

Mr. CAIE said it was not his wish or inclination to show any factious opposition to the Government. In the first place it would be useless to do so. In the second place it would occupy too much time at this season of the year, when time is so valuable. In the third place, he had not conceit enough in any arguments which he might use to convince the minds of the members on the floors of the House. He would, therefore, merely express his dissent from that paragraph which says:

"We learn with pleasure that Her Majesty the Queen graciously received of the Legislative Council," &c.

Representing as he did a constituency of 16,000 inhabitants, three-fourths of whom are what are called "Anties," he felt himself called upon to enter an unqualified disapprobation to the passing of that paragraph, and he trusted a division of the House, showing our opinions on the matter, will be taken.

Mr. STEVENS said he was glad to embrace the opportunity of raising his voice against the assertion made against the Legislative Council, that they represented nobody but themselves. The Constitution of Great Britain has received the plaudits of all writers of history. The reason of this is, because of the admirable checks which one branch has upon another. We should, therefore, endeavor to prevent the usefulness of the Upper Branch being done away with by any remarks calculated to bring them, as an independent Branch, into contempt. It has been urged by one hon. gentleman, that the Legislative Council was endeavoring to force upon the people a scheme which they had previously rejected, and because the scheme had been once rejected the people never ought to have another opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. They were prepared to meet this constitutional question in all its bearings. The action of the Lieutenant Governor was strictly constitutional in all its details. There was no endeavor to subvert the constitution or to force upon the people a scheme that they did not wish. The Legislative Council cannot carry anything into effect without the concurrence of the other branches. They did as they were asked to do by the Imperial Government, and in consequence of doing that they brought matters to an issue, which caused the resignation of a Government that had been in power long enough, and this was proved by the result of the elections. The country knew when His Excellency returned from England that there was something to be done to bring the subject of Union prominently before the people. We now find that the subject of Union was to have been brought before the people by the despatches which were to be laid before the House. If we look at the correspondence which took place

upon the resignation of the Government, we will find that His Excellency was willing to bring this about through the agency of the Government, so that it could be carried out without a party triumph. This showed great delicacy on the part of His Excellency. This subject of Union was mentioned in the speech from the throne, and the Legislative Council presented an address in answer to the speech, the reply to which was endorsed by the Government and couched in the same language in which afterwards His Excellency replied to their address on the subject of Union. They found fault because that reply was not communicated to the Government as a body, and in consequence of this they said it was not a constitutional act of the Governor. Why, he would ask, was it necessary for the Governor to do that when it was but a second copy of what they had already endorsed and approved of? Where was the unconstitutionality of this act of His Excellency? It was a mere matter of form, and they could not go to the country and ask them to decide on a mere matter of form.

A division was then taken upon the second paragraph in the address.

Yeas—Messrs. Fisher, McMillan, Williston, Connell, Kerr, Stevens, Beveridge, Lewis, Hibbard, Herbert, Johnson, Dow, Beckwith, Thompson, Perley, Babbitt, Ryan, J. Flewelling, W. P. Flewelling, Ferris, McClelan, McAdam, Sutton, Wilmot, Chandler, DesBrisay, Glasier, —37.

Nays—Messrs. Botsford, Meahau, Landry, McNerny, Oakie, McQueen, Young—7.

The third and fourth paragraphs passed each with the same division that was taken upon the second, and the remaining paragraphs passed unanimously.

Mr. KERR moved that the address be engrossed and signed by His Honor the Speaker, and presented to His Excellency by the whole House.

This resolution was adopted, and a Committee appointed to wait upon His Excellency to know when he would be pleased to receive the House therewith.

On motion of Hon. Mr. FISHER, the following resolution was made the order of the day for Tuesday.

Resolved, That a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to appoint delegates to unite with delegates from the other Provinces in arranging with the Imperial Government for the Union of British North America upon such terms as will secure the just rights and interests of New Brunswick, accompanied with a provision for the immediate construction of the Inter-Colonial Railway, each Province to have an equal voice in such delegation, Upper and Lower Canada to be considered as separate Provinces.

On motion of Mr. FISHER, 200 copies of this resolution were ordered to be printed.

On motion of Hon. Mr. WILLISTON, a Bill relating the administration of Justice in Equity, was referred to a Select Committee to report thereon.

EMPLOYMENT OF COACHES.

Mr. DOW said there were three coaches employed by the House. He found that a Resolution was passed in 1865 taking this matter out of the hands of the Contingent Committee, and placing it in the hands of the House. He would move this Resolution:—

Resolved—"That two coaches be employed for the use of this House."

Mr. DesBRISAY moved an amendment "that one coach be employed for the use of Committees going to the Government House only."

Mr. JOHNSON said that would be to reserve one coach for that purpose.

Mr. DesBRISAY observed that it was necessary to have a coach for that purpose, but the members could walk to their lodgings.

Mr. DOW said he should be perfectly satisfied with that.

Mr. DesBRISAY altered his amendment specifying that only one coach should be employed and that for the use of Committees.

Mr. RYAN thought they had best withdraw the resolution and amendment, and leave the matter in the hands of the Contingent Committee, and let them make such arrangement for coaches as they saw fit.

Mr. LEWIS expressed the same opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON said the Contingent Committee was appointed only with regard to those expenses of which they could not tell the amount. The Government or the Contingent Committee have no power to appoint the coaches. It is a matter for the House to deal with, and the House cannot employ them until it is organized. The members of the House can require your honor to give directions to the Sergeant-at-arms to employ them.

Mr. RYAN said they could delegate this power to a Committee if they saw fit. It did not matter to him how they settled it, but he thought one or two coaches were sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSON took the position that the Government or a Contingent Committee had nothing to do with these appointments; nothing should be left to a Contingent Committee that could be put down as items. The House should act for itself.

Mr. YOUNG said the course pursued last year was to leave the matter in the hands of the Speaker. He thought if the House desired to employ two coaches they should leave it in the hands of a Committee.

Mr. SUTTON said they had better