

It was suggested that when Bills were referred to the Chief Commissioner, he should be called upon to report upon them within a certain number of days, and ten days were thought to be proper limit of time. It was objected that the Chief Commissioner could not give his attention to such Bills during the session of the House. With regard to the House dealing with the Bills, it was held, that it would be in direct opposition to the principle of mitigation of money grants by the Government. Besides to discuss such Bills would take up an immense deal of the time of the House. They ought to be referred to the Chief Commissioner. In placing roads on the great road establishments it was necessary to take into consideration all the roads of the Province, and the wants and claims of particular localities, and the smaller could only be dealt with by those who had a general knowledge of all the road. Ten days, it was argued, was entirely too short a time to allow the Chief Commissioner to report upon Bills referred to him during the sitting of the House. Hon. members called attention to the roads in their Counties they wanted to be placed in the great road establishment. Mr. DeBri say and Mr. Caie, hon. members of Kent, particularly drew attention to the most important roads in their County, one tapping the Moctouche and C-caigne Rivers, and bringing Moctouche within 23 miles of Richibucto instead of 70; the other, a road running to the Miramichi River. Mr. Coutign called attention to "a leak of six miles in the road from Grand Fall to Quebec."

Finally, a resolution in amendment of a previous motion was carried, that all the Bills before the House to place roads on the great road establishment, be referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works, to report thereon within ten days.

THE ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S AMENDMENT.

The Adjourned Debate on the amendment to the fourth paragraph in the Address was then taken up. Some objection was urged by Mr. Needham against going on with the debate, but Mr. Beveridge said he would prefer speaking then, whereupon

Mr. BEVERIDGE remarked that so much had been said, on the question by honorable members, that it was useless further to take up the time of the House. But as it appeared to be understood that every hon. member should express an opinion, he would do so very shortly. It had given him great pleasure to listen to what had fallen from the member of Carleton as to the great resources of Canada, on the position of the Government on the question of Union, and on the importance to the interests of the country to have it settled. He had to express an opinion, as the Government were not in favor of Union, he would therefore vote against them. He was for Union; he thought that ought to be the policy of the country. He did not care what men or set of men brought about that object, so it was brought about. It had been remarked that it was undesirable that New Brunswick should be united more closely with Canada; but it appeared to him that such a union must benefit the Province immensely; it would be a similar case with a poor man joining in partnership with a rich one; and had they

ever, he would ask, heard of a poor man being unwilling to unite in business with a man who was a great deal wealthier than himself; the benefits must be greatly on the side of the poor man. The great object they should all strive for should be to get Union; without Union taxes must increase in this Province—what with its general increased expenditures and the construction of so many railroads, when he thought of all the branch railways now building, or for which bills had been passed, of the Extensions—Western and Eastern—he wondered where all the money was to come from. It seemed to him that while the revenue was decreasing their expenditures were increasing, and he did not see how the country could go on under the present system supporting its burdens, and meet its liabilities without resorting to direct taxation. Had the Government submitted a Scheme of Union, he would have been willing to go for them. Let them look at the question as they lived, there was no use shutting their eyes to the fact that Union must come sooner or later, and to his mind the sooner it came the better. It was admitted that to join in with Canada, they would be united with a larger and richer people, and such a Union must be beneficial to them. He thought they should all unite to bring about that most desirable object. Had the Government, as he had said, come down with a measure, and shown what the objectionable features of the Quebec Scheme were, and explained where the proper check was to be put that would neutralize the undue influence that they said Upper Canada must have by the principle of representation by population, he would have been willing to go for them, but as they had said they had no intention to submit any Scheme, he must go against them, and vote for the amendment.

Mr. NEEDHAM said, it was not his intention to have occupied the attention of the House at this time, and he would have been better satisfied if he had been allowed to take his own way, and to have spoken when he felt inclined; but rather than it should be said that he was not disposed to go on with the debate, he would now proceed to offer some preliminary remarks.

It was a most important subject they were discussing—the most important that had ever been discussed in that Legislature, involving, as it did, the interests of the country; and according as it was settled, it would affect not only the destinies of the men who formed the Government of the Province, but, ultimately, the destinies of the Province itself. In dealing with the subject, he would observe no exact order, but take it up as it came to him. He would take up the remark of the hon. member for Victoria, Mr. Beveridge, who said that they had never heard of a poor man who was not willing to go into partnership with a rich man, applying this to the union of New Brunswick with Canada. No doubt there were great advantages to a poor man in a union of that kind; but the benefits of such a partnership were not so evident when the riches of the reputed wealthy man—and he applied this to Canada—were reported to be of a very doubtful character, and especially when entering into such a partnership, the poor man had to give up a control of his own affairs, and the general management of his own

With regard to the immediate question before the House, he had never, throughout all his experience of political matters, known a vote of want of confidence against a Government to be pursued on so slight a ground—on ground that took so much the character of clap-net. A vote of want of confidence should be grounded on malfeasance on the part of the Government. The evidence of malfeasance and incapacity against them should be clear and manifest. One of the great charges against the Government was that the Legislature had been called together some three weeks later than was customary. It was all very well for the mover of the amendment to say that by delay the rights of the people had been sacrificed, their interests neglected. There was no truth whatever in that assertion. When they spoke of sacrificing the interests of the country, what was to be said of his hon. colleague, who, of his own motive, voluntarily brought in this vote of want of confidence, grounded, he (Mr. N.) held, on insufficient grounds, that had taken up more than three weeks of the time of the House, and that was still dragging along, delaying the business of the country, and that had already cost the country some \$21,000? Some hon. member had said that if the money had been expended on the bye roads, it would have been much more profitable for the country, and so said he; but before he was done, he would show that that money was a mere drop in the bucket compared with the interests at stake by the agitation of this question. He thought he could show that the delaying the calling together of the Legislature was not a serious charge against the Government. He held the Government were quite right in not calling it together sooner. They were there not for the purpose of legislating for Canada or Nova Scotia, but for themselves. This Legislature was not to be convened for the convenience of Lord Monck or to meet the views of Canadian politicians. Why was it that the Canadian Legislature was not yet in the Gazette called together for the despatch of business? Why did they make this delay? They did so for their own convenience, he believed, with a view to the action of this Legislature. The Government would have deserved a vote of want of confidence if they had played into the hands of the Canadian tricksters. If they had, he would have moved a vote of want of confidence against them himself. He would pursue the subject under discussion as it came to his mind, and if he was not so methodical as he might otherwise have been, he would excuse him as he had been obliged to speak when he was not quite prepared. The hon. mover of the amendment had said that the Government deserved to be thrown out, that they knew the feeling in the country was against them, and they dared not fill up their offices, because they had not a constituency they could call their own. He dared his hon. colleague to resign his seat and run an election against him (Mr. N.) in their County. Let his hon. colleague run him if he dared, he was prepared to resign his seat and test the feeling of York on Confederation. It was most extraordinary the position some hon. members took on that question. They saw, they said, union foreshadowed in the speech; they were, they also asserted, elected to support confederation. But they were insincere in their profes-