

employ them by tender, or instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to employ them. He thought on a coach quite sufficient to carry Committees to the Government House.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said he understood the Government had taken upon themselves to dismiss a coachman, and if they have taken the dismissal they have taken the appointment. He would ask if any coaches had been dismissed by the Government. The coaches which were appointed last Session continued in their attendance upon the House until they they were dismissed.

Hon. Mr. FISHER said his hon. friend had better not speak of Government appointments. The door-keeper was appointed through the Sergeant-at-Arms by the late Government. Mr. Atherton's coach had been employed by the House; but last year it was dismissed and another coach employed in its place.

Mr. BOTSFORD—The door-keeper died, and the present door-keeper was appointed by the Government in order to have an efficient officer there.

Hon. Mr. FISHER said it was no difference to him whether they employed one coach or two, they had always employed two, and two would still continue in attendance. He did not wish to see the main question blinked, which was, whether Mr. Atherton or Mr. Peters should have one of these coaches. Mr. Atherton was appointed in 1857, and furnished good coaches and accommodated the members. He held this appointment until the general election preceding this. He took ground against the then Government, and the House turned him out and appointed Mr. Peters. When our friends have been removed from office for the course which they have taken during the election, it is but common justice that we should restore them. Mr. Atherton was removed for simply voting for us at the election, and it was now their duty to restore him to his situation. These were his reasons for the appointment of Mr. Atherton, but neither the resolution and amendment made provision for it. He did not wish the coaches for himself for he had a carriage of his own. The man who was appointed now would retain the situation during the next four years, and during the winter season they had a great deal of stormy weather. The salary was a small matter, the members made more excitement about it than the people did themselves. The people are willing that every convenience should be provided for their representatives, and all they require of them in return is that they shall discharge their duty to the best of their ability.

Mr. CHANDLER said the simple question was did they require two coaches or not. If two coaches were necessary

they should have them. Mr. Atherton was appointed in 1857 and had performed his duties with kindness and attention. If he has been removed by the late Government for any well-founded charge they should not employ him, but if he has been removed on political grounds he should be reinstated.

Mr. BOTSFORD said the late Government did not displace or reinstate either Mr. Atherton or Mr. Peters. It was the House that did it. The Government have no power to displace them, and he supposed that was the reason that Mr. Peters was not displaced. He (Mr. Peters) was employed by the House, but he did not know whether it was from political motives or not.

Mr. MCADAM would vote against the resolution, if adopting it would prevent them from re-instating Mr. Atherton, who had been displaced for political reasons.

Hon. Mr. WILLISTON thought the hon. members did not understand the matter before the House. In 1865 the question was brought before the House whether the Speaker should employ the coaches. The Speaker declined, and a resolution was submitted to the House to authorize the Contingent Committee to employ them. Mr. Peters had been coachman for the Executive Council and Mr. Atherton for the House of Assembly. They tried to do justice to all parties. They recommended that Mr. Peters should be employed as coachman to the House, as he had formerly served in that capacity, and they thought they were doing no injustice to Mr. Atherton, for he had large contracts under the Government. They also employed Mr. Turner, and these two coachmen did the duty. He could bear testimony to the efficiency of Mr. Atherton, but he thought the Government should not have this patronage. He had a strong feeling in reference to the displacement of officers. He hoped that the day had gone by when officers could be removed except on good substantial grounds. So long as a man is doing his duty to his country, so long should he continue in office. If, on the other hand, a man holding an office under the Government becomes a partizan, he should be removed. The question of whether Mr. Peters or Mr. Atherton be employed had better be referred to the Contingent Committee, and let them investigate it fairly and fully.

Mr. JOHNSON said they should not place the patronage of the House in the hands of the Contingent Committee. They might just as well delegate it to the Committee on Privileges. If the House would place it in the hands of His Honor the Speaker, he would agree to it, but not to placing it in the hands of a Committee of that kind. According to the

amendment, the coaches would not be confined to members going to the Government House, but the Contingent Committee, or any other Committee of the House would have the right to use them, while His Honor the Speaker would not.

Mr. STEVENS said the question was whether they should have two coaches or one. The amendment says we shall only have one. This will not be sufficient to accommodate all the members who require coaches. He would vote for two coaches, which was the number they usually employed. The time spent in discussing this subject costs more than the employment of the coaches.

Mr. BECKWITH moved, as an amendment, "that George Atherton and John Turner be coachmen to this House."

This amendment was then adopted—yeas 17, nays 12.

The Committee appointed to wait upon His Excellency reported that the Governor would receive the Address of the House at 5 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. FISHER brought in "A Bill to provide for the prompt payment of all demands upon the Provincial Treasury."

On motion of Hon. Mr. FISHER the House went into Committee on

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE RETENTION, FOR A LIMITED TIME, OF SUCH PERSONS AS SHOULD BE SUSPECTED OF BEING GUILTY OF ACTS OF HOSTILITY AGAINST HER MAJESTY'S PERSON AND GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BECKWITH in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. FISHER said this Bill was an exact copy of a Bill passed by the Legislature of Canada to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act. They had suspended this Act until the 8th of June 1867. Under this Bill it was to be suspended until the end of the next Session of the Legislature.

Mr. JOHNSON said the question now was whether they should suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, or pass a Bill giving the Governor in Council power to suspend this Act. If they passed the Bill now before them, the Habeas Corpus Act would be suspended immediately, but if they passed a law giving power to the Lieutenant Governor to suspend it, we would have the benefit of our habeas corpus Act until its suspension is actually required. This Habeas Corpus Act is one of our greatest safeguards against oppression; for instance, a man may be troublesome in politics, and his opponent may have him arrested. He can not get the benefit of the Habeas Corpus Act, nor obtain a trial, and he may be kept imprisoned for years without having the right to be tried by the country. In the United States the President took the responsibility of suspending this Act. In our country the people themselves must do it. It is not in the