

Quebec Scheme, in all its original enormity would be forced upon the country. He believed, sure as the needle pointed to pole, that that would happen. Let hon. members consider the pressure that has been brought upon the Government to break them down. They have had the pressure of the Canadian politicians against them, and the Imperial influence of the British Government, and influence from Nova Scotia. They have had the influence against them of leeches and trading politicians, who, through the length and breadth of the Province have been disseminating poisonous stories against the Government, and attesting that a dissolution was sure to take place; and almost the entire Press of the Province had been against them, vilifying and denouncing them. He had no doubt that the member of York (Mr. Fisher) was in constant communication with Canadian statesmen in favor of the Quebec Scheme. He saw several gentlemen in the House who were in favor of Union—taking it as a broad question. But he would ask were there ten members in the House in favor of the Quebec Scheme? Let these gentlemen who were in favor of the general principle consider well before they cast their influence against the Government. They were told that the Quebec Scheme could be altered. When that was said let them harken to the testimony of the Canadian statesmen who had given birth to the scheme. Not a single letter could be altered.

Let them listen to the testimony of the Hon. D'Arcy McGee:

"Everything we did was done in form and with propriety, and the result of our proceedings is the document that has been submitted to the Imperial Government, as well as to this House, and which we speak of now, as a treaty. And that there may be no doubt about our position in regard to that document, we say question it you may, but alter it, you may not. (Hear, hear.) It is beyond your power or our power to alter it. There is not a sentence, eye, or even a word, you can alter without desiring to throw out the document. Alter it, and we know at once what you mean—you thereby declare yourselves anti-Unionists. On this point I repeat after all my honorable friends who have already spoken for one party to alter a treaty, is of course to destroy it. Let us be frank with each other; you who do not like our work, nor do you like us, who stand by it, clause by clause, line by line, and letter by letter."

Let him call up the Hon. J. A. McDonald, a man who stands very high in Canada, and let them listen to what he said:

"We present it not in the precise shape we in Canada would desire it, but as in the best shape the five Colonies to be united could agree upon it. We present it in the form in which the five Governments have severally adopted it—in the form the Imperial Government has endorsed it—and in the form in which we believe all the Legislatures of the Provinces will accept it. We ask the House to pass it in the EXACT form in which we have presented, for we know not how alterations may affect its safety in other places, and the process of alteration once commenced in four different Legislatures, who can tell where that would end?"

From the mouth of these witnesses let

them judge what truth there was in the statement that the scheme could be altered. If the Government were defeated he would tell them again—and another Government formed with the hon. member of York at its head—the Quebec Scheme would be carried letter by letter, line by line. There were gentlemen here in favor of Union, and he would say that if they could get a Union on a fair and equitable basis, such as would advance the interests of the country, it might be a question whether it would not be prudent to adopt it. He would say that the Government were prepared to renew negotiations with Canada and the other Provinces at any conference that might be called together; but not in any event to agree to the Quebec Scheme. The member of York had spoken of British statesmen, and of their being listened to as superiors speaking to inferiors. He did not like the spirit of the remark of the hon. gentleman. It was not doing justice to themselves or to their country. He had great respect for their ability, their acquirements and their superior culture. When they said that this Confederation Scheme would advance the interests of this country—while he had much respect for their opinion—still he thought on a question affecting their own interests, men with practical judgment and common sense were the best judges; and on this question of Confederation they respectfully differed.

The Attorney General then proceeded to speak of the stories repeated by the member of York, (Mr. F.) that the present Chief Justice Ritchie had caballed with him (Atty Gen.) If there was any one thing, he proceeded to say, that it was necessary to maintain, it was the purity of the Bench. The ermine should be kept spotless. The people should look up with respect to those who filled high positions, especially those who had the guardianship of their lives and properties. Up to the present time politics had never entered into a court of justice. He put it to the House if they were prepared to justify the member of York in dragging in the name of Judge Ritchie, and repeating the stories set afloat that he had caballed with him (Atty Gen.) a year ago upon the position of Chief Justice. A year ago he was not in the Government. When the present Government did come into power, and the resignation of the Chief Justice was spoken of, was it not understood that if Sir James Carter did resign, that the position should be given to Judge Robert Parker. Would the country have justified any other appointment than that of that justly revered Judge, of whom he would repeat, what he had said before, that take him for all and all he was the best man he ever knew. When the member of York knew that, how could he justify himself when he said that Judge Ritchie had caballed with him (Atty Gen.). He was not going to deprecate Judge Wilmut; he was not going to say that he was not a great and distinguished man; but he would say, when Judge Wilmut—when a great question was agitating the country from its centre to its circumference—upon the Bench determined against and denounced men who opposed the Quebec Scheme, and lauded to the skies those who framed it, he laid himself open to remark; he forgot the duty imposed upon him by his position; he dragged the ermine in the mire. He heard it was said that Judge Wilmut de-

livered, from the Bench, a speech on Confederation in Sunbury, and the people in the Court applauded him. (Mr. Glazier—they did not). He heard it so stated, and he must believe it. They let Judge Wilmut speak on any subject, and he gained the irresistible applause of his audience. Now, if the people cheered him when he spoke from the Bench, must they not come to the conclusion, if people have a right to applaud him they have an equal right to hiss him. They could not deny that. Then what became of the respect and dignity of the Bench? He would like to see one of the Judges in England act in that manner. He would like to see an English Judge throw himself into the discussion on the Reform Bill, and even that would be more excusable than the case of Judge Wilmut. He would ask the House if it was ever known here that a Judge took part in politics. Had the member of York shown an instance when a Judge went to the hustings. He would ask him to point to a case when a Judge had ever voted? The fact that Judges had never voted was conclusive in his mind against Judge Wilmut. While a Judge (he went on to say) might speak on political subjects, and express his views in conversation at the social table, he has no right to declaim from the Bench. The Government had been charged with doing a great wrong for not appointing Judge Wilmut Chief Justice. But he thought Judge Wilmut had acted imprudently, and not in a manner that met the approbation of the country. He thought that no man would deny that the late Chief Justice Robert Parker's judgment on the Judge best qualified to be successor was entitled to respect. Chief Justice Parker would not have taken the office if he had not known that Judge Ritchie should succeed him. He did not ask the House to believe him at his word, for he had the written record in proof that what he said was true. It was stated that in the appointment seniority prevailed. But it was not true that the oldest Judges were always appointed. In the majority of cases in this Province the junior Judge had been appointed over the senior, and if seniority prevailed Judge Neville Parker had the right. He would not draw invidious distinctions between Judge Ritchie and Judge Wilmut, but he would say that public opinion would justify the appointment of Judge Ritchie, and the country had the testimony of the late Robert Parker that he was the right man in the right place; would not that testimony satisfy the murmurs of dissipation.

The hon. member of York had called the Government a Government of hypocrisy; he had characterized its members as political thimble-riggers; but if there was any man in the Province remarkable for his expertness in that art he sat in the seat of the hon. member. He had done. He was now willing to leave the question in the hands of the House.

Mr. DEBRISEY said, it might appear strange that he should rise to answer a gentleman of the ability and talents of the Attorney General. He would give his reason. He was obliged to go home, as the Supreme Court, in Kent, was then sitting, and he had some very heavy suits pending. That was his only reason for rising to speak now.