

Hon. Mr. Hatheway proceeded to make some further personal remarks, and then spoke against the Quebec Scheme, and said that but for the influence brought to bear upon the Hon. Mr. George Brown, they would have had much better terms of union offered them than those proposed by that scheme, and he did not think the country was yet prepared to adopt it. He then concluded by saying he had endeavored to justify the course he had taken.

MR. MCCLELLAN.—There was one count, the hon. member said, the Government plead guilty to: What was that?

HON. MR. HATHWAY.—The Export Duty Law.

MR. McMILLAN.—Should the Government agree to a scheme of union, would they require the route of the Inter-Colonial Railway to be defined?

HON. MR. HATHWAY.—As a member of the Government, he would give him the necessary information that day week.

The debate was then adjourned over until to-morrow at eleven.

The motion being put, the House was then adjourned over until to-morrow at ten o'clock.

A. A.

### WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21.

MR. FISHER said, he had only discovered yesterday, that the practice in this House had been, not to send Bills to the Legislative Council until after the Address had passed. He could see no reason why they should not go to the Council at once, to enable them to get on with the business, so that there should not be a rush of business at the close of the Session. He would, therefore, move that the Bill to incorporate the Fredericton Railway Company be read a third time, in order that it could be sent to the Council.

Several other hon. members expressed themselves in favor of the motion, which was carried.

The House then went into Committee on a Bill to facilitate the construction of a Railway to Fredericton, which was agreed to.

The time for taking up the order of the day having arrived, it was proposed to adjourn the debate until two o'clock, as Mr. McClellan—who, it was understood, was to be the next speaker upon the question—was not prepared to speak in consequence of being unwell.

The Hon. Mr. SMITH and others urged the propriety of continuing the debate, because the members of the House would not give the other business proper attention while a question of so much importance to the country was not decided. Some of the members of the Opposition ought to be prepared to go on with the debate, or have the vote taken.

MR. LINDSAY expressed his willingness to make a few remarks in the afternoon, but was not prepared at present.

MR. WETMORE thought the same courtesy should be extended to Mr. McClellan as was extended to the hon. Surveyor General—the debate having been adjourned on Saturday in consequence of his being unwell.

HON. MR. CUDLIP thought, if they had less speaking, the country would

be better off. He had always made up his mind on the great questions of the day before he came to the House. They had better have the division, so they could attend to the business of the country.

### A BILL RELATING TO THE SETTLEMENT AND SUPPORT OF THE POOR IN THIS PROVINCE.

MR. LINDSAY moved the House into Committee on the above Bill, and said, that it was a copy of a Bill introduced by his hon. friend from Northumberland, some years ago, which had passed through the House, but had been rejected in the Upper House. Its object was to define where the poor legally belong.

COR. BOYD was in favor of the Bill, for such a law was very much needed. Mr. St. Andrews, and on the borders, numbers of poor persons come from the United States and get relief from the Parish. This Bill provides that a person shall be a resident of the Parish for twelve months before he can claim relief. He thought one Parish should not support the poor of the neighboring Parishes.

MR. ANGLIN was inclined to support the Bill. He believed that, although the City members supported it, several members of the country districts opposed it; and though it was not right to protract matters, yet the Bill should not be pressed on when so many members were absent, for he would like to give any member who opposed it a fair chance.

MR. YOUNG thought it was an important Bill, and advised the mover to report progress on the Bill, for he would like to know more about it before he agreed to it.

MR. LINDSAY said, the Bill was well known to the members of the House—it having passed the House once, or twice, and the Legislative Council had it published in the *Royal Gazette*. If a pauper came from one Parish into another, there would be no injustice in sending him to the Parish from which he came.

MR. HILL had no objection to that section of the Bill, but he had great objection to the manner in which the Bill was passing through the House. With one or two exceptions, there was not a member who had heard it read, and not half a dozen members knew the provisions of the Bill. If this was their system of passing Bills, any Bill could be got through the House. It was an unsafe method of legislating, although the Bill may be all right.

MR. KERR said this Bill was a copy of a Bill which he had taken a considerable amount of pains to frame, and which had passed the House unanimously. The Council thought it a Bill of importance, and published it in the *Royal Gazette*. It comprehends the principles of the State of Maine and the State of New York poor laws. He was glad to see it discussed, and thought it would be a great improvement upon the existing state of things, for they now had no law for the removal of the poor to their own parish.

HON. MR. SMITH said there was no law for the poor at all at present. A gentleman in Prince Edward Island had written to him for a copy of this Bill, which he supposed was the law. He had written back that we had no law: we on-

ly had some custom which had been taken from an English law. They should understand what the law was relating to this subject. He thought that Bill was well adapted to this country, therefore he should support it.

Progress was then reported.

### AFTERNOON SESSION.

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

MR. LINDSAY. As the hon. member from the County of Albert (Mr. McClellan) is not in his place, I will make a few remarks, but I will not occupy much time. The people take a great interest in this question, for they attend here anxious to know what is going on. I am pleased to see them, for I think it is the duty of the constituency to keep their eye on the Government, and to see that the men who come here to represent them do not misrepresent them. I think that public men are public property, and we have a right to refer to their public acts as long as we do not misrepresent them. When a question was asked a few days ago about the defense of the Province, I stated there was something in common between Antis and Fenians. The Attorney General thought I insinuated that the Anti-Confederate members of the Legislature sympathized with the Fenians. I did not mean any such thing. I will call attention to why I consider Antis and Fenians agree. I will read an extract from the *New York Irish People*, a Fenian organ, dated Feb. 17, which refers to the Reciprocity Treaty, and gives a reason why the American Government should not negotiate a treaty:

"Another reason which should have its weight with every well-wisher of America is this: *Why should we negotiate a treaty with the very men who are to-day conceding the plan of a Confederation of the British Colonies*, in order to erect a barrier against the expansion of the American nation, to transplant a viceregal court north of us, where the admirers and the flatterers of the aristocratic regime may go and parade their pretentious individuality? No, let there be no treaty whatever!"

That was to prevent the Confederate Union that would raise a barrier to the further extension of the American Government. Another paper takes the same view of it:

"It will be dangerous to give encouragement, even temporarily, to the inter-Colonial feeling which certain influential men, both in Britain and in Canada, are doing all in their power to cultivate. The suspension of reciprocal trade will be a cogent argument with the Canadians in favor of the building of the inter Colonial Railway, WHICH EVERY INHABITANT OF NEW ENGLAND SHOULD SEEK TO PREVENT BY ALL PROPER MEANS, and which, with the continuance of reciprocity, and the prosecution of the international line, will, in our opinion, never be built. Closely allied to this is the political Confederation of the Provinces, which can never be brought to pass unless an unfriendly policy on the part of the United States shall force them, for their mutual protection and prosperity, into a closer compact and alliance than now exists."