

Mr. ARCHIBALD asked what would be thought if two sections of any denomination agreed to unite and the House resolved that they should not do so? That was the position of this case; not a man connected with the united body had voted for the bill excepting the Attorney General who was the counsel of the claimants. The rule which the House had just laid down would, if applied to some other churches, rend them to the foundation.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said he wanted nothing more than the strong expressions and threats of Mr. Archibald to convince the house that the bill would pass. It seemed as if that gentleman could not get sufficiently strong terms of abuse to apply to him, Mr. C., and the Inspector of Schools. For his part he was content that the hon. gentleman should abuse him, for such abuse did not affect him in the smallest degree. He had understood the hon. gentleman to threaten the house with a Presbyterian ascendancy—that shewed that the union was merely for party purposes. What matter was it to the house what Church, he Mr. C., belonged to? 300 persons had petitioned and had declared and shown that their property had been taken from them. He himself had seen the cemeteries referred to locked. The bill would not take a penny from the united body, its object was to repeal an obnoxious clause which gave them property that they never paid for. He came there to represent his constituency, and to state the claims of any parties putting them in his hands, and did not care how many were opposed to him if he was right. He felt himself hardly equal to the task of combating gentlemen on the other side with all their ability, for he could with difficulty speak the English language, but the remarks of Mr. Archibald showed that this was the greatest defeat of that gentleman's public life. That gentleman must have felt the strength of the case laid before the house, when he had declined the challenge to argue out the question, and had been ashamed to further his own progeny, being obliged to get another member, the hon. member for Inverness, to do the dirty work.

Mr. BLANCHARD said it was very seldom that any member even condescended to such ungentlemanly, indecent and contemptible vituperation as that which had just been heard. Nothing better, however, was to be expected from the hon. member for Victoria. That gentleman had said that he could not speak the English language—that had been abundantly proved, and the words he used were only fit for the arena of the fish market. The next time he spoke as he had done he would receive a still more severe reply.

Mr. BLANCHARD then withdrew his notice of motion to rescind, on the understanding that the bill would be again opposed on the motion for the second reading.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PRO SEC'Y laid on the table the Report of the Fruit Growers' Association.

Also a petition in favour of assessment for support of schools.

Mr. ARCHIBALD presented a petition for the establishment of a new post road in Colchester county.

Mr. BLACKWOOD presented a petition from Commissioners and Trustees of Stirling district, in reference to a school-house which had been destroyed by fire.

Mr. STEWART CAMPBELL asked the government to lay on the table any correspondence in their possession in reference to the abandonment of the Quebec scheme.

Mr. ARCHIBALD introduced a bill to amend chap 72 of Revised Statutes, respecting Commissioners of Sewers.

The House then adjourned.

FRIDAY, April 13.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Mr. ANNAND presented four petitions from Wallace against Confederation.

Hon. ATT'Y. GENERAL presented a petition from Antigonish in favor of assessment for schools.

UNION OF THE COLONIES.

The adjourned debate was resumed.

Mr. ANNAND said:—In rising to address the House on a question far transcending in magnitude any measure ever submitted for our consideration I feel I am under no ordinary responsibility. On this occasion we have arrayed against us a large amount of ability from, we suppose, all the talent of the government combined with that of the leader of the opposition. Although I desire that some one more able than myself was here to put to the members of the House and to the people of this country the important bearings of the question, yet I feel that if the gentlemen who surround me "speak the truth and feel it," it will send an echo through the Province, and if there should be a majority in the House in favor of a transfer of our privileges to a government to be organized six or eight hundred miles off, yet the gentlemen who oppose the bargain will go down forgotten to posterity. I feel on this occasion the necessity for more than ordinary calmness—I feel it would ill become me to imitate the pernicious example set on more than one occasion by the leader of the government. Have we not seen that gentleman approaching a question which involves the dearest rights of the people, which involves the rights of members who sit here, have we not seen him rising to move a resolution which will sweep away our constitution, not in the spirit of a statesman dealing with a large public question, but in the tone and spirit of an angry, an excited, and when this debate concludes, it may be found a disappointed partizan? I do not intend to approach the question in that frame of mind, or to follow him in the intemperate abuse of gentlemen not here to defend themselves. The mover of the resolution spent an hour and a half in assailing the Press of the country and those who contribute to and conduct it. Transferring our thoughts to a wider arena, can we imagine Mr. Gladstone coming to the House of Commons and prefacing his Reform Bill by a tirade against one of the organs of public opinion? Could that statesman condescend to such a course, he would be hissed out of the House of Commons. And yet that is the