

the hon. the Premier while he sat in this House opposing him (Sir John A. Macdonald) for the last ten years, were to be kept as final evidence against him (Sir John A. Macdonald), and that any speech which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was to make against the hon. gentleman in his position of leader of the Opposition could be kept and taken as evidence against him ten years hence. The hon. gentleman would not like that, and yet that was the evidence, the irrefragable evidence, which he brought up against his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) to show that there was something wrong, and that some jobbery was committed in connection with the Pictou Railway, although Mr. Archibald had afterwards explicitly denied under his hand that he had intended to make a charge of personal dishonour or of personal complicity in this connection on the part of the hon. member for Cumberland. But, supposing that Mr. Archibald used language which reflected upon his hon. friend, must they accept the statement of Mr. Archibald, a political opponent, the leader of the Opposition, a statement made in the hot struggle of Parliament, in parliamentary discussion, as a conclusive evidence of the truth of such a charge? And yet he turned round and declared that Sir William Young was a liar, a foul calumniator, that Judge Desbarres was a liar, a foul calumniator; that Mr. Thompson, Howe's son-in-law, was the same; that the lamented Mr. Vail was a liar and foul calumniator. This was the statement of the hon. gentleman, that these four men had all told lies, and were all guilty of perpetrating a foul slander on the hon. gentleman. Would anybody believe that? He did not believe that the majority, if sworn jurymen, would come to the conclusion to set aside the statement of four men like these because the hon. gentleman said he did not say it, and produced a newspaper in which this portion of his speech was conveniently left out. His hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) had shown how things, in the most marvellous and mysterious way disavowed by everybody, were eliminated from speeches in the public press. No-

body knew how this happened, but yet these eliminations took place when any matters which would be very inconvenient were in question. They saw how this was done. His hon. friend (Mr. Jones) said, on looking back at his speech, that he did not find that he had ever used any such language, and, therefore, that everybody who said the contrary were liars, scoundrels, and calumniators, and that he never done so-and-so. The hon. gentleman had the hardihood to state that the head of the Supreme Court of his own Province, the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, was a liar and a scoundrel, and that he based this charge on the most improper motive, on the lowest and basest possible motive, because he said that this gentleman, Sir William Young, was politically opposed to him, and on the ground that this gentleman was a warm partisan. And why? Because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) did not, in his desperation, wish to defend himself against this charge, but Sir William Young said he heard him (Mr. Jones) say it; there could be no mistake about it. The hon. gentleman did use that language, and he did say that he would take off his hat and cheer when the British flag was pulled down. That was vouched for by the Chief Justice, a man who presided at the head of the Courts of law, and who administered the law, both civil and criminal, in the Province of Nova Scotia, and a man on whose judgment he would defend the law, the liberty, the property, and the reputation of every man in the Province of Nova Scotia, including the hon. gentleman himself. He (Mr. Jones) had ventured to say that this gentleman of high standing, of high character, of high position, honoured by the people, honoured by the representatives of the people, honoured by the Crown, the honourable recipient of a title in recognition of his long services, honoured by his own Province as a great and a good and a learned man, and eminent Judge, had lied and foully lied, he had lied in his throat, that he was a calumniator; and that Justice Desbarres was a calumniator, that Justice Desbarres was a liar, because they told Sir Hastings Doyle that that gentleman