

here to settle. Capitalists who resided abroad would also hesitate about loaning money to the country if we gave away our lands. The hon. member for York had said that there was a degree of nonchalance in the Speech. He (Mr. G.) gave this a positive denial. Several measures in connection with the state of the country were referred to in distinct and positive terms. In respect to steam communication with the mother country, only yesterday he had received a letter by mail from England, wishing to know to what extent the Legislature would afford aid towards a scheme designed to promote transatlantic communication. He ridiculed the statement that the Speech was barren; he never knew any speech that was more definite in the subjects to which it referred. What did the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Smith) say when he was in the Government, and a vote of Want of Confidence was introduced? "Ah," said the hon. gentleman, "you are not going to condemn us before you see our measures." He put it down in strong language at the time. Now, he (Mr. G.) would ask, in return, was this Government to be condemned before they had a chance to bring in their measures? He believed not; and if the hon. member for Westmorland believed that there was less sense in this House than there was in the last, he would probably find out his mistake. He asked who were the men that were now assailing the Government, and what was the complexion of the new Cabinet. On looking around, he found that supporters of the Prohibitory Law were here from all parts of the country. Wherever the carriage was, there would the Carnival be held; and, as the *Telegraph* had declared that, as the organ of the Temperance party, it would support only an out-and-out Prohibitory Law Government, it might be inferred from this that there was a prospect of this despotic law being enacted again. He gave the late Provincial Secretary more credit for sincerity than any of his colleagues; and if a new Government were formed, they would no doubt strain every nerve to get him back again.

When they attempted to tell the House that the Government now existing was the Government of 1854, the country would not believe it, and he need not say that he was surprised at the course pursued by the hon. member from the City of St. John, (Mr. Harding.) Did that hon. member pretend to say that he was returned to oppose the Government. At the election both that hon. gentleman and himself were returned together upon the same ticket. But he did not find fault with him for opposing the Government, only he believed it to be a gross piece of inconsistency, and his constituents would not sustain him in the course he had pursued. Perhaps the hon. gentleman was ambitious, and the Government could not provide him with such an office as he wanted, and this might have something to do with his opposition. He had but little regard for the statement made by the hon. member from Westmorland (Mr. Smith) that he did not want office. The highest post of honor in the profession was open to him. There were men he believed who did not want office; and such a man was Mr. Kerr, who had refused when offered the office of Provincial Secretary. He (Mr. G.) believed that dangerous results would spring from this constant wrangling and struggling of parties. Those who persisted in it were not discharging their duty to the country. The turning out of the Government in 1854 was not fair nor honest, nor was it in accordance with public opinion, as was proved by the scornful defeat which the late Government sustained at the election. There might be gentlemen in this House to whom these contests were special delight, and it was the plain, practical and common-sense men of the House who would be the jury on this occasion. He courted investigation into every act of the Government; and all they asked at the hands of an impartial jury was a fair, honorable and impartial trial.

Mr. JOHNSON said: he had ever been on good terms with the hon. leader of the Government who had just spoken, and if he now should give that gentleman or any other member of the government offence by the observations which he should make, he begged them to remember that it must solely arise from the imperative necessity which compelled him to perform a public duty. In 1851, he and his learned friend, the Attorney General, contended together for the establishment of popular principles; and if they were found apart, he wished the House and the country to judge who it was that had changed his principles. When Messrs. Fisher and Wilmot had gone out of the Council, and Mr. Street had joined it, he remembered that the argument was that the infusion of new blood was a guarantee for its standing, and that they should be tried only on their measures; but the present Attorney General then took a different view of the subject, for he said the fairest way to try them was on the Address. He also asked what new chemical infusion had transformed the Government to give it the confidence of the country, and these very words he (Mr. J.) would now apply to himself. Five of the men whom he then condemned were now in the Government of which he professes to be the leader. When he then doubts the return of Mr. Harding at any future election in St. John, let him first examine his own inconsistency—he who was once returned by the Freeholders of that County to overturn a government, and became, in a few months after one of its members. Mr. Johnson here appealed to the Speaker whether this was not a correct account; whether he (the Speaker) and two other members had not resigned their places in consequence of the defection of Messrs. Gray and Wilmot, while one other member held his place, not thinking it necessary to go into a new election. In all that had occurred Mr. Harding had only proved himself true to his principles, and was willing, if the occasion arose next week, to go back to his constituents. He (Mr. J.) stood in a singular position, for he not only held hostile views to the late dissolution, but also to the Prohibitory Law upon which it was said to be founded. He was the only Son of Temperance who had opposed

