

lency to Mr. Smith informing him that at three o'clock he should receive the Legislative Council with their address. It may not be parliamentary language to characterize this as intrigue and treachery, but I would ask is it fair, or many, or honorable? I do not think such an action likely to add much lustre to the heraldic "name." His Excellency prides himself on bearing, or to the "courtesy" and "honor" he seems to prize so highly, — a name which for generations has been a guarantee for courtesy and honor of those who bear it — a guarantee in this case worthless so far as regards His Excellency. Mr. Smith proceeded to Government House and found the Legislative Council already there, and the Staff of the Garrison in waiting now for the answer. To such an address asking that it may be forwarded to the foot of the Throne, the answer is that the wish of the petitioners shall be complied with. This is the usual, and I may say the only course pursued. But what action was taken in this instance? I think the members of the Legislative Council have cause to blush as long as they bear the name of Councillors. The President presented the address, and instead of handing it to the Clerk, it was passed back to the President, and then His Excellency taking upon himself the functions of Royalty commanded the address to be read to him. An address to Her Majesty the Queen, received, read, accepted and replied to in his own name by the Lieutenant Governor of this Province, as though he possessed all the powers of Royalty! Was not this unconstitutional? When we look at the haste shown and the means adopted I have no hesitation in saying that His Excellency knew when he gave his reply his Council would resign, and that it was intended to have that effect. But when charged with giving this reply without the advice and consent of his Council, he says it was merely "an accident." An accident! Mr. Speaker, I'll show whether it was an accident or not. I'll show that it was design, for we now know that the officers of the 15th Regiment received their orders to be at Government House at three o'clock before eleven o'clock in the morning, two hours before the Committee of the Legislative Council had waited on His Excellency to know at what hour he would receive them with the address. He had without doubt arranged the whole matter, and before the appointment of the Committee knew what majority there was to carry any motion, and so at 11 o'clock the coaches at the livery stables were employed to carry the officers to Government House at three o'clock. It is well known that the Government had a large majority on the floors of this House, and that they could not gain their ends by

legitimate means, and so His Excellency by the advice of the Opposition took this unconstitutional course, ignored his Council and by design took the only steps possible to overthrow them. I ask is this "courtesy?" Is this "honor?" But the Provincial Secretary has said that the constituencies of this Province have endorsed the action of the Governor, and casts it upon the people of Westmorland that they were unenlightened on the subject. Well, Mr. Speaker, he lectured through that County, and had an opportunity to enlighten them, but did they vote to support the course which had been pursued.

Mr. TILLEY—Those that heard me did.

Mr. BOTSFORD—Did they? I will call the attention of the Secretary to the Parish of Sackville, a place having the benefits of academies and every other means of information; there after a year's deliberation, and after the very able addresses of the Secretary, they cast an overwhelming vote in support of the late Government. He also referred to the speech of Mr. Chandler in the Upper Branch on the subject of Union. Well, that was printed and circulated through the county, but the effect desired was not produced, for after a calm, deliberate and dispassionate consideration of the whole matter, the County of Westmorland have again pronounced against it. I will now come to the Resolutions submitted by the Attorney General, and the Amendment offered by my colleague. It is proposed to send delegates to England to co-operate with delegates from the other Provinces in the formation of a plan of union based on the Quebec Scheme. Now I do not believe there is a constituency in this Province but would condemn the Quebec Scheme. Why the hon. Provincial Secretary, who always openly, fairly and conscientiously supported that Scheme, believing it to be the best that could be got, acknowledged that his people wanted some alterations, and though there may be many in the country who would take that Scheme with certain modifications, the majority of the people are opposed to it. We are asked to appoint delegates, and who are they to be? Well I presume the Secretary will be one, the Attorney General will be the second, there is the President of the Council three, and if they make the delegation larger, there is the hon. member from Northumberland (Mr. Johnson) four, and if more are sent, there is yourself, sir, who probably as the Speaker and Head of this House, will be included. This will make five. Five leading men who assisted in framing that Scheme, and have given their best attention to the consideration and promulgation of its provisions, and who believe it is the best that can be had; and we are

asked to delegate to these men unlimited powers, and yet hon. members seem to imagine that we shall get modifications and improvements on the Quebec Scheme; why it is folly to expect anything of the kind. And suppose they do attempt to gain some alterations, the Canadians will at once say, "you have pronounced this Scheme the very best that can be had," and what more do you want. Why even you, sir, if you go, will, methinks, say: "I'll take that, if I can't get anything better." I do not think the Union of these Provinces should be consummated on the principles of a Scheme which has been condemned by the people of this Province, and is condemned to-day. I think no delegation should be appointed unless the Government will say that modifications shall be made. Hon. members had better beware, for as sure as unlimited powers are given to the delegates, they will give us the Quebec Scheme and nothing more. I will now refer to a few of the provisions of the Scheme which to my mind are very objectionable. The first ingredient is representation by population, a principle which I believe will be ruinous to this Province. It is clear to all who read that Upper Canada increases in population faster, and will do so in a yet greater ratio, than Lower Canada or these Lower Provinces, and the result of this will be that in a few years they will have the predominant power in the Lower Branch of the Legislature, and yet there is not one solitary check to counteract the influence they will yield. Upper Canada will have the power to control the expenditure of the public money, and as the result, she will dole out a pittance to us, with a show of justice it may be, but in reality with none, all her desire being to secure her own interests. I look in vain through this Scheme for restrictions to this principle. But we are told that we shall have a larger number of representatives in the Upper Branch, in proportion, than Upper Canada. But why should the principle of representation by population be thrust upon us? Where did they get the idea? Not from England certainly, for although the population of London is much greater than any other city this principle is not adopted. There the representation is founded on certain interests. No, they have taken it from the United States, but they have left us with no corresponding and controlling power in the Upper Branch. I ask the Attorney General where he can point to, or lay his finger on a Constitution like this? There is nothing like it in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. No, Mr. Speaker, it is a mongrel Constitution, whose provisions are disastrous to