

ever been taken on any debated question on any occasion.

Atty.-Gen. MACDONALD said the manner in which the motion had been submitted must have commended itself to the feeling of the House. It was, in view of the circumstances of the case, but proper that he should set forth the views which led him and his hon. friends to support the resolution of the hon. member on the previous occasion. It was his view and that of his hon. friends, that they should not take such steps as proposed by the hon. member upon legislation which had so recently taken place. Confederation was submitted in the first instance to the people of Upper and Lower Canada as a means of settling the differences between them; and in 1859 nothing further was contemplated than to give to those two Provinces the control of their own affairs; but it subsequently occurred to the Convention on Confederation that they might introduce into their scheme a power of enlargement, so that they might take in the other Provinces, if they were willing to come in. The negotiation was carried on by Upper and Lower Canada, and instead of the other Provinces being desirous that they should come in, the other two Provinces alone desired that end with a view to settle their differences, and to strengthen the Confederation. The various steps in the negotiation were then severally traced, in order to show that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were unfavourable to Confederation, and that additional grants were made in order to induce them to enter the Union. The Colonial Secretary had left the question for decision by the Dominion Parliament, and the subsidy was then increased by 1,000,000 dollars, with the understanding that it was to be in full settlement of all demands. He believed there was no possibility of any future similar occasion arising; and he considered that the motion of his hon. friend had come too soon. The hon. member thought that it was better to declare in advance that danger might result from leaving the question still open; and that it was necessary that the powers of the Dominion Parliament should be precisely defined. But he did not think that the power referred to would be likely to be exercised again, for he did not think that any of the Provinces would for years to come ask for such a grant. The hon. member had thought fit, however, to test the opinion of the House, and the Provincial Secretary had moved an amendment. It looked queer and odd enough to him for them to be so anxious to bring about a state of things, and that almost the whole of Upper Canada should be in favour of Confederation—and although he personally was not in favour of Confederation, yet he was just as earnestly desiring to carry it out as his hon. friend opposite—that they should be the first to complain. His hon. friend might say that the wisest way of quieting the minds of the people of Ontario—of making the Confederation work harmoniously—would be to define it in the manner he proposes, to bring down to a certainty the terms on which Confederation has been brought about. But supposing they were rubbed—supposing they were told that the British Government had passed a measure of Confederation upon the terms which the people of Ontario themselves desired, and which was agreed to by the delegates of all the other Provinces, that they would not alter it upon the petition of simply one Province—why should not the British Government submit that the other Provinces had an equal interest? He thought it was remarkable that the terms of Confederation did not provide a way in which the Constitution should be changed—that it did not say that the consent of the majority of the Provinces should be necessary, in order to say what was established by the hon. gentleman. He had no doubt that the British Government would accede to the wishes of the majority; but did he suppose that because they assented it they would obtain it as a matter of course? He felt that the request would not be granted, and what would be the result? His hon. friend would establish a feeling of dissatisfaction in the very Province which brought about Confederation, and this would produce agitation. He had seen agitation caused by the refusal of the British Government to accede to the demands made by a Legislature sitting in that very Chamber. But he did not say that anything of that kind was intended, all he could say was, that the result would be that the people of Ontario, who knew they were the greatest power in the Dominion, and who had a larger measure of interest than the other Provinces would feel injured. It was on that account that he did what he did the other night. They had had an intimation of the alteration of the financial basis in the subsidy to New Brunswick, and they knew all along the increased subsidy to Nova Scotia. They had Government warning of the additional grant. The hon. gentleman for South Bruce has taken upon himself a heavy responsibility from which he would shrink. He had supported the last resolution of the hon. member, and he was prepared to support what followed, and should therefore vote for the address to Her Majesty. (Hear, hear.) But he would still believe that there would be far greater danger to the peace and quietude of the country in adopting the address, than there would be if the matter were allowed to stand, because there was not the slightest danger to fear that a change would be made in the financial arrangements of the Dominion. With these remarks, he was prepared to vote cordially with his hon. friend, although he must say that he believed the hon. gentleman would have cause to regret his motion in this matter.

