

much, but they must allow the opposition to hold different opinions, and give them time to express them. They might be prepared to charge the Government with great neglect—with being the cause of all this,—and why should they not have an opportunity of doing it? But, at the same time, if the Government desired their support to maintain peace and tranquillity in this city, and in the province, they were prepared to give it, but would oppose them upon those points on which they thought they were wrong by every constitutional means. The honourable and gallant knight then read the proposed address, and commented on it. He denied that at the time this occurrence took place, the province was in a state of “profound peace and tranquillity.” The greatest excitement prevailed at the time; the province was shaken to its very centre; the province never was in such a state of excitement. Let them strike out that clause if they wished the address to be unanimous. In their attachment to the British Crown they must all agree. He (Sir Allan) treated with the most profound contempt the idea that had been industriously circulated throughout this country of annexation to the United States. He was prepared to lay down his life on the scaffold or on the field to maintain the connexion with Great Britain. (Mr. Notman.—How about the Hamilton “Spectator?”) What had he to do with the Hamilton “Spectator”? The articles on annexation in the “Spectator” emanated from a man who entertained the same opinions as the honourable member himself. (Name name.) Did any honourable member mean to say that he (Sir Allan) adopted the opinion of any man who wrote in the Hamilton “Spectator” in favour of annexation? Had not the same opinions been advanced in the “Journal and Express,” and other papers throughout the province? But he would state publicly, and before the country, that he had no community of feeling with the men who entertained those opinions. The whole course of his life showed his attachment to British connexion, and he was prepared at all times and in every place, to unite with every good man in putting down such opinions, and defending our connexion with the Mother Country. He had been warm during the present session, and he had reason to be warm, but he knew of no vote that he had ever given in the House that he would not give again; he defied honourable members to point to a single vote recorded that they could bring up, that he would not readily give again, neither had he said anything offensive of any honourable member; he had only repelled attacks made upon himself. He objected to the expression of unbounded confidence in his Excellency; he (Sir Allan) had not such an exalted opinion of his Excellency, with whom he had but very slight personal acquaintance, and he did not think the Government ought to ask them to commit themselves. All they had a right to ask was, that they should unite for the preservation of peace and order, and they could not point to any constitutional mode of doing that in which the opposition would not concur, but they were not prepared to go as far as the Ministry wished. They might have acted according to the dictates of their conscience, but he (Sir Allan) had his own opinion of their conduct. It was absurd to say that the peace of the city was restored. Good God! were they prepared to say that peace was restored when bayonets were bristling at every corner, when armed mobs were parading the streets, when there had been assemblages of the people last evening, and again he was told at seven o'clock this morning, and when only last evening two men had been wounded with shot! He thought, too, they ought to be more guarded in the powers they gave to the Governor; he would do a great deal, but he was not prepared to go as far as the address proposed. If the address was restricted so as merely to assure the Governor of their determination to support the Government in maintaining the peace and tranquillity of the country, he was prepared to vote for it; but if it was to be pressed with the objectionable clauses in it, he was prepared to call upon the Speaker to protect the minority by enforcing the rules of the House.

Mr. Notman said that he had great difficulty in rising to address the House. No man living under the protection of the British flag could have anticipated that an outrage so atrocious and unparalleled could be committed in the province of Canada, and in a city of such intelligence, wealth, and liberality. We could no longer point the finger of derision to a neighbouring country and appeal to the lawless aggression there, and the trampling under foot of the laws of the land; the damning charge would be brought against us, that here the majesty of the law had been outraged, and that protection which England extends to the meanest of her subjects, denied to the representatives of the people. Where before, in a British colony, had the sacred character of the representative of Her Majesty been insulted by hootings and hissings? Where had the representatives of the people been compelled to debate under the protection of an armed soldiery, and been insulted and outraged in their persons? How could the honourable member for Missisquoi ask if any honourable member of the House had been insulted or prevented from attending to his duties? If the honourable member had enjoyed the protection to which every British subject had a right, members on his (Mr. Notman's) side of the House had not; but several of them had been grossly insulted within the last twenty-four hours. We have the essence of the British constitution at last conceded to us, after a struggle of many years on the part of those with whom he acted; even their opponents had now acquiesced in it, and they were endeavouring to carry it out; but because the House in its wisdom had passed an Act which did not meet with the approbation of the minority, these lamentable occurrences had taken place. He would ask if that bill was not constitutionally opposed through both branches of the legislature, and after being well and fully debated, and receiving the sanction of both Houses, it became constitutionally, according to the system of our government, the law of the land? and were they to be told that because this Bill gave dissatisfaction to a portion of the inhabitants of Montreal, they were to arrogate to themselves the power of setting all law at defiance? was the House to be insulted, the people of Canada insulted, aye the very constitution in which we gloried to be trampled under foot, by those who were unworthy to live under the British constitution? He (Mr. Notman) had not said a word on the Rebellion Losses Bill; he had listened to the debate on both sides, and he came