

credit to themselves, came over to this side of the House.

No great questions separate parties now,—the opposition is divided from the government side of the house by an almost imaginary line—so that no man can walk over from the one side to the other pleading strong state necessity;—and therefore, if he did so it would be obvious that he had not been impelled by a sense of public duty, but had been attracted by the allurements of office, profit, or ambition. In this view of the subject, it is impossible that I could desert the standard under which I have fought with pleasure, and ally myself with those to whom I have ever been opposed. If any gentleman of the other side under present circumstances were to come over to this side of the house, I should consider him a disgrace to our party,—and were I to cross over to the opposition, both I and they would be equally disgraced,—I because I had deserted, and they because they harbored a deserter.

Having recently found it necessary in my own judgment to throw up my office of Solicitor General together with my seat in the Council on the ground of what I considered public duty, for surely I cannot be suspected of having done so for pleasure; the office being the legitimate, just and natural object of my ambition, through which I might attain to the head of my profession—and it was with sorrow I parted with it,—I think I have a right to demand that those who hear me, whatever they may think of my prudence will have respect for my motives,—and I have also a right to expect to be believed when I assert as I now do that if the opposition, who have not solicited me to come over to them, and to whom I have never tendered my services—were to offer me the best office in the gift of the government on condition that I should join them the offer would be indignantly refused.

I shall be excused, if in conclusion, I indulge in one or two self-congratulatory remarks. I have always acted the part of a consistent politician. I remember not long since, that the hon. member for Windsor in his usual playful manner, when commenting on a remark that I had made to the effect that there was nothing in nature that did not change, observed that he could not altogether agree with me, as he knew that there was in *rerum natura* an individual who never changed pointing to myself. (Laughter.) Now, sir, I have in the course of my political life received many little gentle castigations at the hands of that hon. gentleman, but when he made that declaration, I can assure him he gave complete compensation and satisfaction for every sin he had ever committed against me; and, sir, so opposed do I still continue to change, that were it not for a little hoarseness, and the decorum necessary to be observed in this august assemblage, I should now lift up my voice and sing that beautiful verse of a well known song—

“They bid me seek in change of sides

The charms that others see,

But were I in a foreign land

They’d find no change in me.” (Laughter.)

Hon. WILLIAM YOUNG rose and said.—It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment to this clause of the address, which is so significant in its character as to call for an expression of opinion from both sides of the house. With a

view to the public interest, I think it better that the opinions and feelings of the members of this house should be ascertained in the inception of our proceedings, and therefore, it is, sir, that I have taken this, the Parliamentary mode, of testing them. The hon. and learned Attorney General, during the last session of the Legislature, complained that desultory attacks were made on the government, and challenged us to come down with a direct resolution of want of confidence; it was not then advisable to do so; but I now mean to invite an expression of feeling from both sides on that subject. The amendment I design to move will open up the whole field, and the result will shew what the sense of this house really is on a question of such vital importance to the province generally.

Having only determined to move the amendment I hold in my hand, late last night, I might say early this morning, but little time was left for reflection; nor do I purpose occupying the time of this house with a very elaborate speech, but shall rather follow the course pursued by the hon. Attorney General in 1857—who, in introducing a similar motion, contented himself with stating the heads of his attack, without entering into detail, giving rather the conclusions of his mind than the reasons which led to them. The speech—which I beg leave to refer to, in its constitutional and parliamentary sense, is not that of the Governor, but of the administration, by whom it is framed, and who are responsible for its contents—it is certainly a most remarkable production. Any man who carefully and honestly considers it, could not pronounce it to be the speech of a strong government—conscious of its position in this country—and commanding the respect of a majority of the people; and, sir, while it is my determination now, as heretofore, to abstain from indulging in anything savoring of the personal rancor and malignant bitterness, which characterised the debates of last session, I cannot help saying, that in itself, the speech plainly indicates the deplorable weakness of the administration.

In the speech of last session our attention was directed to one measure; on the present one the administration have not ventured to commit themselves even to one—there is a perfect blank. Not merely is the speech non-committal in part, but as a whole. It is true that in the closing sentence the house is informed in the stereotyped and unmeaning phrase that its attention will be invited to several useful measures,—of what nature, relating to what questions, we are left entirely in the dark. It is a speech, then, giving no promise of Legislative action—indicating no policy, and is not, I presume, intended to be followed by the introduction of any important measures. Such a course would lead any observing and reflecting mind inevitably to the conclusion that the administration, even in their own minds, have ceased to command the esteem of this house, as I believe they have deservedly lost the respect of the country. What has occurred since the last session? Haunts and Colchester have unmistakably spoken out and recorded their opinions adversely to the government. Does this fail to impress on the listening ear of the country the conclusion that the principles of the opposition are gathering day by day new strength? Is not the language which those large, influential constituencies have so openly spoken, intelligible to