

violent attack on me, and abused me fearfully, representing me as false to the country, as one who had no interest in it, but who seemed desirous of destroying its best interests; and not satisfied with that, when the battle had been fought, and he might have been supposed content, he attended a meeting in my county, at Moncton, being accompanied by the hon. the Finance Minister, and the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville), being present at this enthusiastic demonstration; when he thought fit to denounce me, in the heart of my own county. He told my constituents that I was an office-seeker, and always had been; that I had knocked at the door of his Government for office. If that is not true, he can rise and correct me. He added, that his Government had refused me office, which, had they given me, would have placed me on the Government side instead of the Opposition. The hon. member for Cumberland must have known there was no foundation in truth for such a statement, and he had a witness beside him, the hon. the Finance Minister, who also knew it was false and baseless. The hon. the First Minister, to do him justice, I believe would say that I never asked for office; but he was kind enough to offer me the Lieutenant-Governorship of my own Province, as did also the hon. the Minister of Railways himself. The latter also offered me the Governorship of Nova Scotia, and a seat in the then Government. I had two offers of a seat in it, which I declined, and yet the hon. gentleman had the hardihood to declare, in my own constituency, that I had asked and been refused office by himself and colleagues. Have I not reason to complain, also, of the conduct of the hon. the Finance Minister, in letting that statement pass uncontradicted? We had been colleagues in the New Brunswick Government, ten or fifteen years, before Confederation; and I appeal to him, whether I ever asked for an office of any kind, either in the Provincial or Dominion Government? The hon. gentleman does me the justice to say I never did. Then, why did he not contradict the charge or the hon. member for Cumberland, made in his presence? I think that was his duty. The hon. Minister of Railways must have been actuated by magnanimity

or very bad personal feeling towards me. I can imagine no other motive for his conduct; to villify and abuse seems to be an instinct of his nature. All I want is fair play in the matter, from both sides, which I believe most hon. gentlemen will allow me. I now wish to read from the *Moncton Times*, the report of a speech of the hon. gentleman, made on the 27th September, 1878, ten days after our elections, in which he speaks of me in this fashion:

"When Mr. Mitchell was Minister of Marine and Fisheries he proposed to protect our Fisheries by fitting out a fleet. The idea was derided by Mr. Mackenzie and his crew, but Mitchell went on with his fleet and soon seized and condemned the American craft and saved the rights of our fishermen. So other industries should be protected.

"Sir Albert Smith had been spreading himself a good deal over the Fishery Award. He ought to be ashamed to speak of it. The Treaty of Washington, under which that Award was made, was carried at the point of the bayonet against Mackenzie and his army. The late Government had carried the Treaty, and they had selected Mr. Mitchell to represent Canada on the Commission. Mr. Mitchell had prepared the case—a case that with anything like fair management must have secured a handsome Award for Canada. But the present Government—and they deserve credit for it—recognised the fact that they had no man of sufficient ability in their ranks, and they selected Sir A. T. Galt, an old friend of Sir John A. Macdonald, to act for Canada. The Knight deserves his title for entrusting the work to Mr. Galt instead of doing it himself, as he thereby secured five and a-half millions instead of half a million that otherwise he would have got. People must be very ungrateful to object to his empty title, as he really saved us \$5,000,000 by recognising his own incapacity and entrusting to Mr. Galt the work he was unfit to do himself.

"Sir John A. Macdonald—and he could not mention that name without saying that he fully endorsed the remarks of Mr. Tilley in declaring that Sir John was the greatest man in Canada, a man who had rendered signal service to his country, to his own personal loss, a man of commanding talents, who could have enjoyed all the comforts that money could procure had he chosen to avoid public life. Sir John A. Macdonald had asked Mr. Mitchell to act as his position entitled him to, but Mr. Smith, who had the same right, waived his claim, and thus saved at least \$5,000,000, that the country undoubtedly would have lost had the case been handled by Mr. Smith."

So far from my having opposed the Washington Treaty, I supported it. I felt, when Sir John A. Macdonald returned from Washington, that the settlement was unfair to the people of this country,