

anxious to have the same privilege, for they thought a much larger amount of repairs would be put upon the roads under this Bill than is now done.

Mr. L. P. W. DESBRISAY said he had not been instructed by his constituents in regard to this Bill. He thought the people should have some voice in the matter. It should not be made imperative that they should pay money instead of labor, without having a clause introduced that the Bill should not come into operation without a two-thirds majority of the inhabitants of the Parish were in favor of it. He thought they were not aware in the Parish of Welford that a Bill of this kind was to be submitted to the Legislature.

Mr. CAIE explained that he had taken the ordinary course by advertising the Bill.

Mr. GILBERT said it was rather an arbitrary Bill, for its design was to compel the people of two Parishes to support their roads by the payment of money, whereas now it was optional with them whether they would do so or not. In the absence of any petition in favor of the Bill, and the hon. members disagreeing upon it, he would vote against it.

Mr. WILLISTON said the people of those Parishes had every opportunity of knowing that such a Bill was to be presented, for it had been published in the local newspapers, and there being no petition against it, was one of the strongest arguments in its favor. The principle of this Bill had been adopted in Chatham and other Parishes, and he would like to see the same principle adopted throughout the Province, as it would be a great improvement upon the present system.

Mr. OTTY also supported the Bill as it had been found to work well in other Parishes.

Mr. KERR said this Bill was a step in the right direction, and the principle of the Bill should become the law of the Province.

Mr. LEWIS was of the same opinion; by the payment of twenty-five cents for each day's work, the roads would be kept in a better state than they now are under the present system. He would give the Bill his hearty support.

Mr. L. P. W. DESBRISAY said they had better report progress in order that he might have time to learn from the inhabitants of those Parishes whether they were in favor of it or not.

Hon. Mr. HATHEWAY said the principle of the Bill was correct, but they should report progress, as one of the representatives for the County wished for more time. Progress was then reported.

Mr. GILBERT moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, praying that His Excellency may be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a true copy of a Will on the Equity side of the Supreme Court of this Province, on the 30th day of March, 1863, by Messrs. Smith and Peck, Plaintiff's Attorneys, wherein Sarah Bell was Plaintiff, and J. D. Turner and wife, J. S. Turner, D. W. Turner, C. W. Weldon, S. K. Brundage and Her Majesty's Attorney General of this Province were defendants. Also a true copy of the decree made in such cause, dated 2d of June, 1863, and a true copy of memorandum of sale, made under such decree

by Bliss Botsford, Esq., Master, dated 18th of September, 1863; also a copy of an affidavit made by said Sarah Bell in such cause, dated the 4th day of May, 1863; also a copy of an affidavit made by R. C. Scovill, Esq., dated 2d of May, 1863, in such cause, which said several papers are on file in the office of the Clerk of said Court. Also to lay before this House a full and complete statement, showing the several amounts of moneys which this Province or the Railway Board has paid for, or on account of, premiums of insurance costs and charges of whatsoever kind and for repairs, or which have been lost on account of interest to this Province, arising from the amount so invested in such purchases by R. C. Scovill, Esq., Commissioner of Railways, in the name of Her Majesty. Said statement to be made up from the 14th day of September, 1863, the terms of such purchase to the present date, and to show the amount which such property realized at public sale, on or about the first of November, 1864, in pursuance of a resolution of this House, and to whom sold, when and how payable, and to show by such statement the nett amount of loss which accrued to this Province in consequence of such sale and purchase, and a copy of any and all authorities or documents under which said property was, on the 14th of September, 1863, purchased by said R. C. Scovill, Railway Commissioner, for and on account and in the name of Her Majesty.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S AMENDMENT.

Mr. NEEDHAM resumed: I shall request the indulgence of the House, in order that I may fully and fairly explain my views, and the reasons that induce me to vote as I shall vote on this question. I was asked by persons outside of this House why I did not stick to the point when speaking on this question on Saturday evening. I began to think where the point was. I called to mind the various speeches on this question, and found they had taken such a discursive range that it would be unfair not to allow me the same latitude. I shall take up the different points, and endeavour to make myself so plain that I cannot be misunderstood either in the position I assume or the principles I advocate. Before I go on to the main points, I will refer to what I passed over on Saturday, on account of my not having any notes before me, as I did not expect to speak that evening until a few moments before I arose for that purpose. The few remarks which I will now make on that subject is for the purpose of disabusing the minds of hon. members of a wrong impression regarding the York election and its results. That election was no evidence of a change of public opinion in the County of York regarding Confederation. True, says one hon. member, it was no change of opinion on Confederation, yet it was an absolute denouncement of the present Government. This I deny, and I shall show conclusively that the York election was no denouncement of the Government as a whole. The Attorney General at the last session of the Legislature introduced a Bill to abolish the office of political Postmaster General. That Bill, as I understand it, "contemplated nothing more than the mere doing away with that political office, and contemplated no ar-

rangements for removing that or any other office. But the impression got abroad that it was the intention of the leader of the Government to remove that office to St. John, which rendered him very unpopular in this County. I voted against abolishing that office, not because I was a member for York, but because the measure did not accord with my views of Responsible and Departmental Government. I considered the idea of having Responsible without Departmental Government as absurd. The very moment the impression got abroad in the County of York that it was the intention to remove that office to St. John, which had caused the expenditure of twelve or fifteen hundred pounds a year in the city of Fredericton, it created a feeling of hostility to the man who tried to carry that measure. It was easy to get up this impression, and it was made a handle of at the York election. The question was a popular one in a majority of the Counties outside of the County of York; but it was unpopular there, and the election was not based upon hostility to the Government, but upon hostility to Mr. Smith, the leader of the Government, and he alone was brought into the contest. There was another influence brought to bear in this election; that was the excitement got up about Fenianism. I do not assert—and there are thousands who will bear witness to the truth of what I say—that this cry of Fenianism was got up for an especial purpose on an especial occasion, to raise the worst feelings of our common nature. It was got up to carry the election against Mr. Pickard. This cry of Fenianism, and the opposition to the leader of the Government, was the cause of a member being returned in opposition to the Government. Confederation had nothing to do with it, for not only the candidate ignored it, but almost every canvasser; for I went through the County and heard the canvassers speak, and almost every one put forth the same cry: Timothy Anglin has challenged the Protestants, and will you succumb to him? A more infamous falsehood never was perpetrated. However unfortunate was the challenge, Mr. Anglin never challenged the Protestants of York. His challenge was to the confederates of York. He asked them would they bring out a Confederate of York in opposition to an anti-Confederate. They did not, and they dare not. They brought an anti-Confederate to oppose an anti-Confederate. They brought a stronger anti-Confederate than I am myself, and this is an undeniable fact. The moment this challenge was explained, it was seen at once that this was not a religious challenge at all, but was one any man might have made. I stated that most all the canvassers for my colleague on that occasion enunciated the same doctrine. There was one honorable exception; that was Mr. Hartley, Deputy Surveyor in Carleton. He put the question fairly on Confederation. Honor to whom honor is due. I respect my political opponent who will meet me on fair political grounds. Then we can make use of the assertion, "free stage and no favor." Then if we are beaten, we are beaten honorably. But it was not honorable to get up this cry that religion was in danger. If it was, would it be saved by holding an election in the County. No! If it stands on that basis it is not worth having or promulgating in the world. The very moment this cry of Fenianism