

their views, secretly had concluded to go for Confederation, and had made their pledges to the Governor in good faith, or on the other hand, were deceiving His Excellency, descending to duplicity and deceit, for the sole purpose of retaining for a little while longer the seals of office. His Excellency had put it to them pointedly: I must have Confederation with Mr. Wilmot or with you; I prefer it with you; choose which course you will adopt. Had they been opposed to union still, and not under the influence of a lust for power, every high minded feeling would have prompted them to have then resigned and made way for Mr. Wilmot. Mr. Smith boasts of his having no desire for office; this is his continual cry, but I think his past political history shows that he, not less than those whom he so abundantly decries, has had an eye to the "flesh pots." I speak by the record; I know Mr. Smith, having worked with him in the political harness, and I tell him, office has its charms for him as well as for others. Why did he take office when the late Attorney General Fisher went out, at which time there was a gentleman of our party, a personal friend of his own, and one in whom he professed very great interest, and a gentleman quite as competent to fill the office, and quite as sure of being returned by his constituency as Mr. Smith? And where was the public or party exigency that required him to become Attorney General of the present administration, and above all—and this must remain a damning evidence against him, one which sophistry and declamation can never wipe out, that in the instance now immediately under debate—he sacrificed principle—political and moral—for the retention of office. After His Excellency had read the confidential Memorandum to Mr. Smith, he acceded, unfortunately, to that gentleman's request, not to communicate it to his Council. Now how did His Excellency exhibit any desire to entrap, or weave a web around

Mr. Smith, as he has stated? No! the reverse appears to have been the case, for had His Excellency sent that Memorandum to his Council, affairs would at once have been brought to a crisis, and to-day we would have had before us a Minute of Council, signed by every member, and determining exactly how the matter stood. His Excellency followed Mr. Smith's request, however, in order not to embarrass the debate on want of confidence, and now Mr. Smith has to suffer the consequence of not having acted a frank, manly, and consistent course. His Excellency and Mr. Smith are in direct conflict as to what would be done, subsequent to the striking of the committee. His Excellency says Mr. Smith stated an Address to Her Majesty on the subject would grow out of it; Mr. Smith says it was His Excellency who suggested this. Be that as it may, an inference is irresistible, that Mr. Smith agreed to a scheme of union, and that he agreed to introduce and carry it through the House if his influence and that of his supporters could do it; and that he admitted that an Address to the Queen might grow out of it; then are Mr. Smith's statements about His Excellency endeavoring to weave a web about him likely to be believed? His Excellency, it will be observed, declines to enter into a discussion about words used in conversation, but very properly refers to the general statement of facts, to corroborate what he has alledged. Mr. Smith told His Excellency that he had consulted with his friends, and they had consented to support him in the course he had proposed to pursue, and then the terms of the Speech were decided upon. Now, was this a true statement by Mr. Smith! Take the statements of Mr. Gillmor, Mr. Botsford, of all the supporters of the Government, and they prove that Mr. Smith has misstated facts; that either he did not consult his colleagues, or, if he did consult them, that they declined acceding to his proposition. The only