

Hon. ATTY. GEN. remarked that the present government had disposed of more of these disputed claims than any previous one, and they had a pretty good list bequeathed to them by their predecessors. Not that he imputed any blame to them, for as the member for Colchester had truly said, there were no subjects so difficult to deal with as the claims referred to, and very often the delay was occasioned by the dilatoriness of the claimants themselves—where the rights of four or five were involved, and correspondence had to be opened with first one and then another in order to elicit all the information, it was a difficult matter to arrive at an early decision. As regards the case mentioned by the member for Guysborough, it had never been officially brought to the notice of the government, but he remembered having a conversation with the member for Eastern Halifax (Mr. Balcom) on the subject, and if he was not mistaken the Surveyor reported that the land had been previously granted, or that something was wrong.

Mr. S. CAMPBELL—No.

Mr. BALCOM—also denied the statement.

Hon. ATTY. GENL.—Then it must have been some other case the hon. gentleman mentioned to me. This case, however, has not been brought to the notice of the Government, and consequently they cannot be blamed.

Mr. STEWART CAMPBELL said that it was no answer to say that because the matter had not been immediately brought under the notice of the government, that they were not to blame. He held in his hand the return of their own officer, showing that the money had been paid two years ago, and it was their duty to have seen that the grant was made.

Mr. BALCOM stated that when he applied for the grant and had paid his money, he enquired whether he could work upon the land but was told he could not until the grant passed. When he asked how soon he would get it, he was told as soon as possible. The winter before last he wished to cut wood upon it but refrained in consequence of not having his grant; and when he enquired last winter why the land was not laid out, he was told in the Crown Land Office that the Surveyor would be instructed to do so—but when he returned home in the spring to his surprise he found that it had not been done, nor was it to this day.

Mr. MILLER said that he did not think that the house had been much complimented by the tone of the speech they had just listened to from the hon. Prov. Secy—nor could he imagine that the hon. gentleman's followers and supporters would be much flattered, by being represented as deaf men—incapable of being influenced by arguments and only capable of forming their conclusions from the gesticulations of their leader. The hon. gentleman is always unfortunate in his attempts at humorous illustrations, but he is extremely so in the present case. If his anecdote is good for anything it tells most strongly against himself. If the man who loses his temper first is the one who gets the worst of the argument, then he certainly must feel that he has been worsted in the present instance. If temper had been exhibited in this discussion, he could safely ask, who had been the first to show it? The Prov. Secretary had submitted a return from the Commissioner of Crown Lands. He (Mr. M.)

had made some remarks upon it, and he was in the judgment of the house if he had not done so in the most courteous and respectful manner. What did we then witness? The hon. Provincial Secretary got up, and in that peculiar tone of sarcasm for which he has become unenviably noted abroad as well as at home assailed him in unfair terms, and charged him with motives entirely unjustifiable under the circumstances. Nothing was farther from his mind than to say anything unnecessarily offensive to the government. His only object was to serve the public interests, and to endeavor to promote the efficiency of a department in which the people were so deeply interested. The hon. gentleman was, therefore, not justified in the course he adopted.—It only clearly proved his loss of temper, and consequently that his cause was bad, and the position he assumed untenable. But it was very evident why the Prov. Sec. had exhibited so much temper. He had been touched in a weak joint in his harness, and he could not withstand the truth of the assertion that he and his Government had been guilty of gross neglect in reference to the management of the Crown Land Department. It would be for the country to judge whether the Provincial Secretary had raised himself in their estimation by the exhibition he has just made of himself—or whether he had advanced the dignity of his position by the course he had adopted. He had thought proper to use the term "false," in connection with the remarks he (Mr. M.) had made. The proper course probably would have been to have called him to order for the use of unparliamentary language. He did not know in what sense that hon. gentleman intended to apply the expression but he threw back the words to him in whatever application he had used them. The hon. Prov. Secy. had endeavoured to misrepresent his meaning in reference to the observation he had made on a previous day when this return was laid on the table, and to get the House and the country to believe that he had expressed his astonishment at the smallness of the number of disputed claims. Now, what he did say was that he was surprised that the return did not include a larger number, as he intended his inquiry to embrace all descriptions of cases pending in the Department. It would not do, therefore, for the Provincial Secretary to endeavour to misrepresent his language, and create a false impression as to the observations he had made. The hon. gentleman had better have spared the remark that he (Mr. Miller) was groping in the dark and did not understand the matter he was talking about. Such language was simply offensive, and nothing more. It did not require very extensive knowledge, or enlarged abilities to deal with this question of the Crown Land Office—and altho' every one could not be supposed to be endowed with the superior attainments and vast intellectual powers of one of the "ablest statesmen of British America," yet it was not a difficult matter to deal with a subject like the present. It would have comported more then with the dignity of the position that hon. gentlemen held, if he had been more guarded in his language. The sooner the hon. gentleman got over his bad habits of sarcasm and vituperation, the more qualified will he become for his position. For his