

House to alter the representation of our country. This was a bill which they had no interest in. They sent it down here, and there was no objection raised to its reception. This House received that bill, and it was read a first and second time. No member asked to have it laid before the Committee on Privileges. The reason the question was not taken upon it was because it came in so late in the Session that there was no time to take it up. If they had rejected or amended the bill, it would not have been because the Legislative Council had no right to bring it in, for having received it, they had admitted this right. The House of Lords has introduced some of the most important measures in Britain, and this is done in the face of the House of Commons, and contrary to their opinions and the opinions of the Ministry of the day. He would mention a case. During the revolutionary war the Ministry came down with their Speech, and declared they would carry out that war vigorously to the end, and the House of Commons expressed their opinion that the war should be carried on. The Earl of Chatham moved, right in the face of the Ministry and the House of Commons, to discontinue the war. We find the rights of the Lords and Commons are co-equal. Why then does my hon. friend say they have not the same rights which we have? Do not the same rules govern us that govern the Imperial Parliament? In all the other Provinces of the proposed Union their Legislative Councils have been the first to act upon it, long before the House of Assemblies of the various Colonies took it up at all. If his hon. friend denied this right to exist, he would ask him at what particular year or century this change was made. If he cannot answer this, he must admit that the right still exists. He objects to this paragraph:—

"We learn with pleasure that Her Majesty the Queen graciously received the address of the Legislative Council on the subject of the Union of the British North American Provinces transmitted to England by Your Excellency."

If the Legislative Council have a right to pass an address, are we not gratified to learn that Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to receive that address. He (Mr. Botsford) says he cannot agree to adopt the third paragraph in the address, because it includes the manner of His Excellency's consulting with his advisers. This is an important matter, for there are many instances of the Lieutenant Governor's consulting with the leader of the Government instead of all the members of the Council. He says His Excellency's not consulting with his advisers was unconstitutional. We know that the

House as returned was directly opposed to Union in every respect. Suppose the people had changed and His Excellency's advisers had not; was it not right that he should take new advisers, who would adopt his views and take the responsibility? He did so, and his advisers took the responsibility of dissolving the House, and the verdict of the people was an approval of their course. My hon. friend says the constituencies of the Province did not justify the course adopted by His Excellency, but only a majority of them, and therefore the paragraph states what cannot be substantiated. When we pass a resolution in this House by a majority of the members, it is a resolution of the House and not a resolution of a majority of the House, and the same parallel holds good in regard to the constituencies of the Province.

This course adopted by His Excellency led to events which rendered it expedient to dissolve the House. Was it expedient that the eleven constituencies that were in favor of Union should remain governed by the voice of the three that were opposed to this measure? If the House of Assembly had not been dissolved the majority of the people would have been misrepresented by a majority of the members of the House, who did not express their views on this question. Will he (Mr. Botsford) contend that the rights of the people were endangered by this dissolution? It was the duty of His Excellency's advisers to see that the majority of the people were properly represented, and to do that they must dissolve the House. The people had been hastily called upon to express an opinion upon a great question, and they did so; but they had since changed their views, and an opportunity was given them to send men here to represent their changed views. This was not endangering the rights of the people. Could any Government be justified in saying, we will keep you here for three years longer, for if we dissolve the House we are taking away your rights.

In regard to the fourth paragraph he (Mr. Botsford) says we are called upon here to express an opinion of approval or disapproval of the manner in which the resolution in favor of Union was carried in Nova Scotia. We are not called upon to do anything of the kind; we are not called upon to decide whether they took the proper course in deciding upon this measure without submitting it to the people. If he (Mr. Johnson) was asked to say whether it was a constitutional course or not, he should say it was. The representatives of the people are sent here to exercise their judgment and think for the people, without going back to the people upon every matter which comes before them. In the Imperial Parliament all those important measures, like the repeal of the Corn

Laws, have been decided without any reference to the people. In the same manner alterations have been made in the Constitution of Great Britain. This Constitution is not the same as it was in the time of William III. There was no such thing as responsible Government in that day. It has been again and again altered and improved. It has been sufficiently yielding to admit of those improvements, which have been rendered necessary by the increase of commerce, and sufficiently strong to prevent its bursting up as other countries have done. The representatives of the people in Nova Scotia have a constitutional right to act as they have done, and we are not asked to say whether they have done or right or wrong, for it is a matter which they must settle among themselves. We are simply asked to say: do we approve of what they have done? and we are not asked to say whether we approve of how they did it. If they have done what we conceive to be right, we can well say that we approve of the substance of the resolutions, without expressing an opinion as to the manner or mode in which those resolutions were carried; therefore my hon. friend (Mr. Botsford) is not called upon to commit himself in that matter at all. There are a few words in the third paragraph he (Mr. Johnson) thought it would be as well to strike out. The section which says: "Your Excellency may rely with confidence on our cordial co-operation in any measure which may be proposed to accomplish that object." He (Mr. Johnson) thought that was asking too much from the House. It would preclude them from asking for any alterations in any measure proposed. He would suggest that they leave out the words, "in any measure which may be proposed." The section would then read, "Your Excellency may rely with confidence on our cordial co-operation to accomplish that object."

Mr. YOUNG said he still believed, as he did at the close of the last session, that the course pursued by the Legislative Council, in passing a resolution for a Union based upon the Quebec Scheme, thereby endeavoring to force upon the people a measure the people had rejected twelve months before, was wrong. He should, therefore, vote against the second and third paragraphs, but if the fourth paragraph was amended as proposed, he might vote for it. He had been sustained by a large majority of his constituents in the position he took in reference to the conduct of the Government, and in reference to the Upper Branch of the Legislature. He was satisfied the address would pass without any amendment, by at least four-fifths of the members of the House, therefore he would say nothing further on the subject, but would content himself with voting against those paragraphs in the address.