

confidence. In all that Address, which, they say, was prepared by oligary politicians, the Opposition, with all their talents, could not find one paragraph to which they could make objection. It stands there unobjectionable, according to their own positive admission. I must express my deliberate opinion, which I believe to be the conviction of ninety-nine out of every one hundred people in this Province, or in British North America, that this debate, in whatever light we may choose to regard it, is a debate on the Quebec Scheme, and nothing more or less. Many members of the Opposition who have addressed you, are still opposed to confederation. I do not question the honesty or sincerity of what they say, but I tell them they are much mistaken if they imagine that there are, in this House any but themselves of the same opinion. I receive papers from all parts of this Province, and the neighboring Provinces, and they all hold that the Opposition are anxious for the Quebec Scheme. It has been contended by hon. members most anxious to upset the Government, that this is a mere vote of want of confidence, and they accuse them of crimes of omission and commission. They have acknowledged the crime of omission, but the crime of commission will not amount to one serious charge, even if you take the statements of the hon. members themselves. We have listened to the eloquence of my hon. colleague from St. John (Mr. Wetmore), who has delighted the House for the last two days with his eloquence; but settling all the rhetoric aside, and come to the substance and what does it amount to? He takes extraordinary views. Will endeavor to ascertain from his speech what are the charges which he brings against the Government. He states that in the formation of the Government they had a great deal of trouble, and that promises were made which were never carried out. I have no hesitation in saying that great difficulty was found in forming the Government. It is not every day you find parties who have been opposed to one another for years, brought together to labor for the protection of the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Kerr) seemed to imagine that there was no agreement among the members of the Government, and that they were continually quarreling with one another. He is entirely mistaken; from the day I joined the Government until the day I left them, I never heard in the Council, between the members of the Government one harsh word. We often differed in opinion, but we argued the point in the most kindly manner possible. I think my hon. friend (Mr. W.) asked why Mr. Wilmot was not appointed to the office of Provincial Secretary. He declined the office not because he was afraid to go back to the people for re-election, but for private reasons of his own. For my part I never asked, nor expected to be, a member of the Government, and when it was proposed that I should be a member of the Government, I said I could, as a public journalist, render the Government more assistance out of the Government than I could if I was in, and they had better leave me out. They determined I should become a member of the Government, and my colleagues wanted me to take the office of Provincial Secretary; this shows how little they were afraid of opening a constituency. It was said, why did they not put Judge Allan on the Bench at once,

and let Mr. Smith take the Attorney Generalship. That was proposed by Mr. Wilmot, and was one of his views in the construction of the Government. He (Mr. Wilmot) pressed the office of Attorney General upon Mr. Smith, who showed not the slightest disposition to accept it. He (Mr. Smith) said he wanted no office, although every member of the Government united in trying to induce him to take it. My hon. colleague (Mr. Wetmore) spoke of some promise made to him. There was some mention made of his being made a member of the Government, and some proposed that he should be Solicitor General. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) at that time proposed that after Mr. Allan became Judge, the office of Attorney General should be offered to my hon. colleague (Mr. Wetmore). I appeal to every member of the Government if that was not the fact.

MR. WILMOT.—I proposed that Mr. Wetmore should be appointed Solicitor General. The resignation of the Chief Justice was then in hand; His Excellency thought there was no necessity for appointing Judge Allan to the office of Attorney General.

MR. ANGLIN.—At the time the appointment was made, the Chief Justice had intimated his intention to resign, but had not actually sent his resignation in. I think it was after this time that this resignation came down to the Council, and read the resignation of the Chief Justice. This resignation was not to take effect until the September following. After that vacancy had occurred, the Attorney General again made the same proposal that Mr. Wetmore should be Attorney General. I said no; the interest of the country requires that it shall not be. To Mr. Wetmore personal, as a lawyer, I had no objections, but as a politician and leader of the Government, I had strong objections, for he had been but one session in Parliament, and therefore had not had political experience enough to be the leader of the Government. I was one of those who insisted that the present Attorney General should take office. It has been said that he was greedy for office, and created the office of President of the Council to suit himself. I proposed that the office should be created, and it is not considered the first office in the Council. In Canada the President of the Council is not the Premier; he is merely the man who sits in the chair while the Council is in session, and for that small duty he receives \$5000 a year. The Hon. Attorney General refused the office of Chief Justice, which was offered him at the formation of the Government. The man who has twice refused such a position is not the man to be held up before the country as a man who seeks office, who holds out to office, or who truckles to the Governor, or any other man. Neither the country nor the House will believe it. Though my hon. colleague (Mr. W.) and myself will vote on different sides on this question, yet I hope we will agree after it is over in carrying on the business of the country. Among other charges he brings up the question of the Governor's salary. I hold strong grounds on this subject myself; but standing here and knowing what I do, I say the present Government are not to blame, and though my hon. colleague appears to have a case, I really it is no case at all. The former House, by rejecting the resolution of the Attorney General, clearly decided that His Excellency had a right to draw this mo-

ney as he does. All the warrants on the Casual and Territorial revenue for the Civil List are not drawn in the usual form. In the Civil List arrangements, that was placed absolutely and entirely at the disposal of the Lieut. Governor, who draws the money by his own warrant, but the Government have to take the responsibility for the same. It is responsible for every thing done in this Province by the Governor or his subordinates. Another point which my hon. friend (Mr. W.) spoke upon was the appointment of Judges. He went on to state his belief in a great many things that took place. His belief and his information often led him astray, and he assumed things for facts which were in reality not facts. I will inform the House that I never saw that document concerning the appointment of Judges, which was signed by seventeen supporters of the Government, but I heard on board of the steamboat as I was coming to Fredericton to attend a meeting of Council, that there was such a document got up by Mr. Wetmore himself. He (Mr. W.) talks of the Government truckling to other parties, when he was the very man to get up that document and get signatures to it, and then send it in to imitate the Government. They, of course, disregarded it. I said, as one member of the Government, if it comes before us, pay no attention to whatever. I stand here responsible for my acts, and will do what I consider to be the best for the interests of the country. I am prepared to hold myself responsible for what I do when the House meets again. I will allow no set of men to dictate to me. If they think I have done wrong, they can turn me out, and punish me so far as they have the power, but they have no right to express an opinion to me in such a form as that. That document never came before us when the appointment was made. My hon. friend (Mr. W.) says that document was presented on the 8th of September. I believe the Chief Justice was appointed prior to that. (Mr. Wetmore, I see paper was received before the appointment was made.) When His Excellency informed the Council of the resignation of Sir James Carter, he put the question, who should be Chief Justice, and there was but one expression of opinion—that was, that Judge Parker should be Chief Justice. His Excellency undertook to offer the appointment to Judge Parker, and I was authorized to state it. Judge Parker at first refused to accept the office, and there were several telegrams passed between the Governor and Judge Parker before the appointment took place. Judge Parker stated distinctly that he could not in honor accept the office of Chief Justice, unless it was understood that, if he was not appointed, Judge Ritchie could not get it. The Government declined to answer this, but said, "We offer you the office; will you accept it?" They declined to speak of Judge Ritchie at all. They said to Judge Parker, we wish you to take it, for the interests of the Province requires it. The answer came, that, under these circumstances, he felt he could no longer refuse to take the office. That is the way Judge Parker was appointed, and when any hon. member says Judge Ritchie cabaled, he must be misinformed. I think the explanations I have given show that there is no foundation for such a charge. I am satisfied that the House will come to the conclusion that if the Government had