

WEDNESDAY, JULY 4.

Certain Bills received a second and third reading, after which Mr. WETMORE read and laid before the House the petition and protest of George McLeod and others, voters in the County of Kent, against the return of William S. Caie and Owen McInerney, as members of the General Assembly, on the ground that the election was illegal, inasmuch as the Sheriff had not fixed the people that the election would take place at a certain time, and had afterward changed the date; and also on the ground of bribery and corruption.

On motion of Mr. WETMORE it was ordered that on Saturday next, the 7th instant, at the hour of 10 A. M., the House do go into the consideration of the charges contained in the petition of Geo. McLeod and others against the return of Messrs. Caie and McInerney.

Mr. LINDSAY moved for leave to bring in a Bill to place the road from North Richmond to South Richmond, in the County of Carleton, on the Great Road list. Leave granted, and the Bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works.

Mr. LINDSAY moved for leave to bring in a Bill to place the road from the Court House in Woodstock to the River de Chute on the Great Road list. Leave was granted, and the Bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works.

Mr. BECKWITH moved for leave to bring in a Bill to place the road from the North of the Keewick, in the County of York, to the River St. John, opposite Woodstock, on the Great Road list. Leave was granted, and the Bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works.

Mr. BECKWITH moved for leave to bring in a Bill to place the road from Thompson's Mills, in the Parish of Douglas, passing through Stanley to Boiestown, on the Great Road list. Leave was granted, and the Bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works.

The order of the day was then taken up.

RESOLUTIONS ON UNION DELEGATION.

Mr. LINDSAY said he thought it was not right that delegates should be bound down in their action by any restriction laid upon them by this House.

Mr. SMITH rose to close the debate and said:—

I have some anticipations that some amendment would be offered by the Government to the resolutions I laid before

this House, but I had no thought that they would have moved such an amendment as they did. I always thought we were a deliberative Assembly, sent here by the people to exercise our judgments and intellects on all matters pertaining to the well-being of the people of this Province. But it appears the Government do not entertain such an opinion. They talk as though all the blessings which they predicted Confederation was to bring, had already been experienced. Rather than the course they have pursued, I think they should have come before the House, and said "the country have determined to try the experiment of Union," and explained the course they intended to follow, so that hon. members might bring their powers of mind to bear upon the subject, and suggest such modifications and alterations as to them were deemed necessary. Instead of this they are shrouding their conduct in mystery and concealment. When I asked the Attorney General if it was the intention of the Government to confederate New Brunswick and Canada if Nova Scotia decided not to come in, the required information was concealed. They bring forward a resolution intimating that the Union is to include all the Provinces, yet refuse to say if they will agree to a Union of only two. The people of New Brunswick may be willing to go into a Union with all the Provinces, while they would not agree that this Province should unite with Canada alone. I do not believe the Government are justified in pursuing such a mysterious course, nor that hon. members will do justice to their constituents if they vote for the amendment.

Mr. SMITH then referred to a misunderstanding which had arisen with regard to the wording of Hon. Mr. Fisher's Amendment, and then proceeded:—

In the Amendment made by the Government they make the declaration that hon. members of this House are not here to deliberate on the terms of Union, but simply to clothe with unlimited power the delegates who may be sent on this mission; that they will not admit of opinions being expressed by those whom the people have sent to speak for them. I ask the House if they are willing to ignore their functions, to shirk all the responsibility and place it on the shoulders of the Government? I repudiate any such doctrine that in a case like this, when the changing of the Constitution is contemplated, that the people's representatives should take no responsibility. All the responsibility of the acts of the Government will rest upon them and the people. I think hon. members had better pause, or notwithstanding the doctrine here laid down by the Government, the result, if disastrous, will rest with them,

and the people will call them to account for it. It does seem to me that it is not possible there can be a majority of the members of this House willing to stolidify themselves and ignore their functions, and do nothing more on this great question than to appoint delegates with power to change the Constitution of this Province without their having a voice in the matter. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Johnson) told us that Mr. Galt contemplated reducing the taxes in Canada. Does he? I'd show that he contemplates greatly increasing them. Mr. Galt himself admitted in his speech in the Canadian Parliament that they are in such financial difficulty that he should call upon them to give the Government power to issue five million dollars of Treasury notes. The duties they now pay in Canada are much higher than with us, and although Mr. Galt says that that would probably be their last Session, yet before Confederation is accomplished, he is compelled to raise the duties on various articles to meet their present emergencies. I hold in my hand a report of Mr. Galt's speech when presenting his financial statement, and I will read what he says, as also the remarks of Mr. Geo. Brown on the course pursued by the Government. The Provincial Secretary (Mr. Tilly) had told us that in Canada they had an excise duty of thirty cents a gallon on whiskey. Does he know that it is now intended to raise that to sixty cents, and under Confederation we will have to pay that amount. The people of Canada want more money than they have, and even now they are paying eight per cent. for it. Their finances are in a very bad state.

Mr. Galt says (I shall merely read a few extracts from his speech):—

"This year the financial statement included the expense of the election of Legislative Councilors last fall, but it was not likely that this Parliament would ever have to provide means for another General Election."

For Militia he would not ask for \$50,000 as usual, but "he wished to be empowered to spend a sum no less than \$1,500,000." And then he goes on to specify the articles upon which a higher duty must be paid. "It would be his duty to increase the excise duty on spirits from thirty to sixty cents." "On Indian corn, coarse grains, &c., imported from the United States, there would be a duty of ten cents a bushel. On flour the duty would be fifty cents a barrel." "On tea the Government proposed adding to the specific duty three cents a pound, making the duty on tea as nearly as possible twelve or twelve and a half cents a pound, instead of nine cents as heretofore." There is also to be a change in the duty on molasses. It is put down at \$1 per gallon,