

mover of the Amendment, and he has assailed a gentleman who is not here to protect himself. I was present at a public meeting and heard this gentleman challenge my hon. friend to meet him on the public platform and discuss the question of Confederation; he made a positive offer, distinct and emphatic, each, by turn, taking half an hour, on the following Thursday. My hon. friend (Mr. S.) said he was engaged on Thursday. If he wanted to discuss the question he might have named some other day, instead of making that an excuse not to discuss the question at all. (Mr. Wetmore then read the law regarding the appointment of the Auditor General and said.) Why was not an Auditor General appointed? It was one of the most important offices in the country. It may be that the accounts are kept in a better manner than they were, if so why do not they appoint the gentleman who has charge of the accounts to the office, or are they holding it out as a bribe to somebody else? Why was it not given to Mr. Wilmot when he had the promise of it? When promises are made in this way and not carried out, I think the gentlemen making those promises are not entitled to our confidence. If a man promises to pay you a certain sum of money and he deceives you, you say he is not entitled to your confidence. The same rule should apply to the Government. I will now read a document which was presented to the Government about the 8th of September, before the appointment of Chief Justice was made and signed long after Judge Wilmot had spoken from the Bench on the subject of confederation.

"We, the undersigned members of the General Assembly for the Province of New Brunswick, having been informed that the honorable Sir James Carter, Knight, contemplates resigning the office of Chief Justice at an early period, and feeling it important the appointment of his successor should be made in accordance with the course adopted in England, beg leave to suggest, as our opinion, that the Attorney General is, by virtue of his office, entitled to claim the appointment if he thinks proper to exercise the right. But if the Attorney General thinks fit to yield in this respect what we consider his privilege, our opinion is the office should then be offered to the respective Judges, commencing with the senior Judge by appointment, and on his refusal to accept the office, then to be tendered to the next senior Judge by appointment, and so on until the office is accepted. We entirely disapprove of the tendering the office to any junior Judge until the senior Judges, by appointment shall have had an opportunity of accepting the office.

10th June, A. D. 1865.

(Signed)

Joseph Corbin,
A. R. Wetmore,
J. V. Troop,
Geo. Otty,
W. B. Scovill,
John J. Fraser,
W. H. Needham,
E. A. Vail.

G. F. Hill,
John Lewis,
Robert Young,
Ed. Williston,
A. R. McClellan,
B. Beveridge,
G. D. Bally.

The Attorney General, in making his speech, read a letter written by Judge Parker, in which it was stated that his Honor Judge Parker would not have accepted the office of Chief Justice, if he had been afraid that his Honor Judge Ritchie would not get it. I do not believe one word of it. If they had the power

to appoint Judge Parker, did they not have equal power to appoint Judge Ritchie at that time. They had made pledges to give it to Judge Ritchie, and I can prove it. It never was the intention to give it to Judge Parker, who was a man of high legal attainments, and one of the ablest lawyers in America, and for whom the people entertain the greatest respect. He was appointed in consequence of that document which I have read being presented to the Government. (Hon. Mr. Smith.—I stated that Judge Parker would not have taken the office if he thought Judge Ritchie could have got it. We pressed the offer upon Judge Parker irrespective of any such conditions, and all the members of the Government were desirous of seeing him accept it.) If the offer had been made to Judge Parker, and he declined it, would not Judge Ritchie have got it? This paper, signed by all the strong supporters of the Government would have had no effect.

MR. HILL.—I was told by Mr. Wetmore in the City of St. John, that he wanted me, and the other members for Charlotte, to sign this paper. I told him I was unwilling to sign it, for I was opposed to having the Attorney General appointed Chief Justice. I said that it had been stated that Judge Wilmot—for whose benefit this had been signed—was not the soundest lawyer, and that he had taken a course on confederation which would prevent the present Government from giving him the appointment. He (Mr. Wetmore) said that was true, but he added, if Judge Wilmot is not appointed we will lose the vote of every Methodist in St. John, under these circumstances, and as a favor to Mr. Wetmore, I signed this paper.