that law in the House in 1852, thus disagreeing with many whom he respected; while the hon. Provincial Secretary first voted against it, next for it, next voted against its repeal, and then joined a Government which was founded upon its ruins. He opposed it in '52, and the reasons he (the Secretary) had assigned for voting for supporting the Law in '55 was that the liquor dealers had opposed him. [Mr. Wilmot—"I acted in accordance with the wishes of my constituents."] Well the hon. Secretary had changed his opinions, but whether it was to please one party or from resentment to the other, he would not say. The facts were stronger than the hon. gentleman's statements, and it required but little imagination in this case to make the discovery. On this question and others, he and his hon. friend met occasionally, but it only arose from the fact that he kept on a straight line, and the tortuous course of the hon. Secretary brought about an occasional intersection. Here was a law supported by four, and opposed by four of the Executive, and passed by the Legislature, which was required to be repealed without a trial by the very same men—the hon. Secretary included—who had themselves on a former occasion advised the Governor to sanction a similar Law; similar, for although it did not stop the importation, it stopped the sale, which amounted to the same thing. Six of the former Government had voted against and all advised the Governor to pass the first Law, and nobody found fault with them; but when the Liberals, although equally divided, advised His Excellency to the same course, it was discovered to be a grievous transgression. Some there were who declared that a man must be worse than an infidel who would oppose the Prohibitory Law, who afterwards took their seats in the House through the opposition which was raised to its continuance. "Oh, but," says the Attorney General, "if the Opposition comes into power they will enact the law again." Was it very likely that this could be encouraged by a party which at the present time involved no more than one or two members who had voted for that law? While amongst the friends of the present Government and its supporters there were more who voted for than against it? Twenty days before the late election, the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Lawrence) took part in a Temperance meeting there, where the principle was enunciated that neither Church nor State was safe without prohibition, but that gentleman afterwards took his seat as its opponent. The hon. member from Kent was once friendly to the law. ["I deny it," by Mr. Desbrisay.] Was he (Mr. J.) mistaken? Did not his hon. friend advocate the law of '52. ["That is not the present law," by Mr. Desbrisay.] It was a distinction without a difference; and he would now put the question—whether a man who always opposes a bad law from principle, is not as much to be approved as those who are ever changing their opinions for the sake of making experiments? But why mix up the Prohibitory Law with the present question. In Northumberland the people returned three members to oppose the Government, and at the same time to oppose Prohibition; and even his hon. colleague Mr. Kerr on the hustings declared that the government was only provisional. It was not, therefore, in relation to any particular law that he would censure the Government. He would rather look back at their whole political lives, and judging of the future by the past and present, he would treat them—the Government, not the Governor—accordingly. He would now take up their measures as promulgated in the Speech; and first the Election Law.

[Here it was suggested that as it was becoming late, the debate had better be adjourned until tomorrow, and with the understanding that it should be resumed at 11 A. M., the adjournment was carried.]

FRIDAY, February 20.

Mr. JOHNSON resumed.—The hon. Attorney General had said that this was not the time to try the Government—that it should have time to introduce its measures; but this was contrary to the course adopted by himself on several occasions, for before the Railway measures of the late Government were introduced, he had pursued the course which he now condemns; while the hon. Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works then supported the Railway scheme of the Government. To him (Mr. J.) it appeared much fairer that this discussion should take place upon the general principle of the amendment, than upon any particular measure in which local interests clash with each other, rendering a proper verdict very difficult. From the Speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, and also from Speeches of the members of the Government, made during this debate, and also their antecedents, he was now prepared to prove that the present Government did not deserve the confidence of the Province; that a majority of them belonged to the party which had ill-ruled the Province for the last sixty years; and that they were the very persons who had a year or two ago been expelled from office by the almost unanimous voice of the people. The first paragraph of the Speech related to the Election Law, and conveyed a strong censure upon the original framers thereof; and he did not so much object to the Government's apathy in carrying out that law, as he did to that censure. When a law was enacted he believed it to be the duty of a Government to give it all possible effect, but he did not believe, as those gentlemen themselves said in reference to the Prohibitory Law, that it was their duty to "carry it out." [A few observations made here in answer to the Attorney General, and in vindication of the explicit character of the law, escaped the Reporter in consequence of an interruption. We understood him to say that owing to an accident one of the officers had not been able to hand in the assessment list on the day prescribed by law, but the list was filed with the Clerk of the Peace prior to the time for making up the Sheriff's list, and thereby preserved the franchise for those concerned.] The friends of the

