"planters and freeholders," and they alone in conjunction with the Governor and Council could make laws. The Governor represented the sovereign and the sovereign had retained in his hands power to abrogate any statute of the Legislature. He had retained all the powers which he did not confer on the people of Nova Scotia, and those powers were by no means inconsiderable. Having then given the privilege of legislation to the planters and freeholders he had a right afterwards to give that privilege to the rest of the people. Therefore without violating the constitution, but in the exercise of her royal authority, by assenting to an act of our Parliament the Queen extended the privilege, formerly limited to the freeholders and planters, to the householders and other inhabitants of the country. We were told that on another occasion the whole constitution was convulsed and overthrown by a sort of political earthquake,—that the whole of the old council of twelve who exercised legislative and executive functions were dismissed by a single stroke of the pen of the Colonial minister, and that thus a complete revolution was effected. In that statement of the case the hon. member is greatly mistaken. Whose council was that? It was the same Council that the King had ordered to be summoned when he gave the Charter to Lord Cornwallis. That Charter ordered the Governor to select and choose a Council who should hold office at the will of his Majesty. These twelve Councillors were the legal successors of the first Councillors, and at the time they were dismissed were holding their seats at the Council Board at the pleasure of the King or Queen, and were liable to be called upon at any moment, as they were on the revision of our institutions, to resign their Comissions and give place to substitutes. So that in no one of those cases was our constitution invaded.

But the argument of the hon. member assumed a position which is by no means granted, and that is that in the case of Confederation our Constitution was changed by our Legislature. He assumed that to be a fact which is not consistent with the truth. The legislature of Nova Scotia has never been a party to the British North America Act nor has it ever recognised that act as having any force or obligation on the people of Nova Scotia. Upon that point our statute book is completely dumb—the British North America Act is not ratified or confirmed by any statute of ours, and without some such Statute the people and legislature could not have expressed a desire to be connected with Canada. These are arguments for the people of England, and for the constitutional lawyers of that great country,—they will pass from my lips to the Crown Officers of England. The constitutional lawyers of Nova Scotia have shewn themselves unable to deal with the question, and we would have supposed that when all the leading Barristers of Nova Scotia, as has been stated, are Confederate, it is strange that among them all there has not been a man able to produce anything in the shape of an argument, or bearing the slightest resemblance to an argument. I shall state the case most simply, so that it will be plain to the meanest understanding, and I assert that throughout the debate in the Legislature and throughout the press of the country with the immense array of professional talent which has been spoken of not a man has been able to state anything like a simple and reasonable proposition in favor of Confederation, and against the arguments which I have advanced. I will first turn attention to that great leading case which was decided, not by Lord Mansfield alone, but by the whole King's Bench of England, and which stands on the books an incontrovertible leading case on the subject. I mean the case of Hall and Campbell. The hon. member for Inverness talked of Lord Mansfield, and seemed to insinuate that his authority was not of the highest character, and when I heard him I was a little astonished, I must confess. That astonishment is increased when I reflect who Lord Mansfield was,—that he was decidedly and without exception the greatest Jurist who ever sat on the bench of England. Lord Coke was eminent in the Common Law like Lord Mansfield, but the latter had travelled much further than Coke,—he had gone on a voyage of discovery all round the world of jurisprudence, critically examining and mastering the systems of Rome, Greece, and Palestine,—he was a most accomplished scholar, a man of the finest intellect and the highest integrity. There never was a magistrate on the Bench who discharged his duties more satisfactorily and with greater credit since the world began, and yet that is the man of whom the hon. and learned member presumes to speak slightingly. Why, Sir, as compared with Mansfield, the best lawyers in this Province are as the half hatched eaglets compared with the full grown bird that soars almost to the limits of the atmosphere to gaze with unflincing eye on the dazzling radiance of the meridian sun. What was that case of Granada in which the decision of the King's Bench was given? The king had conquered the country,—Granada had yielded to the royal arms, and in April, 1764, the king by a Commission (the same, I believe, as that conferred on this country through Lord Cornwallis, for Lord Mansfield in his decision cites the very words which conferred legislative powers on Nova Scotia, and the charter to Granada has, besides, the words "in like manner as we have conferred similar powers on the rest of our Colonies," or to that effect, shewing that the charters were all copied from one original,) under the great seal of England conferred on the people of