

people, and are acting in diametrical opposition to their well known sentiments.

The Provincial Secretary intimated that there is one gentleman here who deserves the name of traitor; he referred on one occasion to the apology which I made for using language that I was sorry for. Any gentleman who has been betrayed into heated and improper language is acting an honest and honorable part in acknowledging his error. I did that without hesitation, although the Provincial Secretary did not state the words to which he alluded; but what did I find in the press? In a portion of the press reflecting the views of that gentleman I saw a most extravagant and distorted account—a most unwarranted and untruthful version of what occurred. To put myself right I wrote to the gentleman to whom the words were used, and I will let my justification go forth with the misrepresentation that has been circulated.

(Mr. Annand here read copies of letters from Mr. B. Wier and Mr. E. M. McDonald, stating that Mr. A.'s remark in reference to a Fenian attack upon Canada was in reply to an exclamation of Mr. Wier.)

These, said Mr. A., are the naked facts of the case. I met a worthy friend who is perhaps a little excitable, and he used exceedingly strong language to me. I used very strong language to him in retort, but I remember we left laughing at the extravagant expressions on both sides. Gentlemen opposite are very sensitive about remarks made in the press, and if they could, would probably stifle the press and muzzle conversations out of doors, but I hold in my hand the record of language scarcely less forcible than mine, but with this distinction, that instead of being uttered in a moment of excitement in a public street these words were deliberately placed upon the Journals of the country. I find here a resolution moved by hon. Mr. Johnson the leader of the opposition in this house at a time when excitement ran high in consequence of the removal of certain magistrates, an extract from which reads as follows:

"And this House is of opinion that if such an exercise of executive administration should be vindicated the most sacred interests of society would be placed in the power of every corrupt and unscrupulous Government that could command a subervient majority in the Legislature, and the people of Nova Scotia being driven to desire some constitution better balanced and protected the connection between the Colony and the Parent State would be weakened and endangered."

I can say more: I recollect, in 1849 when Canada was in rebellion when the Parliament buildings were burned, when the Governor General was hunted through the streets, there was a Journal in this town in the interest of gentlemen opposite that was so outspoken as to justify fully the persons who committed these deeds, and yet I never heard of any of them being arraigned here for using disloyal expressions. We have heard much about loyalty,—what makes it really? Is it not the institutions of a country? Deprive a people of that which they cherish and every freeman among them will desert those who do the deed. The Pro. Sec. made a great complaint about the reference to Canadian gold and talked about

bringing a member to the bar for having published that paragraph. He also more than insinuated that my friend Mr. Howe had been corrupted by American gold, and by implication myself also who he said was the mouth-piece of that gentleman in this house. This is the paragraph referred to by the Pro. Secretary.

"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 State of the Maritime Provinces, would be a 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 veritably corrupt the members 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 unhappy be found willing to accept the base bribe."

I hold under my hand the language of hon. George Brown to which that paragraph refers and he says:

"He could not understand why we should hesitate about bringing in a million of people with a great country and great resources; we might as well hesitate about some petty all wance of money. There was no such instance in history he believed; other nations paid large sums for territory. Louisiana was bought for twenty millions of dollars. What would we not give for Maine or Michigan or Minnesota, which it was possible to pay. Others pay large sums to secure emigrants. We spent some \$25,000 per annum yet we heard peddling objections raised now in a union, to give us nearly a million of people and vast and rich territories; a few dollars for a few years ought not to stand in the way."

Does any one need to be told that the meaning of this is that the secret service money of Canada, if required might be had? (Cries of Oh! oh! from government side of house.) Gentlemen need not be so excited, for I tell them that I had a conversation with Mr. Brown not very long ago, in which I was led to believe that if I would join the Confederates I might have had money, and place, and preferment in Canada as inducements to my supporting Confederation.

Hon. Prov. Sec. asked that Mr. Annand's words be taken down as he intended to test their accuracy by telegraphing to Mr. Brown immediately.

The SPEAKER said he could take down no words which were not unparliamentary.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that he merely desired that no injustice be done to the hon. gentleman in the representation of his remarks.

MR. ANNAND continued:—My remarks I presume have been already taken down by the proper officer and it will be unnecessary for me to repeat them. The Pro. Sec. has referred to the action of Canada, but I do not wonder that the scheme was adopted by a two third vote in the Parliament of that Colony. We have been told that we exalted Mr. Smith as "an in-occupable patriot." Whatever Mr. Smith's claims may be on the people of New Brunswick they appreciate them, and without wishing to say a word derogatory to the credit of the members of the learned profession here, I doubt that there is one of them who, when the office of Chief Justice was vacant, and when he was pressed by friends and foes to take the position,