MR. WETMORE.—I said it would be an indignity to every dissenter throughout the Province, and when they get an opportunity they will express the same opinion. I do not think he signed it to oblige me. He signed it after he knew that Judge Wilmot had spoken from the Bench concerning confederation, making the following reservation:

"We endorse the latter portion of the foregoing with respect to claim of senior Judge, but dissent from the principle that the Attorney General has first claim to any vacant Judgeship by virtue of his office irrespective of other qualifications."

My hon. friend (Mr. Hill) is now prepared to support this Government which treated the opinions of its supporters with the most perfect contempt. (Mr. Anglin.—This paper was signed before the York election.) I think the Judge had a right to vote. My impression is, that Judge Parker has voted time after time at elections in St. John, and has addressed Grand Juries on different subjects, requiring laws to be enacted for a particular purpose. Dame rumor says that Judge Ritchie used to express an opinion averse to confederation, and if the matter was fully investigated, it would be found that Judge Ritchie had taken as active a part on that question as Judge Wilmot, except the remarks made before the Grand Jury. I will ask my hon. friend (Col. Boyd) if he was not asked to come up here to assist in forming the Government after the last election. (Col. Boyd.—I received a letter from Mr. Gilmore asking me to come up to assist in forming a Government, and I told him I would.) Why was this aged gentleman asked to come up here to

assist in forming a Government, when they had not the slightest idea of accepting his assistance? Was not my hon. friend (Col. Boyd) promised the office of Sheriff? (Col. Boyd.—Yes.) Was that promise carried out? (Col. Boyd.—No.) The Government have never yet made a promise which has been carried out in all its integrity. Are these the men that should have the confidence of the country? I will ask my hon. friend from the County of Kings (Mr. Otty) if he has not been promised the office of Solicitor General? (Mr. Otty.—No.) How was it, then, he was canvassing on the supposition that he was going to get that office? (Mr. Otty.—I made no canvas.) Do I understand my learned friend to say that he did not speak to the electors of the County of Kings, and tell them that he was quite likely to run an election? (Mr. Otty.—I deny it.) I was not present on the occasion, and I must have been misinformed. I am very glad to hear he did not expect it, for he would have been sure to have been disappointed. I was elected to vote against Confederation, and I feel it my duty to vote against it, because elected on that ground. But in regard to my views on this matter, I will state that after giving the matter more serious consideration, my views are very materially modified. It is my impression that the paragraph in the Speech concerning Confederation was put in there against the wishes of the Attorney General, but whether it was so or not, they have to take the responsibility of it. We cannot tell whether they intend to bring forward any scheme or not, for all information is withheld on that point. Then the Address in the other branch of the Legislature regarding Confederation had the sanction of the Government, and they have to take the responsibility of it. If they do not take the responsibility of it, they are not acting according to the principles of Responsible Government. This question of Confederation has been put into the Speech, and into the answer to the Address, and the Government submit to it sooner than resign their seats, thus acting in direct opposition to the principles of Responsible Government. In conclusion: I will call the attention of the House to an appointment to a St. John Battalion of volunteers, of a gentleman residing at Fredericton, who has been appointed Major, instead of selecting a person from that Battalion for the appointment. When the young men of this country go to the expense of furnishing accoutrements, and attend drill, if any appointments are to be made, these gentlemen ought to receive them, and the Government should take the responsibility. I will now thank the House for their attention, and close my remarks.

MR. ANGLIN.—This debate has now been carried on for upwards of three weeks, and we are all very anxious to see it brought to a close. I would prefer not to occupy the time of this House, but I feel, under the extraordinary circumstances in which we are placed, that I would not be doing my duty to the people of this country if I was not, on this occasion, to speak my sentiments. We find the Opposition very busy deliberating and determining where to find fault with the Address; we find them, through their leader, giving notice of a particular amendment, and we find that when he moved that amendment, he had made considerable alteration in it, so that it now stands simply as a motion of want of