

condition that Mr. Smith seems to have attached to his pledge was, that a majority of the committee was to be supporters of the Government. Mr. Smith, when he admits this, admits the truth, but not the whole truth, and the whole truth I want to go to the country. The composition of the committee was decided upon; Mr. Smith was to be one of the committee—I challenge him to deny that—he seems to have forgotten to state how intimate a connection he was to have in carrying out the scheme of union.

I am sorry there is not a member of the late Government here to-day, to hear my statements. Their absence will be properly regarded in the country, in the first place, as a contempt of public opinion, and, in the next, as an admission that I am correct in my statements, and that they dare not hear them and cannot contradict them. If Hon. Mr. Odell was present, I should remind him of the fact that he was to be selected here for the committee, and was to sustain himself in office by going for Confederation. Hon. Mr. Chandler and Hon. Mr. Botsford were likewise to be on the committee; in the Lower House, Mr. Williston and Mr. Fraser, or Mr. Fisher, also. His Excellency, when the arrangement about the committee had been concluded, felt quite assured, and addressed Mr. Smith a letter, which has been read; Mr. Smith says he handed the letter back, and did not receive it. We cannot wonder at this; the terms of the letter were so flattering as to make it a delicate matter for Mr. Smith to receive it, and therefore he may have told His Excellency he would rather not. He did not, however, deny the assumptions of the letter, or refuse to receive the congratulations of His Excellency on what he regarded as enlarged views on the part of Mr. Smith. If the letter was not a truthful statement of Mr. Smith's views, he should have contradicted it. With regard to the second letter, which Mr. Smith states he received, and

read in the coach while leaving Government House, it is His Excellency's impression that the letter was sent down by the orderly to the Barker House, and not handed to Mr. Smith by His Excellency personally. But Mr. Smith states he received that letter, and duty, both to His Excellency and himself, demanded that he should contradict its statements, if he was as he professes; opposed to that union, in the interest of which the letter was written. But to this day, no answer has been received by His Excellency.

Mr. Smith says we have exceeded our powers as a Legislative Chamber, that we are not responsible to the people, and represent nobody but ourselves, and that in no constitutional country has it ever been known that an irresponsible Chamber asked to have a change of policy when the People's House had declared against it, and that if we were permitted to interfere with the acts of the popular Branch, we would be interfering with the liberty of the people, and that it was time we were swept away. Now let us see how far all this is true. Have we exceeded our powers in considering a subject which the Secretary of State has in repeated Despatches declared to be the policy of the Empire, in which Her Majesty's Ministers state they feel the deepest interest, and to the accomplishment of which they look forward with satisfaction, in which the very Government of which Mr. Smith is the head, has submitted the question by command of Her Majesty to this branch of the Legislature, in the Speech from the Throne, for our consideration and action. And have we, in the exercise of what I believe to be our legitimate functions as an independent branch of the Legislature, and according to the views of Her Majesty's Govt., and in the expression of our approval of confederation, and in the passage of the Address to the Throne, exceeded our powers or not? I think not! We may, in the opinion of Mr. Smith, represent nobody