

language that it is possible to make it—that a majority of the members of the House have been basely bribed and corrupted by means that it is frightful to contemplate. What is the position of a man who thus degrades the Legislature, who holds up to the public execration the representatives of the people as men that are to be bought and sold. Farther on I read:—

"But might, we are told, makes right, and in this spirit the Provincial Secretary and his aiders and abettors in the house, propose to lay their sacrilegious hands upon the constitution of our country. Let them beware ere they attempt the unholy deed. The people of Nova Scotia are proverbially loyal, but they will have need of it all if their feelings are thus violently outraged and their rights basely betrayed.—Nova Scotians will not pass under the yoke of Canada without a struggle. A resolution to confederate us may receive the assent of a majority of the House of Assembly, but the end is not yet. Our countrymen, if true to themselves, will triumph in the end."

You have then this same paper using this inflammatory and seditious language, with the object of exciting the loyal people of this province to rise against the action of the Legislature of their country. That is the position to which an hon. member has been drawn, in his inability to find arguments to sustain his cause. Again, in the *Morning Chronicle* of April 10th, we find:—

"In the course of the Confederate Debate in the Canadian Assembly, last winter, the Hon. George Brown referred to the large sum that was given for the purchase of the State of Louisiana, and suggested that the expenditure of as large, or even a larger sum, in the purchase of the Maritime Provinces, would be profitable Canadian investment. Mr. Brown's hint, we have reason to believe, has not been lost sight of by the Confederates. Canadian gold, it is said, is here, and in sufficient abundance to overcome the scruples of certain representatives of the people. The country has a sharp eye on the House just now, and will duly appreciate the sudden conversion of members, should any unhappily be found willing to accept the base bribe."

I ask the house if the most spiritless member is prepared to allow a foul stigma like that to rest upon his character? I feel that all the hon. member has been doing is bringing down discredit and dishonour upon himself and the cause he thus upholds. I may have occasion to draw the attention of this house to the question as to how far these imputations of base, corrupt and dishonourable motives influencing the members of this Legislature, have sprung from the belief in the mind of the hon. member that there are other gentlemen as open to such imputations as he himself may be. Now when a base and dishonourable motive is imputed to a man of fair character, the party who attempts to put such a stigma upon him has a right to sustain it by showing that there is some reason for the belief that it might possibly apply to the person in question. I have already said that these imputations are not levelled against the gov't party alone, but fall with the same weight upon gentlemen politically identified with the hon. member. It may be argued with reason that these imputations fall with far greater force upon the leader of the Opposition, with whom the hon. member has been long closely associated, and whose motives he may be supposed to know better than those with whom he has not been politically identified.

Let me call your attention to this charge of

bribery. No one will deny the truth of the principle that it is only when you find a man lend himself to a dishonourable deed, that you have a foundation to impute a base motive. In what position are the promoters of the Quebec scheme? Were we in the position of having denounced a Union of British North America, and then, without anything to change their attitude, having suddenly assumed a position entirely antagonistic and at variance with that which we had previously taken? If it were so, then the hon. member might have something on which to base a suspicion. Before the question was mooted in this Legislature I was called to address a meeting in the city of St. John, in the neighbouring Province, and chose for my subject the Union of British North America. From that day to this I have been found the consistent supporter of Union. When the late government brought down the question of Union I adhered to the principles on the platform and in the press, and gave them my cordial and enthusiastic support. So down to the present day I stand before the people of this country as a man who, in every position, has used every influence he possessed to promote and carry forward that on which he believed the prosperity and security of the country depended. Can the hon. member find any foundation there for the imputation of base and corrupt motives? Again, if the promoters of Union are influenced by motives that are dishonourable to themselves and the Legislature, in what position is Her Majesty the Queen? When he sees the Queen, session after session, at the close and opening of Parliament, coming down and urging in the most emphatic terms that the Royal lips can use, this question of Confederation upon the people of British North America, does he mean to say that she, too, is corrupted by base bribes? Coming down to Her Majesty's Ministers—to the men who stand before the world as exemplars of the most distinguished patriotism, the most profound statesmanship—are they too corrupted by base means when they declare that the advancement of British North America is to be secured by carrying through this great question of a Colonial Union? What does he think influences Lord Derby and the statesmen opposed to Her Majesty's Ministers who, on every occasion, have stood forward and strengthened the hands of the government of England in carrying forward this great question of Colonial Union? What has influenced the press and people, as well as the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, when, with a unanimity which has never been exhibited on any other public question, they stand forward as the avowed supporters and advocates of this great measure? Is it at a crisis like this—when day by day these patriotic influences that are calculated to operate upon men's minds do operate—that a member of this deliberative assembly should dare to dishonour this House by imputations of being influenced by base and unworthy motives? Go to Canada and you find in that great country an overwhelming majority of both branches of the Legislature in favour of this great measure; and you find Her Majesty's Representative therein using his legitimate influence to press it forward. Go to New Brunswick and you see Her Majesty's Representative heartily