Mr. LAUDER also regretted the discussion that had taken place, it was the duty of the Legislature to work as harmoniously as they could, as they were the most powerful of the Provinces. He thought that when these resolutions were introduced, they would have a disquieting effect, and he still feared so. The great object aimed at in certain quarters was, that the negotiation with Nova Scotia should be stopped.

Mr. BLAKE said, that the hon. member had no right to refer to what had taken place in the previous resolutions. He might also say that he did not, of course, wish to hinder discussion.

Mr. LAUDER would not further refer to these proceedings. They said in this address that Nova Scotia would adopt unfair means, and that one partner, would endeavour to act unfairly by the other partners. The hon.

member for Bruce would find when he went to Ottawa he would meet with a stronger opposition than before. He was not prepared to say it was not a good and expedient measure to conciliate Nova Scotia. No one could tell what might have been the result of the trouble in that Province, if such steps had not been taken. The idea of Confederation was not prompted by mercenary motives, but in a desire to build up a nation—to give permanency to this country. The feeling of this country was not in favour of agitating this Nova Scotia question. The feeling was that this final settlement should not be disturbed. It was absurd to petition the British Government when the result might be known. The petition would be refused, and considered an interference with matters beyond the scope of this Legislature. He was not prepared to record a silent vote. He strongly opposed this present agitation, but he had voted for the previous motion and he would vote for this. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Mr. SCOTT said he took the same view now that he did on the former occasion, that there was no cause for alarm. We should simply receive a "slap on the face" for what would be considered an interference on the part of this House with matters beyond their jurisdiction. He would therefore oppose the address.

Mr. CLARKE said this address coming so soon after the Dominion Act would lead to but one conclusion, that the Dominion Government had done wrong, and while the royal assent might be given to the Dominion Act, this address would be considered as a protest against it. The reason which he considered the strongest against this address was that it would be considered an appeal from the people of Ontario through their representatives. This would lead to a conflict which must terminate either in diminishing the power of this House, or in weakening and discouraging the Dominion House. The Imperial Government would be called on to consider this address. If they conceded to the demand, they must disallow the Dominion Act; but on the other hand, they might decide that this was a question to be dealt with by the Dominion Parliament, which was as supreme in Canada as the Imperial Parliament was in England.

Mr. BLAKE—Then they have the power to alter the basis of representation.

Mr. CLARKE held they had. They were empowered to enact laws for the good of the people of the Dominion. By the Confederation Act they possessed sovereign powers, and it was by virtue of these powers they passed the Act to conciliate Nova Scotia.

The House rose at six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS,

Mr. CLARKE resumed the debate. He continued to speak of the powers possessed by Parliament, and said that no legislature possessed the power of making laws which should be final, and to be binding for all time to come. When the majority of the people desired to change any law they possessed the power and the right to do so. In the neighbouring Republic, certain States asserted certain rights which were not admitted by the Central Government. The result was the late four years' struggle, which resulted in the extinction of the asserted rights for the safety of the national existence. The hon. gentlemen opposite were about to follow the course of the Southern States. They asserted a right to advise the Imperial authorities to pass a law which should be binding on the Dominion Parliament for all time to come. The reply to such a demand would be a refusal. What then would be the course of the hon. gentlemen opposite? Were they going to advise a secession from the Union, or were they going to get up an agitation? No doubt they would endeavour to impress on the people that there was a grievance, and the people would soon be taught to believe

