

ereafter; but, in the meantime, let us deal with gentlemen at both sides dispassionately, honestly, and generously, and not apply a strict rule to one and allow the privileges of others to fly open like a five-barred gate.

I give the member for Cumberland another illustration: Two winters ago we saw the member for Annapolis at the table of this house attempting to pass a bill which had for its object the relief of one of his clients from pecuniary difficulty. He himself avowed the fact, and fought for the interest of his client, being here at the same time in the capacity of representative for Annapolis. The measure did not pass then, and, in the following session, I, having become acquainted with the circumstances, gave it my support, because I thought the case a hard one. But what would be said if I rose in my place, attacked the learned member, and sought to apply the rule that the member for Cumberland tries to apply to Mr McCully? Another member of the house was said to be for many years, if not the partner, the paid agent of mail contractors. Did we at this side ever fling that in his face, and charge him with bribery and corruption? I think not. Let us then have something like gentlemanly treatment and fair play at both sides. Mr McCully came here openly in the face of day to claim a balance, and asked that his client might have leave to sue the government in a court of law; the request was refused.

I now come to a portion of the hon member's speech in which he went far beyond the licence that a public man ought ever to take in debate. I allude to his treatment of a young Scotchman named Smellie; I presume he too has a father and mother, and if he died away from home, where is the charitable Nova-scotian woman, who, in the language of one whose act has become immortal, would not, for his mother's sake, kiss him before burial? Is there one that would stand by and see him choked by a rude hand, while life was trembling in the balance? And is there one who will stand by—is there a man who is not a craven, who will stand by, and while Smellie's reputation, dearer than life a thousand times, trembles in the scale of doubt and apprehension, will permit the member for Cumberland to anticipate the trial—to prejudge the evidence, and to pronounce a verdict against this young man, who, by all the rules of law, and the courteous usages of society, we are bound to presume is innocent until he is proved to be guilty. That young man was in the Railway Office, was intelligent, punctual, and unsuspected. He conducted himself in private life as a gentleman. While I was at the Railway Board, I saw nothing but what was fair in his conduct or character. He has become surrounded, however, with perils worse than death. He stands charged with a criminal act, with being fraudulently concerned with railway contractors, and with falsifying returns, to which, it must be borne in mind, others besides himself had access; and the late government have directed that an action be brought against him. With J. W. Ritchie, the counsel for contrac-

tors, whose interests Mr Smellie honestly opposed, and Mr Laurie engaged as his opponents, that young man has, at this moment, fearful odds against him; and stands between respectability and disgrace, between honorable employment and a prison. And I ask any gentleman at the opposite side, was it decent, was it British, was it honest, was it humane, to bring that young man's name here as it was brought on Saturday, and attempt to cover it with charges of fraud, while he was almost in the dock, and while his reputation and standing in the country were assailed, perhaps by calumny, but at all events by all the terrors and machinery of the law? What shall I say of a man pretending to have the feelings of human nature, who stands forward, while his victim is so bound, and throws the weight of his public character into the case, for the purpose of crushing, before trial, a man that we are bound to hope is innocent? We are coming to strange times when this can be done in the Legislature of our country, in the midst of a British community. We are told that Smellie, Cameron, and McCully, are joined in the one leash. We heard the language of fraud, "frightful fraud," hurled against this young man. Oh, Mr Speaker, in the words of the old adage I may say, "We are all born, but are not buried"; and I sometimes think that if the member for Cumberland would pause for an instant, and reflect a little on his own position, short comings, and obligations, he would give us more pleasure, and elevate his own character in every body's estimation. Hugh Miller, in his "Foot-prints of Creation," has a passage which may be worth reading to the house. He says: "I am disposed to regard the poison-bag of the venomous snake as a mark of degradation. It seems, judging from analogy, to be a protective provision of a low character, exhibited chiefly in the invertebrate families, ants, centipedes and mosquitoes, spiders wasps and scorpions.

"The higher carnivora are, we find, furnished with unpoisoned weapons, which, like those of civilized man, are sufficiently effective, simply from the excellence of their construction, and the power with which they are wielded, for every purpose of assault or defence. It is only squalid savages, and degraded bushmen of creation, that have their feeble teeth or tiny stings steeped in venom, and so are formidable."

Now, sir, with a sincere anxiety to see the member for Cumberland live a useful public man, and go down to posterity, having a higher reputation than he has yet achieved, I would, with kind regard to his future character and position, advise him to read that passage occasionally, when he stands up to discuss public questions here, or elsewhere, and to leave the poison bag at home. (Laughter and cheers.)

You were told on Saturday that Mr McCully might have more interest than that or counsel in Cameron's contract; yet the member for Cumberland said that he was not touching that hon gentleman's private char-