

had said eighty-eight years ago that the neighbouring republic would have been what it is now, he would have been stamped as a fanatic. Would New York ever have stood in the rank of cities which she now does, if it had not been for the great western country? If we can get these inland lines, and compete for a portion of that trade, and pass it through our canals and from thence to Britain will it make any difference to us if the tolls go into the Canadian revenue. The Welland Canal a year or two ago after paying working expenses yielded \$200,000 revenue to the Government. I think Canada will reap no more from us than we will from them.

Mr. BOTSFORD.—The hon. gentleman who preceded me has said, that in speaking on a subject of such vital importance to the country, we should divest ourselves of party spirit and party feelings. It would be desirable not to have such observations made in the course of this discussion as were made with reference to my hon. colleagues in the late Government and myself; when he applies to that body the word treachery, he may be familiar with the epithet, but I think it more applicable to his political actions and the actions of the late Government, of which he formed a part. The late Government, of which I was a member, acted both politically and socially a fair, honorable course with the Governor, and they treated him with respect and courtesy. I have yet to learn that when His Excellency chooses to enter the arena of the public press and brand his Council with feloniously pilfering a paper from the archives of the Council, that they have not a right to hurl that imputation back, no matter how high the source it comes from. I would be wanting the feelings of a man, if I did not reply to so gross an imputation. As the previous speakers have chosen to take the ground that the late Executive Council have acted with treachery in their intercourse with the Lieutenant-Governor, I will draw the attention of the House to a few preliminary facts. The Provincial Secretary told us that we, in endorsing the answer to the address of the Legislative Council, bound ourselves to a Union policy, and that it made no matter whether the Governor consulted us or not, he was justified in answering the address of the Legislative Council, praying for the Imperial Parliament to pass an Act for Union based upon the Quebec Scheme. If I understand the Constitution of the country, it is simply this, that when the Governor speaks on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen, or with reference to the Imperial policy, it is not binding upon the Executive of the Province, but if he

chooses to speak on behalf of himself or his Government, then the Executive Council become responsible, under our Constitution, for what he says. In the first reply to the Legislative Council he speaks on behalf of Her Majesty, but in the second reply he speaks on behalf of himself, and makes his Government responsible, when there was no need for his doing so, for the address was for the Queen and not an address to the Governor at all. I am accused of purloining a paper. (Mr. Speaker.—The Governor is not responsible for what he says.) If the Governor chooses in the *Royal Gazette* to blacken my character and parade his name, not in connection with his Executive Council. I think I have a right to make use of such language as will clear my skirts. I shall make use of the word *intrigue*, unless the House says I am not in order. (Mr. Speaker.—That is not Parliamentary language.) Then I will qualify it by saying political intrigue. His Excellency charges his late advisers with having improperly taken from the files of the Executive Council a document which should have been there. That document was what? It was the absolute acceptance of our resignation, and the moment that paper was given to us we ceased to be Executive Councilors, and we had no right to go to the Executive Council Chamber, and it was our paper. I say that was a gross charge against us.

His Honor the SPEAKER.—This is contrary to Parliamentary rule. The communication in which the expression was made was addressed to his present advisers, and they are responsible.

Mr. BOTSFORD.—If the Governor in Council had laid that communication before the Council, that would have been the view to take of it. But this was published in the *Gazette* and signed by Arthur Gordon, therefore I treat him as an individual. I wish to give the representative of Her Majesty all due deference, and I shall try to keep within the bounds of Parliamentary language, so as not to give offence to you and the House, and shall err in judgment alone.

The debate was then adjourned until after the Journals were read to-morrow.

The House in Committee agreed to a Bill introduced by Mr. Kerr, entitled "A Bill to incorporate the Provincial Oil Company."

The following Bills were then brought in:

"A Bill to amend a law relating to water supply and sewerage in the City of St. John, on the Western side of the Harbor."

"A Bill to incorporate the Caulkers' Association in the City and County of St. John."

"A Bill relating to Warehousing goods."

"A Bill to incorporate the Shipwrights' Union in the City and County of St. John."

The House adjourned until 9 A. M. to-morrow.

J. P. D.

FRIDAY, JUNE, 29th.

DELEGATION ON UNION.

Mr. BOTSFORD resumed.—When the debate was adjourned yesterday I was replying to the charges, and asking explanations with regard to the statements of the Hon. Provincial Secretary, and the hon. member for Charlotte, (Mr. Stevens,) and notwithstanding the Attorney General does not see what this has to do with the subject before the House, I shall go into this matter, conceiving as I do that as a member of the late Government I should be wanting in the duty I owe myself and my late colleagues, if, after the remarks of the hon. member from Charlotte I did not go into an explanation of the whole matter. I was speaking, Sir, on the differences which occurred in the answers of the Legislative Council in their memorandum of resignation; the Government charged His Excellency with advising with members and persons in the Opposition, and this was not denied. The Governor admits having held consultations with Mr. Mitchell. But, Sir, the time referred to was not the only time. Whilst Mr. Smith, the leader of the Government was away on a delegation to Washington, we, the other members of the Government, knew that he was in communication with Government House. On the return of Mr. Smith, we informed him of the fact, and in his next interview with His Excellency, he charged it home upon him. We knew what was going on, and His Excellency could not and did not deny the charge. But there is another point he also admits, and that is that he did not consult with his Council on the answer he intended, and did give to the address of the Legislative Council. On the seventh of April, after a night's reflection on the first resolution with regard to the address the Legislative Council withdrew that and substituted the other. This I presume was the time when the Provincial Secretary was consulted by Mr. Mitchell. Then Messrs. Botsford and Chandler were appointed a committee to wait on His Excellency to know when he would receive them with the address, and here occurred a case unparalleled in the history of our Province. His reply was that he would receive them in two hours from that time. This was at one o'clock. At twenty minutes to three a note was brought into this House from His Excel-