Government enlarged upon the great difficulties of carrying out the law, but it was thus they ever talked when they wished to defeat a law which did not suit their own interests; and no doubt the Revisors had in this instance been told not to proceed, as the whole affair would result in moonshine.—Talk of difficulties! They had been made by those who had ever been hostile to progress, and who, while they now talked of universal suffrage, had opposed the introduction of the ballot, and would, if they could, fix the franchise not at 15d. but at £1,500. He had been associated with the late Attorney General, the present Judge Ritchie, and several other legal gentlemen in the construction of the law, which doubtless, like all human laws had its imperfections; but that it had not been made available throughout the Province was simply the fault of the Revisors. The absurdity of the objections raised against the law was great, but in no instance greater than those raised in York, where it was said that although the Secretary had performed his duty, the law must nevertheless prove inoperative, because it had not imposed a penalty on him for its non-performance. But even these difficulties had been foreseen and remedied by a provision in the law, which provides that in case of any failure for the current year, the list of the previous year should be substituted. Let there be an election now in any place where they tried to oppose; the electors would soon teach the Revisors their duty; and if a similar failure had arisen in Portland during the present year, there was no fear that it would be continued in the next. The law says the right of Franchise rests with themselves, and neglect will bring its punishment. The hon. Commissioner of the Board of Works appeared to be very liberal in his distribution of the franchise; he would give it to every one who could bite the baker's name out of a loaf of bread; but in such case the baker of course must be summoned to prove the fact. [Mr. Macpherson—"I coupled it with the tax of 15d. and the loaf to be paid for."] Then the hon. member probably fixed the value of the bite at 15d., and required full evidence of the payment. The hon. Solicitor General had also recommended universal suffrage, to prove that he was in part a Liberal; but this reminded him of Mr. Johnston of Nova Scotia, who after spending a great part of his life in the endeavour to destroy Responsible Government, to out-Herod Herod himself, brings in a measure for Universal suffrage. He would, however, warn the hon. gentleman not to be quite so reckless; for although the Liberals well knew the danger of taking a step too far, if forced upon them they might not be found so unprepared for its introduction as those who now pretended to urge it.

The hon. Attorney General, it is true, had not in his speech advocated the universal extension of the franchise; his plan in this respect however was a vague one—he would extend it to "intelligence and industry." Now, in the name of common sense, how would the hon. and learned member define his "intelligence and industry?" Where would he begin and where would he end? Where would he begin? why, it placed him nowhere. When the present Government brought in their election Bill, the House found them all at variance—differing among themselves; but now they appear to have fixed upon universal suffrage, a qualification of 15d., and the ability to bite a loaf of bread. It was true, several members of the Government had disavowed the sentiments of one of themselves, and one too who held a most important office in the Province; but the doctrine on this point both in England and Canada is, that when a member of the Government differs from his colleagues, he is at once to resign, as they cannot be responsible for his policy. There was the Surveyor General, the Solicitor General, the Postmaster General, and a great many other Generals in the Government; but if such a doctrine as that allowing a difference of political views in the same Government were to be tolerated, the Government would want one officer more, and that was an Expedient General, in order to inform the House where they were unanimous and where they differed. If they disagreed they should not continue together, and if they agreed the sentiments of one must be taken for those of the whole. [Here the learned member alluded to a new Election Law, which he heard had been printed in Saint John, and supposed it was the Commissioner of the Board of Works who had read the proof sheets.] There was another singular anomaly in the arguments used on this subject: The Government complained that in consequence of the imperfection of the Law, many were deprived of the franchise in St. John and throughout the country; while in the same breath, as if regardless of this, they threaten a dissolution. They however wished the present issue untied until they got their baits and traps all well arranged; and then they were all ready for a dissolution, notwithstanding the disfranchisement.

With regard to the Railway policy of the Government, he would read an extract from the Law, which imperatively prescribed their duty.

How had that Law been carried out? or rather, had not every act of the Government been in its direct violation? They had only complied with it when it suited their wishes, and its exclusive management by themselves. The Bills were drawn and passed as an undivided system, and could allow no expenditure until their provisions were complied with; but now, such had been the laxity of the Government, that if the work already done were to be destroyed, or the work in progress prevented by any person who chose to do so, the offender must go unpunished, because there had been no penalty fixed, and the parties who are designated the prosecutors by the law, have no existence. The Law to regulate the European and North American Railway had been drawn in view of these difficulties; but, in this instance, from the non-appointment of the Commissioners, there was no Corporation or Commissioners who could defend the public property. Nay more, if in the forcible stoppage of the works by some selfish or churlish

