

and let in representatives who would lower the character of the House, and change its complexion entirely. It would change the character of the representatives altogether. There were many young men with winning ways who had no more brains than his boot, who would get into the House if this Bill passed.

MR. NEEDHAM.—It was an exceedingly high compliment for the hon. member of Charlotte (Mr. Boyd) to pay his constituents, to say they could be cajoled by men without brains.

HON. MR. HATHEWAY took a very different view of the Bill from the hon. member for Charlotte. He would put a case that might happen under the law as it stood. If he was a merchant doing business in Fredericton, and take out land to the value of £300, and he would be entitled to sit. He would put another case. In St. Mary's there was a teacher who had been known in the parish for twenty-one years, who was an honest, honorable man, and in whom all the people had confidence; what right had the Legislature, merely because that teacher had not the property qualification, to restrict the electors from voting for him, and oblige them, were there no other qualified candidates in the field, to vote for Hatheway, say because he was possessed of an estate? The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Boyd) thought the Bill most dangerous, but he was not afraid of it, for property would always have its influence. He was in favor of the principle of the Bill, for it gave greater right to the electors in the choice of representatives. He had yet to learn that the man who had little property did not feel as much interest in the prosperity, welfare and good government of the country as the man who held a great stake. He would give the people free choice. If they had confidence in certain men, why should the Legislature restrict them in the right to return them as representatives?

MR. SUTTON briefly supported the Bill.

MR. WILMOT thought it was much more important to regulate the franchise than to abolish the property qualification. He believed the law was evaded now regarding it. There was no Bill that they could pass in the House through which they could not drive a coach and four. With regard to universal suffrage, while in theory the justice of the principle might be difficult to combat, yet the practical carrying of it out had, it was well known, not worked well, and had been most dangerous and destructive.

MR. WETMORE said that, so far his judgment went, he entirely accorded with the principle of the Bill. It appeared to him very reasonable. Whatright, he asked, where people having property if they wanted a certain person to represent their interests in the Legislature, had the law to demand that that person should be possessed of a certain property qualification? He could not see why it was necessary that he should have property. The question arose, who had appointed representatives to the Legislature? Was it not the people who possessed the property of the country? Representatives were sent to the Legislature not because they possessed property, but to represent

the people's interests. It was not requisite that the electors should possess property; but all that was required, he thought, of a man they wished to elect was that the electors should have confidence in him, in his integrity, and his ability to discharge the duties of a representative. As the law stood, however capable a man might be, whatever the amount of confidence the electors could place in him, unless he had a certain property qualification, his abilities were scattered to the wind. If the people had a right to return representatives, he would give them the right to appoint whom they pleased, whether the persons had property or not.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL had always opposed the Bill, though, no doubt, in point of principle, the thing was right. It appeared just that electors who had the right to choose representatives should appoint whom they pleased. But the Bill did seem to ignore the protective point of the property qualification. They (the members of the House) came to the Legislature to represent the property of those who sent them there; and the law, as it stood, demanded that those who represented the property of the country should have an interest in what they represented. If electors chose to elect a representative without property, that man represented not only the property of those who sent him there, but the property of the whole country. If the principle of the Bill was right, if carried out, he thought that it would have little practical effect as long as they adhered to the principle that the men who voted should possess property; that, after all, was the true safeguard, the centre of safety. Though the principle was right, he deemed it undesirable that the election portals should be thrown open to every man. He admitted that in regard to the Bill, his mind was in a certain degree changed, but he thought, as the subject was of great importance, they should take time for further consideration, and he would recommend that progress be now reported.

Finally, progress was reported.

AFTERNOON.

DEBATE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH OF THE ADDRESS.

MR. CONNELL resumed. Mr. Connell, on commencing, was understood to remark, that in his last speech he was going on to refer to the conduct of the present Government, and to say, that if the people had an opportunity to pass judgment on the acts of the present Government, they would not defend it in the course it had pursued. The question against the Government had come down to union. What was their position in regard to it? It appeared that all were now for union, yet they were not prepared to bring down any measure, or to state what they were going to do. He wanted to put this matter to rest, for the interests of the country were endangered in consequence of the unsettled state of that question. The Government stood condemned before the country for the course they had pursued. In York, where the first opportunity was given to the people to express their opinion, there was an utter condemnation of the Government. The hon. member for York (Mr.

Needham) denied that confederation had anything to do with the election. Well, suppose it had not, it showed at any rate that the general conduct of the Government was opposed by York. The people of York, by the course they had pursued, had utterly condemned the course of the Government, and that was the matter before the House. On the question of union the Government had shown an utter want of candor. After they put that paragraph in the speech, they ought to have come down and said emphatically, whether or not they were prepared to bring in a measure. But it was generally understood that the Government themselves would not come down with a measure. There was, however, an arrangement that if a measure of some description were brought down by a member outside, they would support it. There was, he believed, an understanding to that effect. The Government, no doubt, were committed in some way to bring down a measure during the present sitting of the House.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—He had told the House on the first day of the debate that the Government did not intend to submit a scheme.

MR. CONNELL.—Neither submit a scheme themselves nor support a measure brought in by an outside member? Was there no subterfuge about this matter—the leader of the Government did not deny they would get one of their supporters to bring in a measure. If a measure were brought down in this way how would they act? It had been rumored that a course of this kind was intended. It would be too inconsistent, the Government said, to bring down a measure themselves, but they would get up a side wind and bring the matter in that way. They would get up an address, moved by one of their supporters, setting forth that whereas the House was in favor of union, and whereas it was the desire of Her Majesty that the union of the Colonies should take place, &c., resolved that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, &c. They would get the House to pass an address in favor of union, leaving the details to be settled by a delegation to be sent home to Great Britain. He had been assured that that was the course the Government were going to take. Talk after that of a selfish Government, a Government holding on to power. Here was a Government that had so lately talked so loudly about independence, and resistance to coercion, willing now to permit the interests of the country to be encroached upon by the acts of the Imperial Government. Who ever heard of such a thing as to leave the whole settlement of the details of a scheme having such a vast bearing in the interests of the country, to the British Government? He was surprised to find his hon. friend, the member of St. John (Hon. Mr. Cudlip) who had always been opposed to union in any way or shape, remaining in a Government that would take such a course as that he had described. He would be sorry, for his own part, to let the Government send home a delegation to settle with the British Government the details of a measure of union. He would like to see such a matter taken up and brought about by people who were really in earnest. He was not committed to any scheme, but if they could not get a better one than that settled upon at the Conference at Quebec,