

shown by the speech of the hon. member from Albert (Mr. McClellan). For that gentleman, with his clear head and great ability, has utterly failed to show any substantial grounds of complaint against them.

He has taken up the time of the House by talking about mere rumors—by reading handbills of the York election of six months ago; by talking about the removal of officials on account of their political opinions, a charge which he knows in his heart to be utterly unfounded—by reading trash from a newspaper about a Dorchester Scheme, which he knows to have never had an existence except in the brain of some of his fellow Confederates; and finally coming to the land matter, he makes the 15,000 acres dwindle down to a paltry twenty-seven acres, and then acknowledges that there is no point in that.

It is charged that the members of the Government have been actuated by a desire to obtain and retain their offices. I well remember how unwilling the Secretary was to accept his present office. I know that nothing but his strong desire to strengthen the hands of that party, in whose success he believed the best interests of the country involved, could have induced him to leave a business of far more value to him than any Government office—to sacrifice his own private interest and become a target for misrepresentation, ridicule and abuse.

And what politician of this country can point to so proud a record as the Hon. Attorney General. Twice he has refused the highest offices in the land. The offices of Judge and of Chief Justice. Offices which every man of his profession looks forward to as the highest objects of their ambition. And he has refused them because he would not sacrifice the best interests of his country to his own private advancement. And no man in this Province to-day stands so high in the esteem and affections of the people as does the Hon. Albert J. Smith.

This debate has been prolonged until it has become wearisome, and the life is out of it, and I will not take up the time of the House longer.

But from what I have said it may easily be inferred that I shall vote again t the amendment.

MR. WEFMORE.—I was elected an anti-Confederate, and I am free to state that I consider it my bounden duty to vote against Confederation in all its moods and tenses. I am also in duty bound to vote against a class of men who, without venturing to state what propositions they intend to bring down, tamper with the best interests of the country. When I find them submitting to some power and influence which they dare not resist; when I hear rumors of resignations; when I hear of arguments and inducements held out to prevent the insertion of certain measures in the Speech, and then quietly submit to it; when they will not give information in regard to the views they entertain, I ask if it is not the duty of those gentlemen to tell the people of the country what is the meaning of that paragraph concerning Confederation in the Speech. I think if we sustain the Government on the present occasion, the people and the House will find they will have the Quebec Scheme upon them in all its horrors. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) may laugh; how comes it then in that speech. It may be that the Government will screen themselves, and say they are not responsible. I hold that constitutionally what

ever is put in the Speech the Government have to take the responsibility of, and not one word should be introduced into it which they are not fully prepared to explain. Was it anything unreasonable to put a question to the Attorney General, and was it fair to the people of the country that information should be withheld? Far be it from me to take any step which would bring Confederation upon the country at the present time. I consider it my duty to vote against it. I believe we are nearer Confederation under the present Speech than you think of. If that was not so, why do they withhold information. The Government are in an unpleasant position, for they dare not fill their offices or open a constituency. When the people, in the exercise of their discretion upon Confederation, gave a judgment, showing no disposition to accept the Scheme, I think they wanted no paltry saving of a few pounds when they armed those anti-Confederates with power to form a Government that would have been respected in the country, the adjoining Colonies and the United States. What did they do? The Attorney General said he wanted no office, but the first thing he did was to create an office of dignity for himself. Some men like money, and some like dignity. "Some like apples and some like onions." At the time the Government was formed, it was known that Mr. Allen was to be appointed Judge, and that Sir James Carter, who was then in office, was going to resign. Where then was the need of Mr. Allen's running an election to fill that office, if there was not a design of keeping it for some other person. The present Attorney General had refused to take office on the platform in St. John, and just at that time it was a very convenient thing for a man to have an enormous amount of patriotism and a disinclination to accept honor or money, but when the game is well played, and there is a chance for office, the great disinclination that existed before ceases to exist. It may be that it was a very convenient thing for my hon. friend (Mr. S.) that Mr. Allan should take the office for a little while, and put the country to the expense of holding an election, in order to reserve that office for him. He had already created an office for himself, which was the next highest to the Governor, and when the office of Attorney General became vacant, he was very quietly installed into it. He said he would never take an office unless the political exigencies of the country required it. (Mr. Smith.—I said unless the political exigencies of the party required it.)

In reference to forming the Government, I think this country did not want any small business about it. The office of Solicitor General should have been filled up. According to the Constitution of the country, there are nine members of the Government. Of those members the Attorney General is one, and the Solicitor General is another. Why was not this office filled up? There was no lack of strength or support at the last election. They say it is a saving. How much will they save when they get their bills paid up? It may be very convenient to chuck a bone to this one and that one, but is that a dignified way to conduct a public office? Will the people of this country be disposed to sustain this system of bribery and corruption? I am satisfied they will not, when they get an opportunity of expressing their opinion. They dare not open a constituency in St. John, where, at the last election, a most popular man was defeated. I refer to the leader

of the former Government, a man of great strength, undoubted talent, and unquestionable integrity. That hon. member from St. John (Mr. Wilms) would not take an office because he was not going into a one-man Government, who was politically his interior in every point of view. He was not disposed to go there unless armed with strength and position, which would give him influence in the councils of his country, to which his standing entitled him. It has been said that they were afraid to open a constituency, when they had an enormous majority of the people of the country to sustain them. If that is the case, are they the men to conduct the affairs of this country in the present perilous time. I am satisfied the people of this country do not want political odds to look after their interests. They want men of strength who are not afraid to express their views or appeal to the people. It was stated last session that it was necessary to send a delegation home, because an influence was brought to bear from Downing Street directly opposed to our views on Confederation. I voted for that delegation, but I could not have been induced to vote for it, had I known of the dispatch which was in possession of the Government. Was it fair to ask us to send that delegation home without giving us that dispatch? It was told us that the House was going to be dissolved, and we were going to have Confederation rammed down our throats, and it was necessary to send a delegation home immediately. Not many years ago, there was an outcry raised because mutilated dispatches were sent down to the House. The Government said they had kept such parts as contained state secrets. No man at that time raised his voice more patriotically than my hon. friend (Mr. S.) did on that occasion. Now he withholds a dispatch that would have obviated the necessity of sending a delegation home to England. The matter of that dispatch should have been before the House of Assembly, and a respectful address should have been sent, instead of one or two persons. Their views might have altered to a certain extent, were they to express the opinions of my constituents. What did that delegation do in England? They have not informed us. My own impression is, by the way they conducted themselves since their return home, that it was an abortion. What authority had they to send two delegates home? If they had sent but one they would have saved a large amount of money to the country quite as much as they profess to have saved through the non-appointment of a Solicitor General. It has been said that they entered into a railway contract with the "International Contract Company," but it has been asserted that no delegation was required for this purpose as a paper had been filed in the Provincial Secretary's office, showing that a proposition had been made by the International Contract Company to build the road under the existing Subsidy Act, an answer was given them, and they were prepared to build the road, provided an arrangement was made to build the Nova Scotia line. The delegates were not sent home to make any arrangements concerning this matter at all. What authority had he to pledge the credit of the country to pay all land damages where they exceeded \$50 a mile, or are they going to bring another *ex post facto* law to legalize it. These land damages, for which the