

some local difficulties respecting representation by population. I did not know at the last session this Union was so fully and completely approved of and endorsed by the Imperial Government, and therefore I voted to send a delegation to England to represent our opinions on the question. I should not have voted for that delegation had I read that despatch, which was in the possession of the Government at the time and withheld from the House, for I would then have understood the true policy of the British Government. They do not have one policy to-day and another to-morrow; they do not come to a conclusion very hastily upon any matter. After making enquiry into all that related to the Colonies, and the prospect of the Reciprocity Treaty being abrogated, they had made up their minds maturely. They have, no doubt, like other men, erred in managing the affairs of this great Empire, but they do not arrive at an hasty conclusion, one that can be repealed by our sending a delegation to have an interview of a few hours, even although it consisted of two of our ablest men. I should have thought, however, that one delegate was sufficient. The late Attorney General should have been left to look after the business of the country, while the President of the Council would have been competent to have made all the representations to the British Government that was necessary. By this arrangement there would have been a saving of five hundred pounds to the tax-payers of this Province. The last two delegations sent home by the late Government to make arrangements concerning the building of Railroads, cost only \$900 each, while this delegation cost \$3,558, which is a larger sum than was given last year for all our bye roads in the County of Westmorland. I think they perpetrated a wrongful act in sending two delegates, when my hon. colleague appears to have quite sufficient ability to compete with the Government of the Mother Country, collectively and individually, in reference to their great British Colonial policy without having a conference to assist him, but this delegation should not have been sent at all, and I do not believe it would have been sent if the Government, during the sitting of the House at the last session, had communicated to the House information which they had of the views of the Mother Country upon the question. We should economize the public money. I have always opposed delegations. The basis of all Governments is money, without which we cannot pay our liabilities, or keep up with the requirements or the improvements of the country; therefore, we should look closely into the way in which the public money is expended, and, although two or three thousand dollars is a small amount, yet there is a principle involved in it that when money is squandered it is our duty to express our dissatisfaction; and so it is our duty to express our dissatisfaction when the Government violate the known laws of the country. What puts the criminal in the box? It is for violating the laws of his country. Should we then permit the Government, who violate the known laws of the country, as I can show they have done to shelter themselves under their Governmental power and influence. Some years ago, in a conflict like this, my late brother, who was then a member of this House, and in whose political school I was trained, said that the Government of that day had violated the laws

of the country in not appointing commissioners to build the Railroad, as required by law, they having taken it upon themselves to build it by private individuals. There was a principle involved in this, and my hon. colleague Mr. Smith, and my late brother, were side by side on that question. They said, if we allow the Government to violate the laws of the country in one instance, where would they stop them? The Government of the day was defeated on this principle. I can show a like principle involved in this debate. (Mr. Gilbert then read the law regarding the appointment of Auditor General, and continued.) Here is the law which is just as much the law of the land as the law which creates this Parliament gives the electors the right to vote, or gives the candidates the right to offer for this House. If you look at the public accounts, you will find some \$25,000 remaining in the hands of the deputies at the end of the present year, scattered throughout the Province. The Auditor General stands between the Government and the people, to audit, examine and vouch all accounts, he having a judicial power to summon witnesses from any part of the Province, and examine them on oath, in explanation of proof and vouchers. Have not the Government violated the laws of the country in not appointing this officer? What can a Government do to cause the representatives of the people to withhold their confidence from them, if that is not sufficient?

T. P. D.

TUESDAY, MARCH 27.

The House went into Committee of the Whole (MR. A. C. DESBRISAY in the chair) on a Bill relating to the partition of lands.

MR. WILLISTON explained that the object of the Bill was to provide that the costs of the partition of land should be borne by parties having shares in it, according to the respective value of their shares; the costs should be apportioned according to the respective value of their respective shares. As the law stood, each party had to bear an equal proportion of the costs. Before introducing it, he had submitted the Bill to the Master of the Rolls, and it had been referred to a committee of legal gentlemen.

A long discussion, and technical discussion followed: All the hon. members who spoke agreed that the principle of the Bill was just and equitable, and, as far as it went, was a great improvement over the law as it stood. But it was argued, that though the Bill ought to pass as being a step in the right direction, it did not go far enough. The whole mode of partition of lands ought to be simplified. At present parties were obliged to go into an expensive suit in the Court of Chancery, that might eat up the whole estate, and it might happen that one party, out of several having shares in land, could force the others into court, and compel a division against their will, and subject them to equal costs, irrespective of the value of their respective shares. It was suggested that a simpler mode might be adopted. Hon. Attorney General, Hon. Surveyor General, Messrs. Williston, Fraser, Wetmore, Nedham, Wilmot, Anglin, Kerr, Ouy, Lindsay,

McClellan, Connel, and Dr. Thompson spoke. Bill agreed to.

The adjourned debate on the amendment to the address stood for twelve o'clock, but was not taken up until the afternoon, when Mr. Gilbert resumed.

MR. GILBERT [referring to a question put by him to hon. member from St. John (Mr. Anglin) calling on him to make known the reasons of his resignation.] said he thought his hon. colleague (Attorney General) had forgotten that he stated to the House that he did not give his reasons for resigning his seat as an Executive Councillor. He (Mr. Gilbert) had a distinct recollection that he did, and they were put in the Journals of the House as a matter of record. He had called upon the hon. member of St. John (Mr. Anglin) to give his reasons for leaving the Government, and he had been told that it was an extraordinary thing to ask that information; but he would tell his hon. friend, that he had not done his duty to the country, in not making them known. For his own part he wished to understand the full reasons of his resignation, as it was important that everything should be known that had a bearing upon the question under discussion. He would now resume.

With regard to the great question of the union of the Colonies, and he spoke with all due deference to the able men of the Confederate party, who had framed the motion, he thought that they did submit the scheme in far too hasty a manner. It would not, he conceived, have added to the character of the people of the Province for prudence and sagacity, to have accepted it without deliberation and without demanding more time for serious reflection. But since the first submission of the scheme, they had had many important considerations brought before their notice that clearly demonstrated the propriety of effecting the union of the Provinces. They had been authoritatively informed by despatches from the Colonial Secretary, that it was the expressed and avowed policy of Her Majesty's Government, that union should take place. They had been made to understand that it was the desire of that Government not to have Canada pulling one way, Nova Scotia pulling in another, and New Brunswick in another, but to have them all united under one General Government, with one policy and one interest. Though the sectional difficulties of the Canadas had, he confessed, in the first instance started the question, there were other reasons that had urged it on. The mother country had looked to the state of feeling towards herself in the neighboring Republic, and to its aggressive spirit; she had seen that the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty was certain to happen; and viewing the question of union of these Colonies as one not alone affecting themselves, but in the interests of the empire at large. She desired their consolidation in order to continue British institutions in America. These were the reasons why she had taken so positive a stand and had expressed a determination that the union of the Colonies should take place. And she looked to the vast country that stretched north of the Lakes, from Labrador to the Polar Sea, from British Columbia to Baffin's Bay. She looked to the Canadas with their fertile lands,