

fit subject for pardon, but that his pardon should not be communicated to him then for fear of misconstruction being put on it, and after he was no longer useful he was pardoned. Now, if Mr. Brown wished to act fairly toward Mr. Smith, and wished to obtain the evidence of this man free from undue influences he should have let him out of the Penitentiary. If Deblois was out of the Penitentiary before he gave his evidence, he would have been a free man, and would have given his evidence free from the influences and free from the bias which the hope of a pardon necessarily produces on him. But no! Mr. Brown kept him under lock and key, under his thumb, and he was led to suppose, to believe that his pardon rested on his giving evidence against Mr. Smith. I appeal to every man of fairness whether Mr. Smith was not perfectly justified in believing that the Government influence was used in getting up this evidence against him, and that the Commissioners lent themselves to the project to crush him and drive him out of the Penitentiary with disgrace?

I am sorry that I have detained you so long, but it is a matter of grave importance both to myself and Mr. Brown; and I hope you will come to the conclusion that the charges I made against him at the beginning of this session are no new ones, and were not trumped up by me; but that they were hastily and under great provocation repeated—the irregular reiteration of well founded charges brought by Mr. Smith against him, and reiterated on former occasions in my place in the House.