

he presented to Her Majesty and not to His Excellency; why then could he not have spoken professedly in behalf of Her Majesty? In so doing he would have discharged his duty. He (Mr. S.) had no doubt but that there was an arrangement beforehand. When he was sent for, His Excellency asked during the course of his observations, "it we had not better give up, and allow him to form a new Government, and get this question of confederation out of the way." His Excellency thought that he (Mr. S.) had better bring his colleagues to the Government House; doubtless he thought that rather than take the responsibility of his reply they would resign, and Mr. Stratton was there he (Mr. S.) believed for the purpose of swearing the new Government in. Could this conduct be justified? (Mr. Wilmot said he had read a note from the Governor, stating that nothing of the kind was intended.) Mr. Smith said his hon. friend may not have known anything about it; the note he (Mr. W.) had read did not relieve his position. His Excellency had said that Mr. Stratton was there to obey any commands, but he (Mr. S.) believed that one of the commands which His Excellency expected to give him, was to swear in a new Government. He (Mr. S.) could not tell when this extraordinary change came over his Excellency's mind, neither could he tell the agencies or means employed to induce him to change his opinions. Will it not astonish the country to hear that those parts of the despatch of the 12th of July, which have been called insulting to her Majesty the Queen, were written by his Excellency. (Mr. Wilmot said that in the original draft drawn by his Excellency, there was a paragraph in favor of union, this was struck out, although upon the question being taken, Mr. Hutchinson and himself had declared themselves in favor of union. The late Attorney General and the Government are already committed to a principle of union, and were prepared to carry it, through the House in their own time and way.)

Mr. ANGLIN asked leave to explain, he had been called a mean low fellow—one who would insult the Queen—was disloyal to the throne, because it was said he had written a despatch which was an outrage upon the people of this Province, and induced his colleagues to sign it while drunk. Every part of that despatch, to which objections have been made, was written by his Excellency. He had a section in it which would have committed them to a principle of union, but they repudiated it at once. If things had proceeded in the ordinary course, and party fought party in the House, he (Mr. Anglin) would have been ashamed to make any allusion to the fact that his Excellency had prepared that portion of the despatch which has been characterized as insulting to the Queen, but as he has chosen to take an extraordinary course, he (Mr. A.) would no longer bear the odium which some of the members of the late Opposition attach to the writer of those portions of the despatch. The Government were charged with violating the principles of Responsible Government by truckling to the Governor in not making certain appointments. His Excellency in a conversation with the leader of the Government objected to making any alterations, not on the ground that it

was not right to make such changes, but because he thought it would be prejudicial to the purpose for which the delegation were going home to England. His Excellency said he wished to write home certain letters to help the delegation, and the Government agreed to postpone the changes until after the return of the delegates. When they returned, the Governor was on his way to England, and they knew the administration would not desire to make any changes during the absence of his Excellency. (Some conversation then took place between Mr. L. P. W. DesBrisay and Mr. Hatheway in regard to changing officers in the County of Kent.)

Mr. Anglin continued.—The appointments were never actually made, because they thought they would have a prejudicial effect upon the delegation. His Excellency's connections held a high position in England, and the Government thought it was of importance to secure his earnest co-operation, in comparison with which a few paltry appointments was a matter of small account. The Governor in Council never refused to make one single appointment. His hon. colleague (Mr. Wetmore) thought he had made a strong point when he spoke of the Governor's salary. At a meeting of the Council they told his Excellency that they were individually pledged, and the people of the country required that there should be some arrangement made concerning this matter. They found, according to an arrangement made with the previous Government, the Lieutenant Governor drew the whole amount and refunded part of it. They discussed the question, and maintained that he should receive the same amount as under the old arrangement. His Excellency said that would put him in a position of having taken what he was not entitled to. The Council replied that they must have the matter settled one way or the other, and His Excellency spoke of writing home to be recalled rather than settle it. He suggested that he should have time to obtain permission from the Home Government to withdraw the despatch sent by the Duke of Newcastle, so that he would not be disobeying orders. The Council thought that would not affect their rights, and that the salary would then be taken out in the old way. That was made a distinct understanding, but he (Mr. A.) was informed that this arrangement was never carried out. Whether or not it was the fault of the late Government in neglecting to carry this out. It is clearly the duty of the present Government to do so.

Mr. SMITH said he told His Excellency that he was determined to have the matter settled, and he would not sacrifice the course which he had taken.

Mr. WILMOT said he was the person that brought the question up.

Mr. SMITH said that the Government expected the arrangement would have been carried out when they went to England. He then spoke of Mr. Wilmot as the leader of the Government formed to carry out the Quebec Scheme, and Mr. Wilmot replied that he was not more favorable to the Quebec Scheme than before. Mr. Smith said he (Mr. Wilmot) was bound hand and foot to the Quebec Scheme, and had no way to extricate himself. His (Mr. Smith's) motives had been impugned by his hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) when he charged him with not acting upon principle, but from a feeling of na-

lignity against the late Government. He (Mr. S.) did not think the question involved the position of the Government at all, as the Governor had power to draw these warrants himself. This arrangement made by the Tilley Government to allow his Excellency to draw this money and pay it back, was an extraordinary thing. Did they want a donation from him? If he was entitled to the money, it was but justice that he should have it. Mr. Smith then spoke of the despatch of the 12th of July, and said his Excellency had himself written the most objectionable part. He then referred to a remark made by a member of the Upper House that he was twice sent for by his Excellency. He (Mr. Smith) did not think his Excellency was doing right in consulting with a member of the Opposition. When he (Mr. S.) returned from the United States his colleagues told him that some scheme for union was in contemplation, and that the Governor had consulted with a member of the Opposition regarding it. He had mentioned to the Governor that this rumor was in circulation. Why did not his Excellency say at once: "It is true, I advised with Mr. Mitchell." That would have been a frank and generous course; instead of this he said, "Mr. Mitchell and some others dined at Government House." He (Mr. S.) did not blame Mr. Mitchell but he had no language strong enough to express his disapprobation of the Governor's consulting him, while a member of the Opposition, in regard to matters which ought to be considered of a confidential nature, instead of taking the advice of his own Government. (Mr. Wilmot asked whether any arrangements were made to bring the subject of Union before the Council.) Mr. Smith said that his hon. colleague knew exactly what was done. The arrangement was that he (Mr. S.) was to consult his friend, then the despatches were to be submitted to the House, and afterwards referred to a Select Committee. They discussed the question whether they should refer them to a joint committee of both Houses or separately to each House. This matter was discussed from time to time, and the names taken down of those who should be on the committee. He insisted that the friends of the Government should have a majority in the Committee, and he wanted a Joint Committee of both Houses. On a late occasion, when he was at Government House, he felt there was treachery contemplated, that the Governor was under the influence of some evil genius who was acting antagonistic to them. He told the Governor that he had violated the understanding between them. His Excellency replied that circumstances had changed, and he did not know that the Legislative Council were going to do as they have done. He (Mr. S.) said that they could not control the Legislative Council, and therefore they had no authority to take any action in this matter, and he told him that the Government were prepared to carry out their arrangements, and they expected his Excellency would do the same. The despatches were not before the House, therefore they could not yet take any action in the matter. His Excellency did not charge him with using deceit or duplicity, though now the Government is charged through outside influence with being guilty of deceit because we did not act to suit the purposes of those who favored the Quebec Scheme. It was a cool proposition for the Govern-