

after the danger had passed away, the gentlemen would turn round and abuse the Government upon the other tack, and say the money was not wisely expended. He believed the Government would do all in their power to prevent invasion. He would rest satisfied in the ability of the Government and Commander-in-Chief to provide for the defence of the Province.

Mr. McLELLAN thought the hon. member, when he accuses members of the House of asking questions to embarrass the Government, should remember that it was announced by the leader of the Government that this was a time of emergency; that a crisis had arrived in which the Government should not be engaged in party politics; therefore, the people have a right to be alarmed, and to know what means are to be taken for their defence. It is not right for the Government to withhold that information, for there is no reason why they should not tell us how many volunteers they have attached to the service, and what the service is to be. He did not expect them to state where they were going to concentrate those volunteers; that would be no object with the people of the country, if assured that a certain amount of forces are available, and certain means and precautions are being taken to provide against invasion.

Mr. WETMORE—Should fancy that the Attorney General did not feel much anxiety as to what has been done for the defence of the country, as he did not have a very large family; but it was different with those who had wives and home-estates to look after. If his hon. friend had received such letters from home as he had received, he might feel some anxiety. The question was not put to embarrass the Government, but to know if the volunteers were to be called out; that would satisfy those persons who reside in their home-estates, while we are looking after the interests of the country. The hon. gentlemen who had just spoken were in the same position as the Attorney General; they could put their families on their backs and walk off when the Province was invaded; but for those who had families it was an important matter. He would be sorry to ask any question to embarrass the Government, but the people have a right to know the number of troops that are to be called out, in order that the alarm in the country may be allayed.

COL. BOYD said, if there were any gentlemen here who ought to be alarmed it was his hon. colleague and himself, as his hon. colleague lived within a stone's throw of the place upon which the enemy would make their first attack, while he himself only lived three miles away, and they were not alarmed; although they got those "bogus telegraphs" they were satisfied no body of men would enter this country.

Mr. CORAM remarked that it was not proper for members of the House to come forward every day and call upon the Government to know the state of defence, stating that the women at home could not sleep nights. It was their duty to keep their preparations for defence secret from their enemies, and have confidence in the Governor, who rules the Province and his Executive Council. If there is any danger they will give us timely notice, and he would depend upon the loyalty of people of the Province to fill up any call for troops when required. He rested in Carleton, and there was not one hundred stand of arms in that part of the City, while there was every facility for the lan-

ing of an enemy; but he had no letters from any individual saying they were alarmed.

Mr. FISHER brought in a Bill to authorize the County of York to assess for agricultural purposes.

The House then proceeded with the adjourned debate.

AMENDMENT TO THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH OF THE ADDRESS.

Mr. COSTIGAN—I consider it my duty to give my views upon this question, and my reasons why I shall vote against this Amendment. I do not rise to tell this House what side I am on, for that is well known by the course I have always pursued in this House, and before my constituents. When a question comes fairly before the House I do not think it is to the credit of any representative of a constituency to remain in a position which allows the public to speculate on the course he will take. I was rather surprised at a remark made by the hon. member from Kent that he considered that no anti-Confederates could consistently vote for this Government unless he was their mere tool.

Mr. L. P. W. DESBRISAY—I rise to order. If any man on the floors of this House speaks plainly and means what he says, I am one, and I ask him not to misrepresent or misconstrue what I did say, and which I am ready to stand or fall by.

Mr. COSTIGAN—I will not be positive as to the exact words. I can only assure the hon. member that there is no intention to misrepresent him. I wish to keep as near as possible to what he did say. What he said was: Those who supported the Government on this question were prepared to swallow everything at their hand.

Mr. DESBRISAY—I did not say so.

Mr. COSTIGAN—I will tell you what I took down in writing: "The hon. gentleman said no one would support the Government but those prepared to swallow everything at their hand."

Mr. DESBRISAY—That hon. gentleman had better take down all, and not take a fractional part; he should preserve the connection, and not take one part and leave another.

Mr. COSTIGAN—All I can say is—that I understood the hon. gentleman to make an allusion, at that time, to the supporters of the Government, which I considered unbecoming, and I should be pleased to think I was mistaken. In regard to "sides" on this question, it appears to me that queer arguments must have been used by the Opposition to convince those gentlemen who are anti-Confederates, and intend to vote for the Amendment, that they are anti-Confederates still. To show you an instance of what arguments can be brought forward. I will relate an anecdote. There were two young men standing on the bank of a river engaged in fishing. One of the young men proposed that they should cross over to the other side of the river; the other said they were on the other side now. How do you make that appear? Because you are on the other side. It is no such thing. But I tell you that you are on the other side, and I will stand a bet upon it. The bet was taken at once. Now, says the young man who proposed this bet, how many sides are there to this river? Two, of course. Well, is not that one side over there, and is not this

the other side. (Laughter.) I suppose the same kind of arguments were used to convince the anti-Confederates in the opposition that they are Anti-Confederates still. Let us look around and see who are anti-Confederates, supposing the question of Confederation should come up. I hold that the great paramount anti-Confederate is the hon. member for the County of York (Mr. Fisher); constitutionally speaking, he is pledged beyond all other anti-Confederates. I, as an anti-Confederate, pledged myself to my constituents to oppose the Quebec Scheme, and that pledge, extends as long, and no longer, than I occupy my seat in the present House of Assembly. Should they be dissolved, my pledge will be redeemed. The hon. member from York stands pledged to oppose the Quebec Scheme or any other Scheme, as long as this House lasts. We are in the same position. He could not pledge himself beyond the term of his service as a representative for the County of York; therefore, to look at the matter fairly and honestly, he stands pledged as an anti-Confederate in this House more so than any other member. It has been said that the return of that hon. member was a proof that a change of opinion was going on in the country in regard to the Quebec Scheme. I believe the hon. gentleman was true to the Scheme then, and I believe he is true to it to-day. I believe those pledges were given to secure the votes of the anti-Confederates of York. He saw that if he came out to fight the battle on the question of Confederation, he would not have been returned. There was no reason why anti-Confederates should not vote for him when he had pledged himself to oppose the Quebec Scheme. This fact should prevent him from boasting of being returned as an anti-Confederate, and claiming that return as a victory over anti-Confederates. It was unfair to claim that as a victory, and send it abroad through the newspapers that the people had changed their minds in regard to the Scheme. When the Scheme was first brought before the people, the press advocated it, and there were agents travelling through the country—men brought from Canada and paid by politicians in this country, to go among the French. (Hear, hear.) They went from house to house, asking, how much cedar can you furnish to make Railway sleepers? What facilities have you for getting limestone? What is the rate of wages? Ignorant people began to look around and enquire what all this meant. They told them that Confederation was going to be carried, and the Canadian Government had sent them down to get the material to build your Railways at once. Was not that a strong influence brought against us? I wonder they were not carried away by these influences and inducements that were held out to them. How is it to-day? We find the same thing going on, and we are not in a position to go through the country and counteract its effects. They boast of a change of feeling in the country. It may be true that there are changes. People change from one side to the other. Some change in favor of the scheme and some against it. I believe if the question of the Quebec Scheme was to be put before the people of this country to-day, and they were required to vote for or against it, they would find as many votes in favor of it as there was at the last election. (A member,—"They had better try it.") I have no more reason to be-