

credit of this country is pledged, may be £500 a mile; is that the way the business of this country is to be conducted? By what authority does he take charge of the revenues of this country? Suppose you sent home an agent, and he pledged your credit without your authority, would you have confidence in him? How then can you have confidence in a Government which has acted in the same way. There is another matter in reference to the Governor's salary. An outcry was raised in 1864 and a resolution was moved by the present Attorney General, fixing the Governor's salary at a certain amount. On this question he exerted all his energies to defeat the Government. He must have cared for office then, for he could have had no object in reducing the Governor's salary, as he allows the same amount to be drawn as heretofore. (Mr. Smith—It is paid back.) He should have taken a manly position, and told the Governor that this money should not be drawn, if it was he would resign his situation. Instead of this it has been a continual intrigue. First they swallow one thing and then another, and the next thing they will swallow will be confederation.

HON. MR. SMITH made some explanation regarding the Governor's salary, after which the debate was adjourned.

Mr. Wetmore to resume at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The House was adjourned until the usual hour.

T. F. D.

THURSDAY, APRIL 5.

On motion of Mr. CONNELL, the House went into Committee on "A Bill to authorize the Woodstock Branch Railway Company to issue Debentures."

This Bill produced a lengthy discussion when progress was reported, and the Bill referred to a special committee.

Progress was reported on "A Bill to amend the law relating to the Shipment of Seamen at St. John."

Mr. NEEDHAM called the attention of the House to a report of his speech in the *Morning Journal*, in which it was stated that he called Mr. Cardwell "an unprincipled scoundrel and an unprincipled liar." He would give it an unqualified denial. He never said it, and never thought it. He had never used such an expression, either directly or indirectly, or that could in any way be so construed.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S AMENDMENT.

Mr. WETMORE resumed: I regret that I had not occupied a little more time last evening, so that there would have been no necessity for my making any further remarks. The debate has been protracted to an alarming extent, and has taken more time than we expected. I do not wish to occupy more time than is necessary to explain my views on this question. When the House adjourned, I was commenting on an important feature in this case. It is one on which I think the honorable gentleman who forms the Government have sacrificed the views which they entertained on a previous occasion. It may be that the Lieutenant Governor has a right to receive that amount of salary. I express no opinion upon that point. What was the motive that induced the present Attorney General to make a motion in 1864

to fix the amount of the Governor's salary? Was it to create a turmoil in the House, to turn the Government out, and get some of his friends in? I do not charge him with any improper motives, for I presume he acted in a fair and legitimate manner, and did his duty as a member of the House of Assembly. He says nothing but the political exigencies of the country could induce him to take office; therefore it must have been to set this matter right. If His Excellency has a right to a single penny, by the same principle he may draw every fraction from the treasury, for there is no limit. Though the excess of salary drawn is regularly paid back, yet it does not alter the principle that it is wrong to draw it without legal authority. The present Attorney General on that occasion said that the Lieutenant Governor should receive so much and no more, and if he drew one single penny from the treasury outside and beyond the amount he was entitled to receive, the Government of the day was obliged to take the responsibility of it. I agree with that sentiment, and I think that upon the formation of the present Government, it should have been made a *sine qua non* that His Excellency should not have drawn this excess of salary.

My hon. friend (Mr. S.) in 1864 sought to fix the responsibility of it upon the existing Government. He then portrayed the evil of allowing money to be drawn without legal authority, from the Treasury, in all its horrors. And now, when they have the power to stop it, they still allow the evil to exist. Is that the way a man should act who assumes the leadership of the country? I am prepared to say I have no confidence in men who act in that way. It shows a lack of determination, if not a lack of principle. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) says there was a solemn agreement made between His Excellency and the former Government that this excess of salary should be drawn and paid back. The Government had no power to make agreements regarding the funds of the country to bind us for all time to come. Such agreements can only be made by legislative enactment. If His Excellency has a right to draw this money, he has a right to keep it. If arrangements of this kind have been made by the Tiltz Government, it is no reason that the Smith Government should follow it up, for two wrongs do not make one right. I think the people of the country want to treat His Excellency with dignity and respect, and pay him such salary as he is entitled to without any paying back. His Excellency may be under the impression that he is giving us a bonus, and another Governor coming here may have the same liberal spirit, and retain the full amount, which has been drawn and sanctioned by two Governments, and we would have no remedy. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) talks about his patriotism, as though he was the only man that had given up anything to serve his country. I gave up an office, because I was induced to come here to endeavor to prevent the passage of the Quebec Scheme. My hon. friend who did not want an office, jumped into the late Attorney General's shoes before they were hardly vacant; he resembles one of those "No. I thank you, men," who when asked to have a piece of cake or a glass of wine, always said, "No, I thank you," but they generally managed notwithstanding to eat and drink more than any one else in the company. (Mr. Smith—You wanted an office soon after you got into the Assembly.) If I did I sought an

office fairly, and there was the most solemn pledge and promises given me. I hold the man that pledges his word to another pledges his sacred honor, and if he violates that word he is entitled to no respect. Why were those pledges not carried out? I am just as much entitled to an office as my hon. friend. My grandfather held one of the first offices in this country, and discharged its duties in an efficient manner. I never made a pledge to deceive any person, and I trust my name will never be sullied by breaking a pledge to any man. In reference to expiring laws, the speech of last session says: "Your attention will be called, with a view to their renewal, to several enactments which owing to my inability to call you together at an earlier period, have either expired or are on the point of expiring." And the answer says: "We will give our attention to such enactments as have recently expired or are about to expire." If the Government thought proper to overlook the re-enactment of such laws, they acted improperly and are to blame. They tried to throw the blame upon Judge Allan, and upon the leader of the former Government. The export duty law was known to have expired in September, and it was the duty of the Government then to have called the Legislature together to re-enact that law. Another law has expired providing for the prompt payment of all demands upon the treasury, and all money received without that is received without the authority of law. Unless there was a law for it, the learned Attorney General had no right to negotiate a loan of £15,000. I think they admit the error, for they have brought in a Bill. (Mr. Smith—The Bill brought in now is included in the Treasury Note Bill of last year.) If the Government can make such arrangements as they please, pledging the revenues of the country without showing law for it, the country has got into a bad position. The Government, trying to justify the matter, only makes it worse; upon whose credit did they obtain money in England, and upon whose authority?—(Mr. Smith—There was no money obtained at all, it was simply a cash credit. In the event of our wanting money we made an agreement to authorize us to draw it.) I suppose my hon. friend will tell me whether there has been any drawn or not. (Mr. Smith—There has been £5000 drawn recently in consequence of the Fenian excitement causing a run upon the Savings' Bank.) I am rejoiced that at last we have got some information. He has admitted the fact that £5000 have been drawn. By virtue of what authority was that money drawn? What right had he to pledge the credit of the Province for £20,000. There is no law to justify his doing it. (Mr. Anglin—There is a law authorizing the investing in England the surplus amount in the Savings' Bank, which is held there to meet any run upon the Bank.) Where is the surplus money? It is all gone. (Mr. Smith—It is all right.) It may be all right, but it has been invested in England. My impression is, that there has been a wrong committed in obtaining this money without the sanction of law. If that be the case I have no disposition to give the Government an opportunity of interfering with the finances of the country. The Attorney General talks about personal attacks. I have attacked the Government because I thought they deserved it. It is well for my hon. friend to consider who set the example. He has assailed the Equi-