it, they would learn only one side of the question. An agitation would be commenced; it would gain strength, till at the end of two years it would be found that there would be a positive hostility on the part of this Province against Nova Scotia. The sore would fester, the central Government would lose strength, and then would come the end of Confederation. Honourable gentlemen might say, well, what if it should be so? It was asserted that the object of entering into Confederation was to settle our Provincial difficulties. He denied that was the object of Confederation. The object was to bind the Provinces together into one grand Union. If Ontario was so jealous of its powers—if it could not work harmoniously with the whole, the only course was to drop out of the Union. And what then? Did anyone suppose that a country with a million and a half of population could maintain a separate existence? It would be absorbed into the neighbouring Republic within a year. And then what would become of those rights of which hon. gentlemen opposite were so jealous? The Southern States asserted their rights, and we all know the result. Supposing we should appeal to Washington, it was not likely our protest would receive even as much consideration as this address, now before the House, if it should pass. Silence was sometimes golden, and it would be well if hon. members opposite would remember this fact; they would not then place themselves in their present unfortunate position. A man or a nation that was forever asserting its rights was a nuisance to the community and lost the respect of all. He (Mr. C.) did not wish that it should go forth to the world that Ontario had placed itself in a position of antagonism to Nova Scotia and to the Central Government and its policy. The passed declaring a resolution that it was inexpedient that any change should be made in the Confederation Act. It was competent for this House to pass its opinion, but it was quite another affair to embody that opinion in an address. It was quite competent therefore for any hon. member who had voted for the resolution to oppose this address on the ground that he had gone far enough. He (Mr. C.) would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Lyon, "That all the words after the word 'that,' be left out, and the following substituted—that it is inexpedient to present any Address to Her Majesty the Queen which may be considered as an expression of dissatisfaction at the action of the Imperial Government with the Dominion Government

with a view to allay the disaffection in Nova Scotia." (Applause.)

Mr. LYON, in seconding the resolution, regretted that the time of the House should be taken up with these frivolous matters, and he called on every member in the House, whether he voted for the resolution of the hon. member for Bruce the other evening or not, to vote against the address to-night.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said he had moved a six months' hoist the other evening to the resolutions of the hon. member for South Bruce, but one of these resolutions had been carried. The natural sequence of that resolution was legislation to carry it out. (Hear, hear.) But, while he said this, he denied that the address moved by the hon. gentleman was calculated to effect that object. It would require a unanimous movement on the part of the whole Dominion. He was opposed to the Confederation scheme from the beginning, knowing that Ontario, being the richest Province, would gain least by it. One of the chief agitators of the scheme was the Hon. George Brown. He represented that the country was going to ruin through its connection with Quebec, and that the only safety for the Province was to enter into a union with the Lower Provinces. That Upper Canada was not in such a sad condition, the state of the country and its finances at the time plainly showed. The Hon. President of the Council (Mr. Brown) at that time pointed out that there was a higher object to be gained by Union. He spoke of the consolidation of British power on this continent, and the safety and prosperity which must inevitably follow. He (Mr. C.) at the time urged that there could be no gain in this respect. (Here the hon. gentleman quoted from the Confederation debates, and explained the position which he took at the time.) At that time, he predicted what must follow. Agitation followed, and would follow. Who was to receive any benefit by this agitation? The hon. member for Bruce who received the name of being an able legislator, who was said to be a very Bacon in intellect, had kept up an agitation ever since he took a seat in the House. And what had he gained by it? (Hear, hear.) Why, he had succeeded in nothing but making long speeches, and wasting the time of the House. When Nova Scotia appealed to the Imperial Parliament for redress, they were referred to the Dominion Government, and so would Ontario if she followed the same course. The hon. gentlemen opposite were the very ones who brought these evils upon themselves, and they should submit to them without creating a useless agitation. They should take the responsibility on themselves. Let them send their address to the Imperial Government. Let them go to Great Britain with their grievance, a grievance much lighter than Nova Scotia complained of, and let them meet with the same answer that our sister Province received—go to the Dominion Parliament. With these views he was prepared to vote for the motion of the hon. member for South Bruce (laughter and applause) and vote against the amendment. He would not give the hon. gentlemen opposite a chance to raise a selfish cry at the polls next election that the Government had voted against a measure for giving justice to Nova Scotia. He (Mr. C.) agreed with the hon. member for Grenville, that we should not go with our grievances to the Imperial Government. We had assumed Responsible Government, and he did not believe in yielding it up again. The hon. member for Grenville might well ask what was to be the result of this Address? Were the hon. gentlemen opposite going to dismember the Union when the Address would be rejected, as rejected it would be. If not, then they were simply going to a great deal of trouble, and raising a great agitation to no purpose. (Applause.)

