

sions if when they said that union was the Government policy they did not support it. For his own part he had come to the House as anti-Confederate, opposed to the Quebec Scheme, and he was as strongly opposed to that measure as ever he had been.

So much had been said about the York election during the course of this debate, that he did not intend to enter into it at great length. The result of that election had been loudly proclaimed to be a triumph of Confederation. He believed that those who most loudly claimed it as a triumph were insincere, and knew that what they said was untrue. At the last election in York, both candidates were opposed to Confederation. There was no doubt of it. In speaking of what took place at that election, he did not intend to be personal. With regard to the remarks his hon. colleague, Mr. Fisher, had made about himself, (Mr. N.) he was willing to interpret them freely, and put them down to the elation of success. He had been accustomed to be freely spoken about, and he was one of those men with whom people took greater liberties than they did with others. No doubt, if he was in the Government, and had power and patronage at his disposal, they would speak differently of him. But he did not intend to retaliate on his colleague the personalities that gentleman had uttered regarding him. The people of York, unbiassed, uncorrupted, of their own free mind, had returned him at the last general election by an immense majority over his hon. colleague, and put him in the position he had now the honor to occupy, and he would not condescend to disgrace it by resorting to personalities.

With regard to the late election, he had just a little to say. That election had decided something that he could not before understand. In reading the election law, there was something in it about bribery and corruption. He had always thought that bribery and corruption meant one and the same thing, and he never could understand why two terms meaning the same thing, should be used, when an incident at that election settled the question to his mind. Here he held an object in his hand (holding up a bank note), when he first saw it and gazed upon it, the words of Hamlet's address to his Father's Ghost came into his mind—

Angels and ministers of grace defend us!

Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damn'd.

Bring with thee airs from Heaven or blasts from Hell.

Be thy intents wicked or charitable,

Thou comest in such a questionable shape,
That I will speak to thee.

But what, they would ask, was so very extraordinary about the object. It was a simple bank note. It appeared a very good rule, no doubt, when slipped into the hands of the free and independent elector by some one of the agents of hon. candidates. He would read its superscription—"St. Stephen Bink, May 1st, 1863, for value received pay the bearer \$2—payable where? at New York. They bought their voter for \$2, and paid him with Yankee money, and that was what he called fastening corruption on to bribery. With reference to that election, it decided nothing at all—or if it decided anything, it decided that his hon. colleague

could not claim a Confederate triumph, for it was patent to all that it was the sensation got up about the Fenianism that carried it. It was a clever and cunning dodge. When Fisher was safely returned Fenianism was entirely ignored; its work was done. But the alarm about Fenianism was not over, for its work had not been yet done. He never had believed in this Fenian alarm. And there were men in the States who had means of knowing who said that Fenianism was nothing but a trick—a sensation got up by Canadian politicians to carry Confederation. With regard to this vote of Want of Confidence, a greater anomaly had never been raised. When the Governor came down and asked the House for power and money to enable him to place the Province in a state of defence, did the opposition oppose the granting of that money and these powers. No. They went as strongly as the Government party to put all the resources of the Province in the hands of His Excellency, and this at the time when they were running a vote of Want of Confidence against the Government. Was that statesmanlike—was that the course they ought to have taken. No. They ought either to have ceased at once from their Want of Confidence, or have stuck out to the last, and refused to vote the money away. That was what they ought to have done. Mr. Needham proceeded to say that he had once remarked that he took a broader view of these matters that came before the House than most members. He liked to look into the past and look forward to the future; when he looked back into the past of his colleague, Mr. Fisher, and contrasted his position with the positions he held in times past he must come to the conclusion—if the country had reason not to confide in the present Government, ten thousand times less had they reason to have confidence in Mr. Fisher. When he declared that the Government sent home a despatch to the Colonial Office; a despatch that he called insulting to Her Majesty, and said he felt so humiliated, he could not but remember he had said, as much when in 1856 he went home on the Railway delegation, and a long-legged Yankee bearer of despatches in a blue bag got superior honor on board the steamboat, and his luggage before him when he arrived at Liverpool. He felt humiliated then for his country that greater honor should have been paid to this American than to himself. Now he was humiliated because this present Government had sent home a despatch, one of the best and most independent documents that had ever emanated from a Colonial office. There was no man that withstood the scheme of Confederation but must endorse it. Humiliated! He would tell the House when he felt humiliated for his country. At the time the Conference took place in Canada, where Galt said to the delegates of the Province, "What is the least possible amount of money you can get on with?" With bent brows and after deep cogitation, they concluded that the least possible amount was \$210,000. Think if after surrendering to Canada the entire revenue of the Province, to be asked what was the least possible amount they could get on with; after surrendering the glorious right of self-government, after giving up their political independence, after giving away all they could give away, to be asked by Galt: "What is the least possible amount

you can get on with?" He wished there had been a man there. He wished he had been there, and, his life for it, they would not have consented to such infamous terms, whether the meeting had taken place after dinner or before it.

With regard to the despatches from the Colonial Office, it was only now that his hon. friend, Mr. Fisher, had come to obey them. There was a time when his hon. friend had no such reverence for home despatches. (Here the hon. member referred to the political printer.) With regard to the despatch of March 23rd, 1865, from Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Fisher said if it had been laid before the House during the last session, there would have been no need of a delegation. He held that there would have been more need. If the House had had that despatch before it, the vote for the delegation would have been passed without a division.

In reference to his own position with regard to the Government, he was independent. They did not hold him by a hair of his head. He never had any instructions how to vote. He came to the Legislature to vote against Confederation and to support a Government who would prevent the Quebec Scheme from being inflicted upon the country.

If he should do anything contrary to the pledge he had given; if he should say or do anything that should prove him recreant to his trust, let them class him with Arnold, the greatest traitor known in American history.

With regard to the celebrated despatch of the Government, (of July) and the imputed disloyalty of the men who drew it up, he had a word to say. Loyalty was a very good thing; as religion was a very sacred thing; but there were no two words that had been more desecrated than religion and loyalty; they could be made to mean anything. The Confederate scoundrels had made very free use of Her Majesty's name in order to give force to their arguments. He had no hesitation in saying that they had no authority to bring Her Majesty's name into this controversy at all. It was with Mr. Carlwell, the British Minister, with whom they had to do. Suppose the British Government attempted to coerce these Provinces into adopting the scheme against their will, and the same result followed, as followed for the coercive course of the British Government towards the twelve American colonies, he held that resistance to unjust authority was not disloyalty to Her Majesty. He has had as loyal affection to the Queen, and esteem for her many virtues as any of her subjects that breathed. But loyalty, as he understood the term, was not alijest submission to tyranny and oppression, but it was the devotion of the heart, based on the honest conviction of the judgment. While there was a loyalty to the Queen, there was also a loyalty to themselves, a loyalty to the land of their birth. They all knew the lines:

Lives there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said—

This is my own, my native land!

That was real absolute loyalty. When those two principles of loyalty came in contact loyalty to their country must take the way. He told the people of the country, if any Government should dare to coerce him into adopting a constitution against his will, that moment