

in my above statement, that you did not see it.

Yours, &c.,

(Signed) SAMUEL WATTS,
Editor Carleton Sentinel.

Your Excellency acquiesces in the prudence of the advice then tendered to Your Excellency with regard to the calling out the Militia, and which subsequent events have justified, as they have also the still later correspondence addressed by my colleague and myself to Your Excellency.

I still adhere to the opinion that if our advice had been acted upon in its earlier stages, this correspondence need not have been so extended, and the general alarm along the border in the upper district might have been allayed.

In the present instance, Your Excellency appears to have been guided by the counsel of Your Excellency's constitutional advisers, a course quite consistent, placing, as it does, the responsibility where it should fairly rest.

I have the honor to be,

Your Excellency's

Most obedient servant,

CHARLES CONNELL.

To His Excellency, the Honorable A. H. Gordon, C. M. G., Lieutenant Governor, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Connell then proceeded to speak on the subject of Confederation, and to say that it had been alleged throughout the discussion on the subject—that the delegation from the Province to the Quebec Conference was totally unauthorized. He believed, on the contrary, that it was authorized; but even if the late Government had not any authority to appoint that delegation, he considered they would have been perfectly justified in doing what they did. What was, he would like to ask, the duty of a Government? Was it merely to draw their salaries and transact the routine business of the country? Was it not rather the duty of a Government to advance, by all the legitimate means in their power, the interests of the country—to introduce measures that would benefit it and lead it on the path of progress and prosperity. Let what might be said to the contrary, he considered they had a perfect right to appoint delegates to consult with the delegates of the other Provinces on a measure that would advance the interests and consolidate the power of all these British North American Colonies. (Mr. Needham—Was it right for the Government to adopt a new Constitution for the country, and determine to put it through the Legislature without giving the people an opportunity to pronounce upon it?) He would tell the House what was the course the late Government ought to have taken. He thought, in the first place, that they should not have gone outside their own members to form the delegation. That, he considered, was wrong. In the next place, they should have been satisfied with reporting to the House the result of that delegation, and with submitting the resolutions passed at the Conference in Quebec; and if they had taken that course and given the Legislature an opportunity to have discussed those resolutions freely and calmly, they would have carried out their measure. They did wrong in dissolving the House and going to the country when they did. But when it was said they had no authori-

ty to appoint the delegation, he maintained they had, and he would have made it a grave charge against them if they had not done it. (Here the hon. member quoted from a dispatch from Mr. Cardwell, of March 9, 1865, to show that the delegation was fully authorized.)

Mr. Connell then, in concluding, went on to say that he hoped the result of the vote on the question before the House would be to make the Government place their resignations in the hands of His Excellency, and give place to another set of men who better understood the feelings and wishes of the people. And he hoped that these other men would take an opportunity to allow the people to give expression of opinion on the question that was agitating the country. He wished to put an end to the unsettled state of things in the Province.

[An irregular conversation followed, on a question of order, raised on the Attorney General's rising to answer Mr. Connell on some charges in the correspondence that that hon. member had just read. He appealed to the justice of the House if he had not a right to answer that gentleman when he brought charges against the Government subsequent to the bringing in of the vote of confidence. It was finally ruled that no member had a right to speak twice to the question before the House.]

Mr. BAILEY said the Opposition had made a number of charges against the Government, but he could not see that they had established a case against them. They had asked hon. members to withdraw confidence from the Government because they had not sooner called the House together. He did not think that charge so grave as to merit a vote of want of confidence. The Government had also been charged with having allowed the Export Duty Law to expire, and having collected revenue illegally. But as he had pleaded guilty to that charge, and as he did not believe that the interests of the country had suffered, he would not condemn them on that point.

There was another charge of not filling up the public offices—of not having an Auditor General, according as the Constitution demanded—if not having appointed a Solicitor General. He confessed he was not prepared to judge them on those questions. But as to the other charge against them about the sale of Crown Lands, he thought that when Mr. Gibson made his application to purchase lands, if the Government were not prepared to receive his application and sell the lands, they should not have ordered the survey. Why, he should like to know, make out an order of survey, and subject Mr. Gibson to the cost of that survey, if they had no intention that he should have the lands? He considered it a very great hardship that a man should be compelled, as Mr. Gibson was, to pay \$500 for the survey of lands if no sale was to follow upon it. He had had personal experience on this head. (Here the hon. member gave two cases where he made applications for lands on or near the Salmon River, and near Newcastle, where surveys were ordered to be made, for which surveys he had to pay, and pocket the loss of the amount, as no sale followed.) With regard to the sale of the Crown Lands of the Province, his opinion was that they ought to be sold while they were available, before they were stripped, or before all the timber was burnt off. The sale of the public

lands he showed, was far better for the revenue of the country than to lease them for lumbering purposes. Some of the hon. members who had spoken had charged it against the Government, that they had not filled up the Auditor General's office, and the office of Solicitor General. For his own part, he thought that the present system of Departmental Government was a curse to the country. Here they were in the Government, on the floors of the House, half-a-dozen political officers, which gave the holders great influence and patronage, and the people had to fight against them. No doubt the Government had been guilty of a few deeds of omission and it may be, of commission; but no men or Government were perfect. He was not prepared to condemn them on the charges brought against them.

Reference had been made to the delegation that had been sent home to England, and it had been said that no good had come out of it, and that it was an useless expenditure. His opinion was that it had not been sent soon enough, but late as it was sent, he held the Government could not have done otherwise, and he hoped that he would hear of something being done. He found that the House had been in session for twenty-one days, and not much had been done. The cry through the country was, when was the House going to get through with this debate? He had made a calculation of the amount of money this debate had cost the country, and what did hon. members think was the sum total? No less than \$12,000. He did not think that the charge of wasting that amount of money could be brought home to the Government. (Hon. member—What charge had been brought home?) Not one. Under all the circumstances, he could not support the amendment and go with the Opposition. What he had said, and the vote he would give, he was prepared to stand by. He came to the House as an independent member, and he was perfectly unpledged to any party or set of men. He came here to do his duty to his constituents and to his country.

The House then was adjourned over until Saturday at ten o'clock.

A. A.

SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1866.

House went into Committee of the Whole on further consideration of a Bill to abolish the property qualification of members to serve in the General Assembly of the Province. After considerable discussion the question was taken, when the House divided—12 ayes, 11 yeas. Mr. Costigan then moved the reconsideration of the question, on the ground that several members were absent, and that he was satisfied that the majority of members, from their expression of opinion, were in favor of the Bill. The motion to reconsider the question prevailed, and finally a motion to report progress was carried. A long discussion took place on the subject of Bills for placing roads on the great road establishment, and the question was raised whether they should be dealt with by the Government, or referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works. Mr. L. P. DesBrisay argued that the result of referring such Bills to the Chief Commissioner was that nothing was done, for twelve months.