

said, "here is a vote for Charles Fisher." (Mr. Wetmore—How do you know?) I heard so. I am prepared to show that Judge Ritchie never voted nor took any part in a political contest, and when Confederation came up he had nothing to do with it. There is no instance on record where a Judge ever mixed himself up with party political questions. Suppose a row took place between the party he was voting for and the other side and a murder was committed, and he was called upon to try those parties, could he divest himself of political feeling, and bring his mind into that calm state, that he could give a dispassionate judgment.

The ex-Surveyor General chooses to style us traitors. I shall not reply to him in the same way, for I know he gets excited, and we must make allowance for him. He called the Attorney General a mongrel, and he thought he would soon get to the pure breed. (Mr. McMillan—called him a cross between a Confederate and an anti-Confederate, and was perfectly justified in saying so, for he has declared in that Minute of Council that he was against all union, and then by the Speech from the Throne he has foreshadowed a scheme of union.) My hon. friend accuses us of being a cross between a Confederate and an anti, because we have respectfully, by the command of His Excellency, put into the Speech that he has received certain commands with reference to a Union of the Colonies, and we answer to that and say, that when that correspondence is laid before us it will receive due consideration from this House. He condemns us because we only respectfully allude to it, and my hon. colleague (Mr. Gilbert) takes the other extreme, and condemns us because we put it in at all. These are two antagonistic principles, and it is an unerring law of nature, that different species of vegetables or animals produce hybrids, therefore, when he calls us a cross breed, I will call my hon. friend from Westmorland, and the ex-Surveyor General, hybrid politicians, and I think their constituency would be benefited by destroying this hybrid breed. I will now thank this House for the attention which they have paid me while addressing them. I do not appeal to their sympathy, but I say that, in my opinion, the charges made against the department over which I have supervision are perfectly groundless; other charges brought against the Leader of the Government have been already explained. I ask the House to give the charges a calm investigation, and not pre-judge us, for I feel satisfied, whatever the decision may be, they cannot put their hand on one title of evidence to justify any of the charges made against this Government, for I am satisfied that they have discharged their duty, and I am satisfied the vote of this Assembly will acquit them of any such charges made on so baseless a foundation.

Mr. CONNELL.—I will make a few observations in reference to the subject of debate, which has arisen out of the following resolution:

"And your Excellency may rely with confidence upon our cordial co-operation and support in the adoption of such measures as may be deemed necessary for the protection of the country; but we respectfully state to your Excellency that

your constitutional advisers, by their general conduct, are not entitled to our confidence."

I am one of those who believe that the course pursued by the Government has not given satisfaction to the country, and I will give my reasons for this belief. During the last sitting of the Legislature, a resolution was brought into the House and supported by the Government, that a delegation should go to England. Where was the necessity for that delegation and what good has resulted from it? That delegation was sent avowedly by the authority of this House, for the purpose of conveying to the British Government an idea of the state of things that existed in this Province, and I ask the Attorney General if he believed it necessary to go to England to convey this information to them? Did he think they had the constitutional right to interfere in our local matters? They had previously sent a despatch giving the result of the elections in this Province, to show that the people had rejected the Quebec Scheme, as they had only returned nine Confederates in the whole Province, although there were four who had not declared themselves for or against the Scheme. It is about time they should write another despatch, for we are all for union now. His Excellency's speech is for union, and some of the hon. members are for union one way and some another. The Attorney General will go for union, provided there are some checks made to counter-balance representation by population. Was it necessary or desirable to put the Province to the great expense of that delegation? Is it true the Government may shelter themselves by saying this delegation was authorized to go to England by a resolution of the House which says:

"Whereas, in the exercise of the right of internal self-government enjoyed by this Province, its people are entitled to deliberate and decide upon all questions affecting their own local interests in such manner as to them may seem best calculated to promote their prosperity and welfare;

"Therefore Resolved, As the opinion of this House, that a delegation should at once proceed to England for the purpose of making known to the Imperial Government the views and feelings of this House, and the people of this Province on this important subject."

I was opposed to this resolution, and I was in the minority; but small as that minority was at that time, it is now the feeling of a vast majority of the people of this Province. The course pursued by the Government in initiating that delegation cost a large sum of money; while it was unnecessary, uncalculated for, and, in its results, was of no benefit to the Province. This delegation did not authorize them to do. What authority did they have to enter into any arrangements, or contracts, for building the line of railway between Moncton and Amherst? They had no authority whatever except what was given them under the Pacific Act, which gives the Government no authority to make any contracts. They may have had some secret arrangements which were never made public, but they were not authorized by this House or by law to make any contracts whatever. The delegates who went from Nova Scotia were authorized

by their colleagues—as appears from a minute of Council—to make arrangements concerning the fisheries, reciprocity and railways, but our delegates had no authority to enter into a contract with parties in England to build the railway from Moncton to Amherst. The only thing I can see in the law in reference to the matter is this. The Pacific Act in reference to this Railway is restrained, unless Nova Scotia makes a contract for their portion of the line. Then it is allowed to operate, but it gives no authority to the Government to enter into contracts for building it. I should like to know why it is that this line of railway connecting with the Nova Scotia line should have more of the immediate attention of the Government than any of the other lines contemplated under the Subsidy Act. It seems arrangements are made, contracts entered into, and the surveys paid for this railroad. By what authority has the Government entered into a contract to pay them all the cost of a right of way, where it exceeds \$200 a mile which will be a considerable sum, and the road runs through valuable marsh land? Why do they give them this preference, while it is very difficult for parties engaged in other railways, to even get their road acknowledged? (Mr. Anglin.—In what case?) In Woodstock the road has not been acknowledged, nor the survey paid, although the work is going on.

Mr. GILBERT.—The survey has been paid. My hon. friend undertook to make another survey, which has not been paid.

Hon. Mr. SMITH.—The impression you wish to convey is that we are not doing what ought to be done, in regard to the Woodstock Railway. Mr. Hartley and Mr. Hay came down here to talk the matter over. I told them the Government would give them every assistance, for we felt disposed to encourage them in every way.

Mr. CONNELL.—It is very important that these matters should be entered into at once. They have not yet been acknowledged even up to the present time. It is true, the Attorney General promised to have the matter closed in ten days after Mr. Hartley and Mr. Hay were here. But the reason now given is that the contract has some slight informality about it. If that is the case, why not inform the company of the fact, that they may remedy the evil, and the road be acknowledged by the Government? All I want is fair play. They have not extended the same justice to the Woodstock Railway as they have to the other, for they have paid for the survey of that, and, in addition to this, they have paid for a second survey which has been made on the Dorchester line, to suit the convenience of somebody. That being the case, why do they not pay for the survey of the road at Woodstock? But I suppose while the present Government remain in power, we need not expect any justice of that kind. The Woodstock company have furnished their bonds and have done all the law requires, while no such requirements have been made of the St. Stephen branch, Western Extension, or the Dorchester line, and no papers exist in the office showing that fact. If there is any fair play in this, I do not understand it.

There has been a great deal said in reference to the Government officers not being filled up, and in consequence many evils have arisen throughout the Province.