

rests between His Excellency and this House, than between this House and the Government. I am not prepared, nor would I be justified in assuming to give a definite answer."

To this I replied as follows:—

"There is another point to which I take exception. My hon. friend has not been catechised on a question resting between His Excellency and this House, but between the Government and this House; for the Government, I hold, is responsible. His Excellency has neither motive nor design to withhold papers; he has no Constitutional objections, and should have none. I think this state of things has lasted long enough; we have now been twenty days in Session, and have been put off from time to time by the hon. member of Government with a great variety of excuses; but the reason given to-day is the most extraordinary of them all—want of time to consult with His Excellency. I hold that my hon. friend should recognize, not shirk the responsibility."

"Why are we thus put off from time to time? It must be merely to suit the convenience of the Government. Is it because the want of confidence motion is pending in the other Branch, and that the Government is just trembling in the balance that they thus retard public business, and then endeavor to throw the onus upon the Governor. If not, why do they not frankly give us the information we require, and lay before us the correspondence which has been had with reference to the Fisheries; to the Commercial Treaties; to the affairs of British North America; to the Inter-Colonial Railroad; to the question of defence, showing us whether it is the intention of the Government of Britain to continue to defend us as in the past, when the Province has set itself up against the policy of the Empire and Confederation. It is time there was a change in the conduct of the Government toward this House, and a change there must be."

These extracts, without further comment, sufficiently illustrate the points I mentioned.

Your honors will pardon me if I again refer to some matters on which I have previously spoken, as it may be necessary in order to remove some of the prejudices which have been created in another place, and it is due to His Excellency that this matter should be fairly understood. Mr. Smith says that "the rights of the People were interfered with by the course taken by the Governor, as well in the subject matter of the reply, as in the manner. Is it wrong for the Governor to assume that the policy of his Government was one of Confederation or Union? for this is the matter of the reply. Let us see. That Mr. Smith agreed to

recede from his Anti views, after the time that Mr. Wilnot's resignation was submitted, must be apparent to every one. Mr. Wilnot left the Government because of the refusal of his colleagues to go for a union policy, and the Governor let Mr. Smith understand, that if Mr. Wilnot's views of his colleague's policy were correct, that he would have to refuse to accept his resignation. He told him also, that the Despatch of June, and the repeated expressions of the policy of Her Majesty's ministers, made it imperative upon him again to submit the subject, with the papers, for the consideration of the Legislature, and in a spirit of friendliness, pointed out the difficulties that his Govt. would get into. Mr. Smith took time to consider the matter, and stated that he wished to consult his friends before taking so important a step,—went off to St. John, and westward, to do so; when he returned, said they were willing and agreed to it. He again discussed the subject, pointed out the mode by which he proposed to carry it out, received the congratulatory letter, did not deny the fact on which it was founded, viz: his assent to a union policy, heard the Minute of Council read, assented to it, and asked the Governor not to send it as it might embarrass him, heard the notes of the arrangement on which the despatch to Mr. Cardwell was based, agreed to the Confederation paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, and discussed the names of the Committee. What conclusion would any gentleman draw from these facts, but that Mr. Smith's policy was one of Union, and that he intended to carry it out. Now if this was so, how has the Governor violated the Constitution by putting in his Reply, that "he rejoiced to learn that fact." Mr. Smith says it is a violation of the principles of Responsible Government to put it in without consultation." Let me ask Mr. Smith if it has not been the practice of Mr. Gordon, as well as previous Governors, to do the business of the Council with his Premier, and through him with his Council, and that it is only on exceptional occasions that he communicates with, or consults the assembled body? Mr. Smith knew this to be the fact. I further ask him if the reply to the previous Address of the Council was not communicated to him in the same way, and "without consultation with the assembled Body," and if so, where is the difference? In both, the policy of union is recognized, and that alone, and if one is right the other cannot be wrong. 'Tis true, that although he was in the morning by the Governor, that he intended giving a favorable reply, why did Mr. Smith wish, when the Legislative Body was assembled, to get time to consult, and why