seen Lord Monck and some of the members of the Canadian Government, and he said he thought they would be willing to make concessions.

This was after Mr. Smith had been told that no concessions would be made. Therefore there is some chance of getting concessions. I have taken up every objection referred to by the ex-Attorney General. I have taken up the finances and shown that in Union with a uniform tariff New Brunswick will not pay more, if as much, duties as other parts of British North America, because we do not consume as many dutiable goods. It will give us more money for local purposes. It will secure the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. \$9,000,000, of the money necessary to build this Railway will be expended in New Brunswick thereby developing the resources of the country. It gives us \$1,400,000 for Railway Extension, without costing us a cent more than we paid in 1864. It

was these facts known by the great bulk of the people that caused them to go for Confederation. If the population of Kent Westmorland, and Gloucester had been a reading people, we would not have had the pleasure of seeing some of the hon. gentlemen who represent these Counties, here in opposition to the Government. They have been returned because the French do not read as much as the English population. The press does not have the same influence upon them, and public opinion does not reach them.

The late Attorney General comes here and appeals to the House upon this question, and tells the members that if they invest so much power in the delegates they cannot go back to their constituents and say they have done their duty. I doubt whether the leader of the Opposition—the great anti-Confederate, now a Unionist, can lead them astray. There are a thousand reasons why he should not, although he has made some suggestions which may be acted upon. The country has declared against him both with reference to his administration of the Government, and with reference to his policy on this question. A more inconsistent politician does not live in New Brunswick. When he was in the Government of which I was a member we constructed a railway, but when he went out of the Government there was not a man who denounced his own act with as much power and force as he did. When a proposition was before the House to provide for the extension of our railways, he opposed it, and said £200 a day was sent out of the Province as interest, and the country could not bear it; but now he says build these extensions and our railway will pay six cent. His vote is recorded against the Subsidy Act, but he has put those extensions through and even in one respect exceeded the authority given him by law. He brought in an Act to appropriate \$10,000 for Military purposes when he was in the Government, and when out of it he voted that that money should not be appropriated for that purpose, but should be given to the bye-roads. The next year he comes in and asks for \$30,000, for military purposes, and is there not a letter published in which he tells us that after Union with Canada we will have to keep up an army and navy, and yet he came down to the House when a member of the Government and asked for a navy. He is now a Unionist, although a short time ago he was against any Union with the Canadas. Great as may be his abilities he is more successful when he is seeking to break down, than when he is endeavoring to build up. He is endeavouring to delay this question with the hope that something might possibly grow out of the delay.