man, riot and bloodshed were to ensue, the only party liable would be the Government of the Province. Again, in the midst of the work, a contractor might be stopped by this same selfish or churlish man, and what is he to do? why, he will of course claim his money. The Government can, it is true, proceed forcibly with the work, but they must do so in violation of all law, and this was what they called economy. The Attorney General had censured the hon. member for York (Mr. Hatheway) for what he called the violation of confidence. It should not be mentioned; but in order to sustain this rule, the confidence must be mutually observed, which was not the case in this instance, as the Government had first informed Mr. Hatheway's friends that in consequence of his refusing the Commission, they could not carry out the law. In this instance, therefore, the hon. member was fully relieved from all secrecy; nay, more, he was bound to speak the truth. A member of the Government, it appeared, had full authority to state abroad that he "put his foot down" to prevent Mr. Hatheway's appointment, but Mr. Hatheway was in the mean time bound to secrecy. By such a rule, the greatest injustice might be done to an individual. But to return to the works. The Government, thus self-constituted, were proceeding with them, and laying their fir sleepers in the direction of a Lumber yard in Portland, the owner of which declares that he will not let them on his premises. ["We don't intend to go down there," by the Attorney General.] Then in the name of all that was gracious, where did they intend to go? Did they mean to make a whole mile of Railway to reach the water, where they could not get, and of displacing it hereafter? Was it—he challenged them to the denial—a fact, they were laying the track with fir sleepers—that they were driving fir or spruce spiles, six inches at the top, and laying pitch pine stringers on this miserable foundation? Once more, to whom could a party supposing himself aggrieved, apply for damages? Again, the law provides that all contracts should be made by tender, but had

[For continuation see First Page.]

Special Notices.

WORMS! WORMS! WORMS!—A great many learned treatises have been written, explaining the origin of, and classifying generated in the human system. Scarcely any topic of medical science has elicited more acute observation and profound research; and yet physicians are very much divided on the subject. It must be admitted, however, that, after all, a mode of expelling them and purifying the body from their presence is of more value than the wisest disquisitions as to their origin. Such an expelling agent has at last been found. Dr. McLANE's Vermifuge proves to be the much sought after specific—its efficacy being universally acknowledged by the entire medical faculty. As further proof read the following from a lady—one of our own citizens:

NEW YORK, October 15th, 1857.

This is to certify that I was troubled with worms for more than a year. I was advised to use Dr. McLANE's Vermifuge, prepared by Fleming Bros. of Pittsburgh. I took one bottle, which brought away about fifty worms. I commenced improving at once, and am now perfectly well. The public can learn my name and further particulars, by applying to Mrs. Hardie, No. 3, Manhattan place, or to E. L. Theall, druggist, corner of Rutgers and Monroe streets.

Purchasers will be careful to ask for Dr. McLANE's Celebrated Vermifuge, manufactured by FLEMING BROS. of PITTSBURG, PA. All other Vermifuges, in comparison, are worthless. Dr. McLANE's genuine Vermifuge, also his Celebrated Liver Pills, can now be had at all respectable Drug stores. None genuine without the signature of FLEMING Bros.

THE POOR AS WELL AS THE RICH can have a sure cure for Coughs, Colds and Consumption, in its primary stages, owing to the cheapness of Mrs. Gardner's Indian Balm of Liverwort and Hensblood, a medicine which should be in every family, and always on hand. It is for sale at Weeks & Potter, 154 Washington Street Boston, General Agents.

Wm. T. Baird Agent for Woodstock.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.—In chronic dyspepsia, where the stomach has become callous to all ordinary remedies, and stimulants fail either to provoke appetite or facilitate digestion, these pills, by their simultaneous action upon the fluids which dissolve, assimilate and adapt to the purposes of nutrition the food taken into the system, will quickly impart a healthy tone to the whole physical machinery. Indigestion, and all its concomitants and consequences, including general debility, liver complaint, pains between the shoulders, headache, a feeling of oppression after meals, sleeplessness, languor, flatulence, bowel complaint, etc., are among the ailments invariably cured by a course of this inestimable remedy.

MOFFAT'S LIFE PILLS AND PHENIX BITTERS.—Physically considered man is the proudest of animals; but his system is liable to external and internal derangement to which we give the name of disease. Remedies of a simple kind should be first employed. The Moffat life pills purify the blood, renovate the delicate organs of the stomach, whilst the Phoenix Bitters, by gently stimulating the appetite, give a new zest to life and its enjoyments. Proprietor W. B. Moffat, 335 Broadway, New York.

W. T. BAIRD, Agent for the County of Carleton.

A. P. HAYWOOD, Agent for Houlton.

TAE OLD AND TRUE MAXIM THAT an ounce of preventative is worth a pound of cure, will be fully realized by those who make use of G. W. Stone's Vegetable Liquid Cathartic and Family Physic, as it cleanses the blood from all impurity, frees the stomach from bile, produces a healthy action of the liver, and perfectly regulates the bowels; it also removes all local pains prevents and cures dysentery, diarrhoea, cholera morbus or cholera, strengthens the whole system, and is perfectly agreeable to the taste.—Vox Populi.