

that may have existed as to the reasons which may have influenced him in changing his position, and in leaving his former friends and going over to his former enemies. Does it follow because a man is a politician and belongs to a particular political party, that he is to be the slave of it, and to repress every conscientious conviction? Changes of this character affect the position of every public man, and should never be made unless upon the very best grounds. A change made under such circumstances as these implies the possession of great courage, because the man who does it knows that he must face a public very apt to imagine that his change may have been made for reasons of a very different character. If Mr. Miller's reasons for his change of position are published as they were given here, as I am informed they have been, it appears to me that he stands, so far as that change is concerned, and ought to stand, exculpated from having acted from the motive attributed to him. I am very glad that this arrangement has been made, and I felt yesterday, when the stage already referred to was reached, that this was the course which men disposed to act rightly towards one another ought to adopt.

Gentlemen of the jury, I am very happy to say that you are relieved from further attendance in this case. It is a happy thing for you, for we had not got half through with it.

The following are the remarks of Mr. Weeks, referred to as appearing in the *Herald*:

"He reminded the Court that there was no plea of justification on the record. The defendant had not ventured to say that the alleged libel is true. He did not say in his pleadings that Mr. Miller was bought or bribed to support the Union. Had he said so, in the face of the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper, and the plaintiff, \$10,000 would not be a cent too much damages to give against the defendant, and he believed if a plea of justification had been pleaded any jury empanelled in this city would give such a verdict. But no such plea had been set up, even before the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper and the plaintiff had been publicly given in this Court. In the face of that evidence (Mr. W. said) the plaintiff was bound to bring this suit, and he should have brought it long ago. Mr. Miller had vindicated his character by evidence on Your Lordship's minutes, which we cannot impeach, but he should have done so sooner. He should not have allowed similar charges to be made against him for years, without giving the explanations that have been given in this trial. It is well for Mr. Miller that this public examination has been made, for the man who will hereafter assail him as he has been assailed in the past would deserve to be punished by a jury. But the defendant did not know the facts of the case until this trial, and he believed the plaintiff's action, unexplained, justified the criticism of the *Chronicle*. That is what the defendant now intended to show: that his criticism was not malicious. In fact, the defendant was not at all in the Province when the alleged libel was published."

This closed an investigation that completely vindicated Senator Miller.