

sertation of an hour and a half said that it had been put on him to review the tariff. Who put that task upon him? Was it done in caucus, or did the Government put it upon him, feeling that they had not enough ability among themselves to discuss the matter? I do not wonder at the selection, however, because if Mr. Chambers could make a tariff in two days, he was just the man for the undertaking. We have in the Government a Finance Minister, an Attorney General, and other unofficial members, but their duties are delegated—one member gets the tariff to deal with, another touches upon the finance question, and so on all around. I have now finished my review of the speeches of the hon. member for Colchester, and if I have said anything offensive, I trust he will not take it in that light, for I have not meant it so.

The next gentleman to whose remarks I will refer is the hon. member for Victoria, who, smarting under some observations which I had made on a previous day, rose with the determination of hurling around him without consideration or reflection, such anathemas and vituperation as are rarely heard here. I ask him if he knew that he was talking of men whom this country delighted to honor for forty years, when he talked of a few blacklegs coming down from Canada? When did we ever hear this Legislature disgraced by such language before?

THE SPEAKER—Order.

MR. BLANCHARD continued—I feel that I am right in what I have said, when I am commenting upon an epithet too obnoxious to be used here. I have spoken about “bad English,” but I ask if worse English than the expression to which I have referred could proceed out of the mouth of any person? The hon. member said that these men, delegated as they were by the highest authority in Canada, should have three years in the Penitentiary. Let those who are out of that institution plume themselves on the fact. I ask any member of this House, or any man who hears me, to go home and think of himself, of the position he occupies, of those who are near and dear to him, and I ask if one man out of fifty thousand can say after that examination “There is no spot on one of those with whom I am connected.” Let the hon. member consider that, and when he next feels inclined to hurl the epithets “blackleg” and “common drunkard,” let him remember that he who is without sin should cast the first stone.

THE SPEAKER said that Mr. Blanchard’s language and manner were calculated to irritate members.

MR. BLANCHARD continued—I have sat here for three or four days listening to such language as no ordinary man would submit to, while such language is used in reference to those whom I respect, as long as I draw the breath of life I will not suffer those who use it to escape with impunity—they must take the consequence. The hon. member for Victoria said that the Canadian Government, having reduced this country to the verge of bankruptcy, were now calling on us to pay their deficiencies. That is not the fact, and the hon. member should have known

that we go into Confederation with an equal debt, and that the surplus debt of Canada is to be paid out of her local revenues. He also said that Cape Breton had petitioned to be annexed,—I gave proof for my assertions on the subject of that union, and I ask him to give his proof for that. But at the close of the hon. member’s speech he said that he was about to reveal a state of facts that was not at all creditable,—he undertook to say that, desiring some alterations in post rides he had called on the Postmaster General, and that the answer of that officer was, “have you seen Mr. Blanchard?” He then went on to ask if I was the man to be consulted, insinuating that I controlled the post office patronage of this country. He had not resumed his seat an instant when, not knowing what he meant, I asked whether the changes were not in post rides that run through my own county. I received no answer to that question, and I ask what the House thinks of a member coming and trying to cast a slur upon me and upon the Post Master General, without being in a position to answer that question on the spot. But what will be thought of him when I read the correspondence which passed between Mr. Woodgate and myself at the close of the hon. member’s speech? I wrote this note to the Postmaster General.

HALIFAX, Feby. 15th, 1868.

A. Woodgate, Esq.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Kidston has just stated in the House that on asking you about some Post Office changes, you asked him if he had consulted me. Will you be kind enough to let me know if the above is correct, and if so, under what circumstances you made the observation.

Yours truly,
(Signed) H. BLANCHARD.

GENERAL POST OFFICE,
Halifax, Feb. 15, 1868.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, and to state that some few days ago, Mr. Kidston called at my office, and suggested some changes in the mail route between Plaister Cove and Baddeck and Mabou, Whyococomag and Baddeck. After expressing, each of us, our views on the subject, I said “Have you consulted Mr. Blanchard?” or “Would it not be best to speak to Mr. Blanchard on this matter?” or words to that effect. I mentioned this, as you were one of the members of this county, and I considered you should have a voice in such cases; at the same time, I never for one moment supposed Mr. Kidston would bring on the floors of this House a conversation which I looked upon as altogether private, for the time being, as of course such mail alteration would have to be referred now to Ottawa.

I am, yours respectfully,

A. WOODGATE
H. Blanchard, Esq., M. P. P.

The fact was that two-thirds of the whole rides which he wished altered were in my county. The hon. member, I repeat, got up and in the most open manner charged me