

as the Governor desired him to do so, whether a majority of the House of Assembly were with him or not.

Mr. DRAPER replied that he had said, so long as harmony existed between the representatives of the people and the Government—but it could not be considered that harmony exists as long as there was continual opposition maintained from different sides of the House. The distinction which he understood as having drawn was, that the responsibility rests entirely with the head of the government.

Mr. BOSWELL. The honorable gentleman has said, that he would not resign unless required to do so by the head of the government. He has not said that he entertained the slightest respect for the opinion of the representatives of the people. He desires harmony, but he wishes the whole responsibility to be thrown upon the shoulders of his Excellency. He (Mr. Boswell) could put no other interpretation upon his language.

Mr. HINCKS said, it was very much to be regretted that this important subject should have been so much mystified; at the same time he thought there should be great allowance made for the hon. and learned gentleman. He no doubt felt himself in a very awkward situation. He had come down to House and avowed principles, upon which a few years ago he said he would make "war to the knife."

Mr. DRAPER said, the gentleman was here called to order, and

Mr. HINCKS proceeded. He was extremely happy, he said, to be corrected, if he had fallen into error.

Mr. DRAPER again requested permission to explain, which having been granted, he proceeded to observe that he was quite unwilling to remain under an unjust imputation, which might, with few words, be entirely removed—however painful it might be to enter into an explanation which might wound the feelings of those for whom he entertained a high respect. He recollected in 1836 having made a speech at an election meeting after dinner; [hear, hear] in the course of which he said that there were those fitting prominent stations in the community who advocated principles of a dangerous tendency, and with a full knowledge that they were dangerous and injurious to the interests of this colony. He had also said, there were then in the ranks of the Reformers many individuals for whom he had a personal friendship; but that there were others against whom he would make war to the knife; and in the following year he had amply redeemed his pledge.—[hear—hear] There was one other remark which he would make: There were those in the House who could do him the justice to say that long before this discussion was contemplated he had drawn a distinction between those who were discontented and those who were disaffected. The complaints of the former might be remedied, but as for the others he cared not how soon they sought any country which would be more congenial to their feelings.

Mr. HINCKS said he was happy to hear the explanation of the hon. gentleman. It appeared that it was not the principle advocated by the majority of the House of Assembly, but the opinions of certain individuals against which he would make war to the knife. The principles which were then advocated by a majority of the House of Assembly were the same as those which he at present advocated—the principles of res-

ponsible government—those principles which would be found laid down in Lord Durham's report. Every hon. member of that house must be fully aware that the great mass of the country had been convinced that the head of the government had intended this to be the principle upon which the government should be conducted. The despatch of Lord John Russell appeared to him to be inconsistent with itself. The first part from which the learned Attorney General quoted was altogether at variance with the latter, which he (Mr. H.) was well assured was far more satisfactory. It recommends "non-interference on the part of the crown in our internal affairs except where the interests of the empire and the honor of the crown are deeply concerned." He (Mr. H.) agreed with his hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Merritt) that it is time this house and the country should know distinctly whether this system of interference in our internal government is to be persevered in by the home government. It matters little who are responsible here if we are constantly to have our laws which we have passed at great trouble and expense set at nought and sent back to us annulled and void (hear hear.) The hon. and learned gentleman in order to point out, the degree of responsibility under which he considered the government as standing had quoted and documents which had been held and acknowledged by these gentlemen with whom he acts, as going entirely against the principle for which we are contending. What the country wishes to know is whether the provincial government is to be conducted according to the principles of British constitution. These are the principles to which a majority of the people of this Province are attached.

Mr. BOSWELL said the hon. and learned gentleman must excuse him for again pressing the question, because it was of very great importance to him that it should be distinctly answered, as upon that answer would depend his future course of conduct within that house, and he would put it in such a shape as that it might be replied to by a single affirmative or negative. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if the government cannot command a majority of this house, so that its measures may be carried on harmoniously, if they do not find by the whole proceedings of the house that they have the confidence of a majority of its members, that then a dissolution of the house shall follow, or that they will resign? ["Yes, yes," from Mr. Draper.] Then I am satisfied. And he could only say that this being the case it was an unfortunate circumstance that the hon. gentleman could not have stated it explicitly to the house at present, and have prevented the necessity for so long a discussion.

This day, June 19.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The Council in pursuance of an appointment made with His Excellency proceeded to the Government house, and presented their answer to the address from the Throne.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

June 19.

The house met at 10 A. M. and sat in committee on the Rules for directing the proceedings of the House.

3, P. M.

The house in Committee, Mr. Morris in the chair, resumed the Consideration of the resolutions in answer to the address.

Mr. Neilson moved that all the words after "Resolved," be omitted, and that a series of

resolutions which were read by the hon. member be substituted.

To a question from the attorney General Ogden, Mr. Neilson explained that when a series of resolutions were considered, the house would consider both series.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. J. S. McDonald proposed the postponement of the debate: proposing that when the original resolutions were under consideration, the objections or amendments embodied in Mr. Neilson's series of resolutions might be brought forward each day.

The motion that the Committee report on the progress was carried with leave to sit till the next day.

Mr. Christie gave notice of a motion for the next day week to consider, the administration of justice in the District of Gaspe.

Mr. Neilson's draft of counter resolutions was ordered to be printed at the expense of the house.