

ers, or else he had never as he promised to do, received the assent of his supporters to the course designed.

There are two points now to which I wish to direct your honors' attention. I wish to prove that His Excellency was justified in feeling as his statement in the correspondence indicates. His Excellency states that—

"In the desire to avoid giving cause of embarrassment to his Government, and at their request, His Excellency delayed for nineteen days the reception of the Address of the Legislative Council, in reply to the Speech from the Throne; nor was it until it became evident to His Excellency that further delay in this respect would seriously imperil the harmony of the relations between himself and the Legislative Council, and the Legislative Council and House of Assembly, that he fixed a day for its reception."

I shall now quote from the authorized Debates of our own Branch, and the extracts I shall read, will sustain this position of His Excellency, and the same extracts will show that the Government a short time since held very different views with regard to the relative responsibility of themselves and His Excellency in the matter of an Address of this House. On the 17th of March, while discussing the propriety of His Excellency receiving the Address of this House, in answer to the Speech, I remarked that:—

"The Government should advise His Excellency to receive the Address, as they have no doubt, advised the delay; I hope the honorable member of Government will not falsify his professions in the early part of the Session, by refusing to give such advice, and thus delay public business any longer."

\* \* \*

"Hon. Mr. ODELL—There is no want of candor on my part; I have given an answer. The hon. gentleman asked me what course His Excellency would adopt, and I told him that I could not tell him, because it rested entirely with His Excellency."

\* \* \*

"Your honors appointed a committee, and in reply to that committee, His Excellency stated that he would communicate to them an answer as to when he would receive the Address; and surely now, it is not my place to take the initiative out of the hands of the Governor, in determining when the Address will be received."

"Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—I will not be placed or kept in a wrong position. I did not ask the hon. gentleman to assume to speak for His Excellency. As I have stated, His Excellency told the committee he would communicate to

them when he would receive the Address: several days have now elapsed, and when we find the only active supporter of the Government in the House, except the hon. member, attacking the committee for not giving the House a report of His Excellency's answer, I am called upon to throw back the reflection, and place the responsibility of delay, where it should rest, on the Government. What I want the hon. member of Government to do is, now that he knows the wishes of the House, now that he understands that there is no excuse for further delay, and that the exigencies of the public service require that we should be placed in such a position as that we may get to work at our Legislative duties, not to advise His Excellency to delay any longer receiving us. I regard the hon. gentleman as His Excellency's constitutional advisor in this Branch, and I now ask him if the Government has advised His Excellency not to receive our Address until after the Address of the Lower House is adopted? I ask a reply? Now, then, I assume the Executive is responsible for the delay, not the Governor. I did not desire this debate on the Address just passed, although the whole business of to-day has been irregular, and may be set up hereafter as an embarrassing precedent; but, as the ground has been taken that our Address cannot be received until after the Address below is passed, the discussion becomes necessary in order to the maintenance of our Constitutional rights, and the assertion of the true responsibility of the Government."

On the 22nd of March, the following took place:—

"Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD asked if the Committee was prepared to give any further information as to when His Excellency would receive the Address of this House."

"Hon. Mr. MITCHELL had no information to give. The hon. member of Government was present, and as he held the Government, not the Governor, responsible, perhaps that hon. gentleman could give some information."

"Hon. Mr. ODELL was not prepared to give any further information."

And again on the 27th. Hon. Mr. STEEVES asked the hon. member of Government when the papers relating to Confederation would be laid before this House. Hon. Mr. ODELL replied that the papers were in course of preparation, and would be shortly submitted. After some further discussion, hon. Mr. ODELL used the following pointed language, showing where he then thought responsibility rested. He said:—

"I do not know why I should be catechised in this way, in a matter which more particularly