

Hon. Attorney General, Messrs. Wilkins, Marshall, McDonald, and Davison.

NAVIGATION SECURITIES.

Messrs. Whitman, Bill, Wade, McKenzie, Moses, Fuller, Bent, Davison, and Morrison.

PENITENTIARY.

Messrs. Robinson, Morrison, Churchill, Ryder and Chambers.

TRANSIENT PAUPERS.

Messrs. Tupper, Dimock, Smith, Bill, and McLearn.

SICK EMIGRANTS.

Messrs. Brown, Geldert, Tobin, Jno Campbell, and Caldwell.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Messrs. Whitman, McKeagney, Webster, Davison, Parker, McKinnon, and Martell.

PRINTING.

Messrs. McDonald, Munro, Hydo, Moses, and Robinson.

ROAD DAMAGES.

Messrs. Arnaud, Munro, Rhinard, Dimock, and Bond.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Messrs. Wade, Fuller and Killam.

POOR ASYLUM.

Messrs. Munro, Morrison, Churchill, Chambers, C. J. Campbell, Robinson, and Geldert.

EXPIRING LAWS.

Hon. Provincial Secretary, Mr. Wilkins, and the Hon John Locke.

After which on motion of the Hon. Mr. Johnston, the Debate was resumed.

The House opened at five minutes to Four, some business of a business character, connected with the House itself—with reference to franking, &c., having been first transacted.

Hon. J. W. Johnston then moved his resolution proposed by him yesterday, in the form an amendment to the answer to the Address, in amendment to that moved by Mr. McLellan.

Hon. J. W. Johnston said I do not design to enter into any lengthened observations in support of the resolution in amendment to the answer to the Address—which I have just read. Sir, the confidence reposed by the people, in this House, and the confidence which the House accords to the Executive is a matter of grave and great importance and it is essential to the well being of this people that they should know upon what foundation the confidence rests. I may assume that the Government did not enjoy the confidence of its ancient supporters. It is true that there is no record of this on the Journals; but there can be no doubt of it on the minds of the Members of this House. That what I have

stated is the fact, because there are men here who know its truth. But, sir, let me refer to something more specific. The Government came down at the opening of the last Session in a taunting tone, and seemed to doubt whether there was an opposition at all, and offered statements which could not be consistent with their retention of office. [The Hon. Gentleman here read from the Journals in support of the statement.]

Well sir, this is a very moderate and gentle way of letting themselves down,—but there is the fact; a session of the assembly commencing with taunts and terminating with the admission that no measure of importance had been passed. Then we were told that this was attributable to the young members; What then? all the more essential that the novices should be guided, sustained, and supported by the ancient sages of the Executive. We are told that nothing was done. Why so? Was there nothing to do? Was the Province in such a condition that there was nothing required to be done? Surely there was time enough; they had at least ten weeks to do nothing in, and therefore I am warranted in testing the opinions of the House in this expression of opinion.

[The Hon. Gentleman here attacked the Government for having, after the Bill of last session passed for repressing the importation of intoxicating liquors—exercised their power against it so far that some of their supporters were so designated that they would not appear to support the final passing of the bill.]

But Sir, the motion did not prevail; the decision of the House was not rescinded, and I view the question not as regards the opinion of the hon. and learned Att. General, but with respect to the course which he pursued; for he had announced that it was impossible to carry on the government without the House accorded its assent to the idea he propounded as forming the basis of his political creed. Was it not due to his friends and supporters, that when they came to this city to fulfil their functions they should be informed of the views and opinions entertained by the Executive upon a question of such vital importance as that to which I have referred. Sir, in the action of the Executive there is an exhibition of a moral Sampson, sightless and shorn of his strength—supported only by braggidocia. Was not the measure to which I have referred purely administrative? Was it not the duty of an Executive to have grappled with the question in a bold and fearless manner? Did the hon. and learned Attorney-General, in view of the course he pursued