

sented to-day. I was prepared then as now, to defeat the Quebec scheme. Let me state to the house that a committee was appointed in the city to operate against the Quebec scheme; and at the last meeting, when it was wished to adopt a policy adverse to all union, I told them then that I would not assist them. My opposition was entirely to the Quebec scheme. It was then determined to send these petitions over the face of the country. I went to Lunenburg, and assisted in returning the gentleman who now sits here. In respect to the petitions, I said I would send them into Richmond, but I would not interfere with Mr. McDonnell's county. I was going to write to Mr. McDonnell, but I heard he was coming up to Halifax. I then saw Mr. Annand, in his own office, and he suggested the very words that are written in the paper which he has just read.

MR. ANNAND.—Oh! Oh!

MR. MILLER.—It is true; it was at his own table they were suggested, and they were printed in his office. He presented, the other day, petitions from Dr. Cameron, which he had sent with his own frank.

MR. ANNAND.—I did; at the hon. member's instance.

MR. MILLER.—I denied at the time having sent these petitions, and yet he contradicted me; now he acknowledges having franked them.

HON. FIN. SECRETARY.—I must corroborate to the fullest extent the language taken down by the Provincial Secretary. I took the words down at the same time. The hon. member said—"I would have received money or office if I had wished it."

MR. McDONNELL.—I also took the same words down.

MR. MILLER.—The hon. member now stands convicted before the house and country of having uttered a "villainous falsehood."

MR. LOCKE.—The word *money* never struck my ear. I heard preferment and place—that is all.

HON. ATTY. GENERAL.—Then the hon. member must have a deaf ear for some things.

C. J. CAMPBELL.—Was not the language read here in his presence, and he never contradicted it?

MR. ANNAND.—Substantially it was the same statement made by the hon. member for Richmond. It differs, however, in the fact that Mr. Brown used the word *interest*. What is the difference between *interest* and *money*?

HON. ATTY. GEN.—The hon. gentleman first referred to Canadian gold, and then said he himself could have had money if he had wished it.

HON. PROV. SECY.—The present question is one of great importance, for it involves the character of a public man. The question came up in reference to a paragraph which the hon. member had put in his paper concerning some remarks on the sale of Louisiana, by Mr. Brown. That gentleman said, even if the Union of the Provinces did cost Canada something for a few years it was but a small matter in comparison with their value. The hon. member for Halifax knew that

he was guilty when he made the charge he did against Mr. Brown of the greatest crime of which a public man can be guilty—that of putting a false construction on the language of another, for the purpose of misleading the public mind. Mr. Brown said—suppose Canada has to contribute a few dollars more to the intercolonial union—what does it amount to? Look at the sale of Louisiana to the United States. The hon. member knows that this was a *bona fide* transaction; there was no secret service money connected with it. Mr. Brown is one of the most sagacious statesmen in British North America; but a man would be an idiot if he were to come forward on the present occasion and say—Canada was going to use secret service money for the acquisition of these Provinces. The hon. member must have known that he was putting a false estimate on the language of Mr. Brown. When he was met by a derisive cheer from this side of the house, he said that he had an interview with Mr. Brown, and followed that up with the declaration that he could have had money if he wished it,—that he was proffered place and preferment in Canada. Then I felt this was a grave charge, requiring investigation. All I can say is, if any one had attempted to bribe me, I would have felt that it would never do for me months afterwards to come forward and mention it. I knew enough of Mr. Brown to be aware that wherever he was known the charge would be scouted as too absurd. I read the words at the table, and stated my intention to telegraph them to Mr. Brown. He would not repeat the words, but said the official reporter had taken them down. I did all I could to enable him to correct me if I was wrong. He did nothing of the kind and therefore I telegraphed to Mr. Brown, whose answer is now before you. The country will now understand the value of charges of corruption coming from such a quarter. Now he comes forward and denies his own language, and gives the same version of the conversation with Mr. Brown that was given by Mr. Miller, and which he contradicted at the time.

MR. ANNAND.—I will merely say to the Provincial Secretary that I have not backed down. What Mr. Brown stated to me made the impression upon my mind—that it was for my interest that I should join him and his friends in carrying confederation.

HON. PRO. EC.—The hon. member only endorsed the statement made on Friday by the hon. member for Richmond. Under the circumstances not the slightest imputation can rest upon Mr. Brown's character. All that he said was, that a man of Mr. Annand's position ought to be able to make himself some standing in the Confederation. He would have as good a chance as any one else. Perhaps if Mr. Brown understood the talents or the position of the hon. member he would not have said so much. What would be thought of a hon. member who was going about day by day, and button-holing gentlemen, and telling them that the best way to get to Ottawa was by opposing the scheme of Confederation. Is that corruption? I do not think the hon. gentleman would like to say so!