

had done its work, and the election was over, the sensation telegrams ceased to arrive from Canada, New York, and other places. My hon. friend Mr. McClellan read a squib here which was published some days before the York election. I tried to get one but could not, so they could not have been very numerous in the County of York. He must have had it salted down. There were plenty of squibs in circulation on the other side, one of them speaks of Needham, Anglin and Co. I never knew of any such company. Talk about a "hidden hand," or slander. Was that a hit at Anglin? No! It was a hit at Needham. They were not satisfied with asserting that Anglin had challenged the Protestants of York; but they say Needham is going over to the Catholic Church, and challenges them too. A more able politician, or a more able, honest, consistent journalist never put pen to paper than Mr. Anglin, for he is honest to the core, and despises a mean, low act as much as any man. True, he has his own opinion in regard to the worship of his God, and where is the man that does not. Toleration is obliterated from the Dictionary. I ask toleration from no man, and I give it to no man, for it comes from the source of our existence. I never was ashamed to let everybody know just what I believed. They know whether I am an Orangeman or a Catholic, for I never was what I would be ashamed to acknowledge. I do not mean to say that I am always right, or that I am the man pointed out in Scripture as the man that has a right to cast the first stone; but I say, when I believe a thing to be right I am not ashamed to assert it. My hon. colleague stated on nomination day, that at the last election a great many lies were thrown broadcast over the County of York. I said more about Confederation before that election than any of my colleagues, and I challenge any one to produce one solitary false statement made by me, or one single bit of exaggeration. Can you do it? Why then did you say it? I never did on any one occasion make one assertion that was untrue, neither did I exaggerate. I did not even make the case as bad as it was. The good old Apostle Paul said he had been beaten, stricken, ship-wrecked and in prison, &c. In this respect I think he and I resemble each other. While I have not received forty stripes save one, I have been injured in a more tender part than the back, for I am, to use an expression made use of by the late Hon. J. R. Partelow, in St. John, the best abused man in the country. I take it and fight it off; yet, whenever maligned, I feel this consolation, that there one was pronounced in Scripture which I have never felt, that is the woe pronounced when every man speaks well of you. It is said that every thing is fair in war, politics and love. I do not believe that doctrine. I do not believe my hon. colleague did right in telling the people of Keswick that the railroad would go down by the Keswick valley, and telling the people of St. John that it would go right by there. Another point against the Government was, that they did not call the House together before they did. This, of itself, shows the weakness of the Opposition, when they are compelled to take up a point like that. Then regarding the non-appointment of the Auditor General. The Sur-

voyor General read you the law, which says, an Auditor General shall be appointed, or some other person. Some other person was appointed and the law was fulfilled; then that being the case, this charge also falls to the ground. Ah, says my hon. friend, the office of Auditor General is ministerial, and they can summon witnesses from any part of the country. Was it ever done? I never knew it to be done, neither has my hon. friend (Mr. F.) ever known it to be done. Then why all this prevarication. It was a mighty charge to bring against the Government, that they ought to have appointed an officer to do what never was done and never will be. They have appointed an officer to do what was essentially necessary, and I do not know but what the power invested in the Auditor General, would, by implication, be invested in the person nominated to be his deputy, he would have a right to travel and take this evidence as much as the Attorney General would. Another point in the indictment is in regard to the sale of public lands. This point my hon. colleague touched very lightly upon. I know he does not like to hear much about it, and I do not wonder at it. I do not blame him for speculating in public lands. When the Government turned him out for this, I believe they were cowardly. Some gentlemen in that Government were deeper in the mud than he was in the mire. I heard of one member of the Government who applied for one hundred acres of land under the Labor Act, declaring he had no land in the country. Why was not that man turned out of the Government? They pronounced upon my hon. colleague and threw him overboard. They supposed that a human sacrifice would atone for the wrong done, but York County took him up and returned him at the head of the poll. I voted for him, and I did it because I thought they wronged him. I did it, because I expected that when he came here he would act a man. I did not expect he would come here and truckle to the Government and cry yes, yes, for them. I believe no wrong was done in that Crown Land transaction at all. The same transactions had been done time after time by members of the House and the Government, and when the example was set, why should subordinates suffer for it. The only way the Government can do justice to Mr. Inches is to give him the salary which he ought to have—that is \$1000 a year. It was wrong to condemn my hon. colleague and Mr. Inches, as if they had been guilty of some moral wrong, while members of the House and Government had perpetrated the same thing, and yet went scot free, because they did not do it while members of the Government. There was a charge made against the Crown Land Office that they had sold a piece of land without putting it up to public competition, but the Surveyor cleared that up to the satisfaction of the country. What did the late Tilley Government do in reference to selling lands without putting them up to public auction? Hear, mark, learn and inwardly digest it. On the 22d of May, 1857, James Buchanan prays repayment of £23 ls. 3d. expenses incurred in attempting to make a survey of Crown Land under the late Deputy Mahood's order. To reimburse him, he was granted 192 acres of Crown Land without bringing it to public sale, and from this land

\$900 was received as stumpage for lumber. This is a fact which stands recorded in the Secretary's Office, and cannot be gainsayed. Here is another case: 200,000 logs were cut by a trespasser, and notice was given to the office, and a seizing officer was directed to seize them. Did he put them up to public competition. No! They were bought in at a private house for \$1.50 per thousand. The Government was requested to prosecute the trespasser, but declined to do so. If you want any more of these operations, you can get them to any extent at the office. I only searched over a dozen to get these. I will now come back to the squib read by Mr. McClellan, in which it was stated that our taxes would increase under Confederation. I said I endorsed it, and I ask hon. members if they do not know that taxes would increase. I know who wrote it, though I did not know it at the time, and I am authorized by the gentleman who wrote it to say that not one member in York knew one word about it. What was the offence? Was it because the delegates were charged with violating the Sabbath, and signing the document on Sunday. They denied it. Was it not true. There is a delegate here, and his silence gives consent. According to all correct theological views, it was not a work of necessity, and God knows it was not a work of charity. Then they must have been guilty of violating the moral law, and according to the doctrine laid down in Scripture, he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all, therefore they should be the last men to preach morality. I opposed this Confederation Scheme because I thought it would be injurious to New Brunswick. I urged my colleague to explain the Scheme to the people. I called a meeting and put forth my views, and the cry was, Needham wants to go to the House of Assembly. I said some others not only wanted to come here, but they wanted to go to the far off Ottawa. I told the anti-Confederates, when they were making up their ticket, to leave me out, and I would go through the County, and do as much for the party as I possibly could. I did not know I was on the ticket until I was sent for. I attended none of the caucuses, but I was in earnest and sincere in my endeavors to kill the monster, and I did not care who aided and helped me so long as I did kill him. If I did not kill him, I wounded him, and he is bleeding and will bleed to death, for die he must and die he shall. We may talk about confederation or not as we like, but we may be assured that confederation under the Quebec Scheme will never take place; this may be strong language, but it is true. We are told that we anti-Confederates are all disloyal men—that we oppose the Queen. We are told this by the men who bow the knee to the image—not of Baal—but to Mr. Cardwell. This is a new image set up in 1865 whom men bow down to and worship when they hear the sound of the sabbat, &c. What did Lord Derby say about Mr. Cardwell in the House of Lords? He said he feared that that hon. gentleman had got the colonies, which he controls, into trouble, equivalent to the same troubles which he got Ireland into when he was secretary of that country. Is it treason to attack Mr. Cardwell or Her Majesty's Ministers? It is not. When the Queen asks the people of New Brunswick to do anything,