

[The writer of "A Constitutionalist" presents his compliments to Mr. Nugent, and regrets extremely that the publication of his first letter has subjected him to the annoyance of a personal assault, although he is pleased to hear that the gentleman took nothing by his motion, except—a flogging. He also undertakes that sundry other distinguished ornaments of the Obstructive party have been enjoying very pompously for his name. "A Constitutionalist" begs to enclose it, and Mr. N. is quite at liberty to communicate it to all comers, whenever the writers of the precious productions in the Times and Observer, to which he has referred, give to the public the same information, and to their opponents the same advantage. While they preserve and countenance the anonymous, he will maintain it—when they throw off their masks, his shall be thrown aside; in the meanwhile they may, as well keep themselves cool, and swallow their "brimstone and molasses" as the lady used to do at "Do the Boys Hall," for fear of something worse.]

No. 2.

"Brave undertakers to restore,
That could not keep yourselves in power,
To advance the interests of the Crown,
That wanted wit to keep your own."

HUMBRAS.

"Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils: for time is the greatest innovator; and if time of course alter things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"—BACON.

Having explained to you the reasons which have led to the preparation of these papers, I will now, for a few moments, turn your attention to some of the leading points of difference between the Constitutionlists and the Obstructive faction. Looking back to the history of these parties, we find—

1st. That the Constitutionlists advocated the retirement of the Judges from the Legislature, and their exclusion from the heats and animosities of party politics. This improvement in our old constitution is entirely British, and was sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government.

The Obstructives opposed the change, and have ever since howled over the injustice of it. The best proof that they were wrong, and that we were right, is, that while Chief Justice Halliburton has led a life of more dignified independence of late years, than ever he did formerly—the Chief Justice of New Brunswick, who was not removed, is still trailing the ermine through the mire of politics, and is at open war with the Lieutenant Governor.

2nd. The Constitutionlists denounced the absurdity of the Legislative Council sitting continually with closed doors—they declared that the Peers of England dared not to do this, and that scarcely any Legislative Chamber, in any Country pretending to be free, was chargeable with such an absurdity. This change is entirely British, and was sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government.

The Obstructives opposed it as a dangerous and unheard of innovation. They accused the leaders of the Parliamentary majority, who moved resolutions, and wrote addresses about it, of wishing to excite the populace to burst in the Council doors with sledge hammers; and, in fact, held out the idea that the moment the public were admitted to listen to the debates, there would be an end to British connexion.

3d. The Constitutionlists denounced the practice of making the entire Legislative Council, who held their seats for life, the entire Executive also, with a right to govern the country in defiance of Governors and Parliaments—they contended that the members of the Executive Council, who were to be the Governor's advisers, and to aid him in conducting the administration, should be distributed through the two Legislative Branches, as in England, without the power to controul either, but dependent upon the co-operation and confidence of both. Need I say to you, that this practice is entirely British, and that it has been sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government?

The Obstructives worshipped the old system as the perfection of Colonial Government, and they denounced as disaffection, radicalism, and rebellion, every attempt which we made to cast off its monstrous anomalies. It was in vain that we pointed to the American Revolution—to the Canadian insurrections—to the constantly recurring collisions between the people and the Executive in New Brunswick, Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland. They cared for none of these things, but clung to the belief that twelve old gentlemen must still continue to govern the Country, after their faculties were gone, and they had scarcely strength enough left to draw on their own breeches, leaving their seats to their heirs with the rest of their personal property. This is the beautiful Constitution to which the present opposition wish us to return.

4th. The Constitutionlists contended, that, while Her Majesty's Representatives should, in every Colony, firmly exercise

the prerogative, and maintain a position of dignified independence, his advisers ought to bring with them into his Council the same pledges, as in England, of public confidence, from large bodies of the people—that these pledges should be revoked, or renewed, at every general election, and that, when withdrawn, the parties could no longer be useful either to the Governor or the Province, and that if they clung to the former, the Governor must share their unpopularity, and ultimately come into collision with the people. These opinions are British—no ministers presume to surround the Sovereign in England who cannot obtain seats in either House of Parliament. The sanction of Her Majesty's Government, as well as enlightened public opinion, have declared that henceforward the practice of the Mother Country is to prevail both in Canada and in Nova-Scotia.

The Obstructives vowed that there was no necessity for this mark of the people's confidence—that an old Revenue officer with one idea—an old privateer's man, who could not spell—or an old miser whose God was gold, not one of whom could get a seat for a Town or a County of the Province, or hold it if he had it, were the best possible advisers a Governor could get—nay, that they were the only ones he could get.—that, once taken, the Queen, or her Representative, could not dismiss them, and that the whole country would go to destruction if they were put aside.

5th. The Constitutionlists contended, that, besides the check of re-election, upon the Members of Council individually, there should be the further check of a general vote of condemnation, upon the whole body, by a majority of the Representatives of the People, whenever the conduct of the Administration was so slovenly or unprincipled as showed that the Governor was evidently ill-advised. In asking this right for the Commons, we never dreamed of divesting the Representative of Her Majesty of the means of defending himself and the country from factious or unconstitutional aggression—by changing or dissolving his Council without a vote, or dissolving the House, and appealing to the country, should his advisers be unfairly attacked. This is the back bone, the leading principle, the aim and substance, of what is called in the Colonies "Responsible Government." Need I say that all this is British, and that the interested knaves and fools who contend against it, are traitors to the Mother Country in the keenest sense, are disloyal to the whole genius and spirit and practice of her noble constitution. In Canada and in Nova Scotia this system has been introduced—its value is fully comprehended by the people. I do not believe that in any County in Nova Scotia, not even Pictou, a majority of the Constituency would be got to yield this privilege, if the question was fully understood. By whom has this great change been wrought? By the Constitutionlists. By whom has it been opposed? By the Jeffreys, and Cogswells, and Collins, who insisted upon their right to govern the Country, when the Country had deliberately declared them incompetent—who refused to retire from Her Majesty's Council, even when Her Majesty informed them that she wanted no more of their advice. By these men has it been stoutly opposed, and by a motley and miscellaneous fragment of the population, who, for various reasons, disliked the change, or were pressed into the ranks of the opposition. Into the composition, conduct and motives, of these people, I shall enter by and bye; at present it is only necessary to say, that it is not to be wondered at that their leaders are very savage. The privilege they have lost—that of governing for life, whether the governor or the people required their services, was a great one—it is one that has not existed in England since 1689,—it is one which, thanks to the Constitutionlists, and in spite of their opponents, no longer exists in British America.

6th. The Constitutionlists contended that the natural tendency of an immovable, irresponsible Executive Council, was the hereditary transmission of office, and influence, and emoluments, from father to son—thereby creating a narrow, exclusive, social and political clique, at war with the people, hampering and controlling successive Governors, and enjoying and bequeathing offices and honors which they never earned. These cliques existed in all the Colonies, and in some were familiarly known as the Family Compacts. They have been smashed in several of them, and will be in all, for no British people ought to tolerate such a nuisance. Under what is called the "Responsible" system, none such can grow up. The people having the right, every four years, to get rid of bad Councillors by refusing to re-elect them—and the Representative Branch having the right to review and condemn the acts and appointments of the Governor, and to compel him to change his policy when these are not satisfactory, it is quite clear that no per-