

they would weigh heavier and he would get the benefit. It was very desirable that there should be a law to provide for the inspection of butter and pork, in order that their value might not be depreciated.

Hon. Mr. CUDLIP spoke in favor of the Bill, and against the additional section.

Mr. BEVERIDGE said this Bill would simplify business and prevent mistakes. Since they had adopted the decimal system in money matters, they should reduce all their business to the same system.

The Bill was agreed to, and the additional section lost.

The House in Committee agreed to a Bill, introduced by Mr. Williston, entitled "A Bill relating to the Newcastle Gas Company."

#### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S AMENDMENT.

Mr. SUTTON said that as every member of the House was expected to speak on this question, he would have to say a few words. He felt rather abashed in rising to address them, after the eloquent speech which they had listened to for three days. In regard to the debate being delayed, he did not blame either the Government or the Opposition. He would not delay it by making a long speech. When he came forward as a candidate for a seat in this House, he (Mr. S.) and two of his colleagues declared themselves in favor of Confederation. The County which he represented had never changed their opinion on this question, and he represented their interest in that great Scheme. To go into an argument to show how we would be benefited by it, would take up too much time. This great question had been made a party question, and no person could get office under the Government unless he was opposed to the policy of union. He would offer no factious opposition to any measure which would be a benefit to the country. He did not believe that the North Shore had a sufficient number of members in the Government, for at the present time there was not a single individual to represent them, as the Hon. Mr. Hutchison was absent.

Mr. PERKINS did not think it necessary to make a long speech. He was fully prepared to support the Government in the stand they had taken against Confederation, believing, as he did, that the Quebec Scheme would be ruinous to the best interests and liberties of the people of this Province. The present Government have conducted the general business of the country in a satisfactory manner, under great disadvantage, for they had a great pressure brought against them; especially by a few disappointed politicians. He would vote against the amendment.

Mr. LANDRY said it would appear that he had been sent into the market when he came into the Legislature, and he would like to know whether he was going to be sold by wholesale or retail. He thought he was worth more than they were disposed to give him; if he could not get more, he would not sell himself. He would not say whether this Government had done right or wrong, as he did not consider that this was the question. The real question before the House was Confederation, and he was sent here to

sustain the Government on that question. If he went back to his constituents, and they were in favor of Confederation, he would go for it, but he did not think they had changed their mind on the question. He had often been asked why he was not anxious to unite with the French people of Canada. He would like to unite with the French, but there were people there worse than the French, with whom he did not wish to have anything to do. Though he would vote with the Government on this question, as it involved Confederation, they need not expect him to vote with them on any other question. As an example of the speeches that would be delivered in Confederate Parliament, he finished his speech in French.

By the amendment to the reply to the speech, which is now under discussion in this Assembly, we are called upon to pass sentence upon the acts of this Government during the past year. They are arranged by this amendment as being unworthy of the confidence of this House and of the people of this Province.

This Assembly is the jury before whom this cause is to be tried in the first instance, and from our decision lies, sooner or later, the appeal to the Supreme Court of the people.

It is for us to examine the counts of this indictment and decide upon them.

For the motives of our decision, we are responsible to our own consciences. For the wisdom of that decision, we are responsible to our constituents. I have heard something said to and fro in this debate about men being held personally responsible for what they said.

Beyond that which I have before mentioned, I acknowledge responsibility to no man or set of men. I propose to take up the different charges against the Government so far as I can remember them, and examine whether, singly or collectively, they furnish sufficient grounds for their condemnation.

In the first place they did not call the House together soon enough. I did not understand the hon. mover of the amendment to say that this was a cause of loss to the country at large, but rather a source of inconvenience to the members of the House, by keeping those from the rural districts from their farming labors. Now if the hon. mover and his supporters will unite in expediting the business of the session, and abstain from all factious opposition, I think this inconvenience may be in a great degree remedied. Besides, I think that this charge comes with ill-grace from the hon. member, acting in concert with the members of the late Government, who dissolved the late House, brought on an election in this very month, and forced the Legislature to be called together at a much later season than the present session was called. The intermission has been two months shorter than is ordinarily the case.

In Nova Scotia, which is much more exclusively a farming country, the session has but commenced; and in Canada, where they do rather more farming than in New Brunswick, the session will be still a month later.

But I presume that the hon. mover sees this matter in a very different light, when applied to his friends the Hon. Messrs. Galt and Tupper, from its application to the Hon. Mr. Smith.

But they have not filled up the offices of Solicitor General and Auditor General. I am perfectly willing that they shall

leave the office of Solicitor General unfilled for ever. I do not think the country will suffer any loss in money or otherwise by this course, and I have always been of the opinion that in this small Province, with a Legislature of but forty-one members, we have entirely too many departmental officers on the floor of this House.

But the hon. members say the office of Auditor General is a part of our Constitution. It does not seem to be a very important part. According to the account of the hon. member, we are indebted for its introduction into our Constitution to a despatch of Lord Glenelg in 1837. Nevertheless, the suggestions of that despatch were not carried out until the appointment of Mr. Partelow in 1854.

Where was the great constitutional leader of the Opposition during all those seventeen years. When the office was filled, was it not notorious that it was done almost solely for the purpose of making provision for the gentleman who received the appointment.

During the last four years, when through blindness and other afflictions, that gentleman was incapacitated from attending to his duties, where was our great constitutionalist? Should sympathy stand in the way of great constitutional principles and the pecuniary safety of the Province, which the hon. mover says are all involved in the appointment of a suitable man to fill this office.

I believe that the great constitutional part of this subject is great political humbug and clap-net. I think that the auditing of the accounts can be as well and as safely done by the gentleman now occupying the Audit Office, or in connection with the Secretary's Office, as by the appointment of an Auditor General. At all events, I am willing to leave the decision of this matter to the gentlemen composing the Government of the country, satisfied that if the interests of the country require the office to be filled up, it will not be left vacant.

With regard to the land sales, that point has been made a political canvass of outside of the walls of this House, but has been dwelt upon much more lightly here. The standing tirades of the newspapers would scarcely bear transplanting to this Assembly.

For my own part, I am satisfied the Province could well afford to make Mr. Gibson a present of that land, rather than not have his great business carried on—a business which is supplying from that single stream one-sixth of the lumber shipped from the River St. John—a business which has caused a permanent investment of \$100,000, and which has given employment to nearly a thousand men and five hundred horses during the past winter. I may here narrate an incident, showing how the investment of capital is encouraged in the State of Maine. A company wished to build a factory at a small village called Lisbon, in the State of Maine. They applied to the Legislature for exemption from taxes for a term of ten or twenty years. The Legislature passed the Bill, and where a year ago an alder swamp stood by the side of a brook, now stands a factory and boarding houses built at an expense of \$100,000, giving employment to 200 operatives, and turning out \$600,000 worth of manufactured goods. Was it not better for Maine, by granting this privilege, to secure so much