

now? Why not then? Because now the Conservatives are in office, and are aided by the Catholics—therefore it is that an attempt is made to raise a political feeling on the question; but that will not do for the country. The hon. member let out something in his speech of seven hours. He said that when the Conservatives got a hold of the public works, a row was kicked up, and it was requisite to form an Association;—so that it was not religion alone, but the public works also; and the latter probably assumed the more prominent place in the estimation of some gentlemen. Let us hear no more of the hon. member's peculiar guardianship of religion, a stronger arm than his may be depended on for its support. Objection was not made to Catholic opposition at a time when offence was given, because then aid was required;—now, when no such offence appears, it is pretended that to have that aid is something dreadful. He would fain make us believe that the government is subject to great pressure from the Roman Catholics. I declare, however, whether the assertion be credited or not, that no pressure from high or low, rich or poor, have been brought to bear on me, nor on my colleagues that I know of. When I was coming to Halifax, some influential persons of that denomination warned me, remarking that there were many of the poorer of their people in the city, and that if they attempted to press, I should not be pressed by them, and that in yielding I should not consider that I was serving those who gave me the advice. That was the language used to me by gentlemen having a large stake in the country; and I would not do right did I not state the circumstance. That is the kind of pressure that I have experienced; they kept pressure off instead of the reverse. We have had pressure, however, from some who ought to be ashamed of its exercise, and who were not Catholics. Talk not to me of priest-ridden people, I see more of that out of the Catholic pale than within it.

I was amused at the distinction made by the member for Windsor between Scotch and Irish Catholics. He enquired whoever heard him say a word against his friend Mr. Bourneuf, or his dear old friend the member for Clare. He was so complimentary that I feared for the fidelity of my old friend; I doubted whether Eve was more tempted by the serpent than the member for Clare, by the member for Windsor. He said—Would I not have made Mr. Doyle Solicitor General,—and did I not want to make him Judge, but his own people would not let me. If so, why does he charge them unjustly? If they would not consent to that, when they had the power, why attribute improper pressure to them now! He who acts in that way, sows the wind, and may expect to reap the whirlwind. He says also, would I not do anything I could for my friend Mr. McLeod,—did he press? No; although the member for Windsor wished that one of the denomination should be head of a department. If there was no pressure then, why conclude that there is now? That people supported the hon. gentleman for ten years, and with the enthusiasm peculiar to themselves. It comes hard from him, therefore, to cast any slur on their character,—particularly when he himself gives evidence that when he wanted to do what neither they nor I would agree to, they told him to stay his hand. Who that recollects the eloquence and talents of Lawrence O'Conner Doyle,

but regrets his departure from the country; and that he did not so act as to remain honored and useful here? The hon. member says, that the member for Guysboro' made little of the Gourlay's shantie row, as compared with the conflict at Fox Island. They did contend like men there, and when it was over bore no malice, but were ready to fight for one another next day. But here, in the city of Halifax, with troops at your back, the fight of Gourlay's shanty appears to have frightened you out of your propriety. I could take half a dozen men from my county that would beat all the set you speak of. What was done in the Fox Island affair? The ring-leaders were arrested, convicted and punished. We did not try to implicate all the Catholic inhabitants of Guysboro',—we did not insult them—No; if we acted so we would have failed. The people love fair play—they come from the best blood of England and Ireland,—and you mistake the proper way of dealing with them, if you trample on fair play and common justice; if you try to prejudge, and assail their clergy. Here you raised the popular feeling;—the late Prov. Secretary issued his proclamation, and soldiery were sent to the scene. That was a nice way to take up Irish rioters;—you know nothing about it, and should not speak of it. I wonder that men are so un-Irish, who were so long carried on their shoulders. That the hon. member is so differently situated to-day, is his own fault,—and I believe it will be sometime before they lift him up again.

We acted in the way I describe—180 miles from the capital; and in tory times, too. Who took up the men, and who sat as a jury? Catholics as well as Protestants. No distinction was made; the majesty of the law was respected, and took effect, and the people banded themselves together for that purpose. I found myself at the head of 130 fellows, special constables, who would very quickly sweep your railway rioters aside. No taunts or insults were used; they who were in fault were tried and punished by the laws of the province,—and that is an example which the hon. gentleman may follow when he attains to power again, and meets with similar difficulty. If he asks me how to quell a riot, I say not by prejudging, or charges of disloyalty; but by more rational means. I also am mixed up with those charges, as taking part with those implicated. I care little for that, as do those who are best acquainted with me. The late Mr. Uniacke has been spoken of, and I may ask who performed the duties of his office for the last twelve months? The under officer, assisted by others, and we were delighted to have the work done, and to let the principal take the salary. When gentlemen opposite do as much for one of our friends, they may charge us with injustice. We did a little more than our duty in the kindness evinced in that instance. Harshness is one of the last charges that should be brought against the government in reference to their dealings with that officer.

I turn to the Journals of 1839, to show the disposition of the member for Windsor to visit any one with his indignation whom he thought in his way. At that time it was considered well to send a delegation to England, and the late Mr. Hantington and Mr. Young were selected from this branch. It appeared, however, that another was going also, and a committee of the