Mr. COYNE contended that as the leaders of the party represented by the hon. members opposite had accepted Confederation, with all its weaknesses and defects, without submitting it to the people, they should submit to the consequences. He opposed this measure, for he did not desire to give the Imperial Government the power to veto the system of Responsible Government, which was gained after such a long struggle by this Province. He could not agree with the hon. the Provincial Secretary that this measure should be accepted, and the responsibility thrown on the hon. members opposite. He believed the responsibility rested on the whole House. Every member had to bear a share of it. There was a wrong and a wrong to the question, and the one should be supported and the other condemned. He considered the course pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite was wrong, and he would oppose it. It raised sectional feelings, and could not but result in harm.

Mr. BLAKE, in reply, said the hon. gentleman who had last spoken had called upon him to consider whether it might not be possible that he might be wrong. He would recall to the hon. gentleman's recollection that he was only the organ of a vast majority of this House in moving the resolution which he moved; he would recall to the hon. gentleman that it was not upon his own individual opinion, but that it was the opinion of his hon. friends with whom he usually acted—it was not only upon the opinion of those gentlemen, even coupled with the opinions of others equally respectable, who were usually adversaries of his, but he added to these names, the united voice of the Administration of the day. Did he say that he had the voice? He erred—it was their votes, for their voices he had not got. (Hear, hear.) Such a spectacle as had that night been presented by men who the other night voted in favour of the resolutions, from which this necessarily follows—by men who having so voted—having owned their intention to vote for that necessary consequence, and who yet stood up there to condemn it as inexpedient in the highest sense of view, as futile in the lower sense, and as incapable of any good result. Such a spectacle as had been presented that night was, he believed and hoped, without a parallel in the history of the Parliamentary Government of any country. (Hear, hear.) Sir, to see that the members of the Administration who at the opening, he was glad to say, he believed sincerely approved of his resolution. He put it in that spirit, for he did believe it, but their own language had undeceived him

That the Government should make hold to say that they voted for the resolution, which they thought wrong and inexpedient—which they thought the highest interests of the country required should not be voted for—that they were going to vote for an address which they thought wrong and inexpedient, and which would produce an agitation through the country which could not do good, but which would do harm, was humiliating and demoralizing in the extreme. He could respect the position of the hon. member for Grenville, and of the hon. members for Peel and Ottawa. If the latter member had spoken after the speech of the Hon. Provincial Secretary, he might have equally applied to him and to the Atty.-General the words he had used with reference to the member for Grey. He agreed with those members that the position that those gentlemen would occupy in giving their votes was a most humiliating position, for they were about to give a vote which they believed to be wrong, and which they said they thought that other members ought not to give, and which was against the best interests of the country. But what was the reason that the Provincial Secretary gave the vote that he did? It was true that he had allowed some portion of his own feelings to escape him, it was true that he had said that he would have liked better to have let the usual result of a defeat follow, and he endeavoured to throw the responsibility of the step upon him, but he would tell him not to hope to escape from the full responsibility of this measure. He and

the members of his Administration had determined to take a particular course; and, upon reflection, they had resolved to pursue that course; and he would tell them that the country would not be satisfied with the avowal that they themselves made—but although they believed that the best interests of the whole country would be injured; that although they believed it would be wrong, and impolitic, and inexpedient to pass the resolution, yet because a majority had voted in favour of it, because they believed the people of the country were in favour of it, they were prepared to bow to the popular will, and were prepared to vote for that which they believed would be detrimental to the interests of the country, lest they should be ejected from office. (Cheers.) Were these the men to control the legislation of this country? In whom was the country to put their confidence? Men who said—"We will vote for what we think wrong, because we fear that you will be able to delude the people into the idea that you are right, and that you will defeat us consequently at the polls, because we think that you will be able to raise a false issue, therefore, we will act in opposition to the interests of our country; and, although we see we would be acting in the interests of the country in opposing you, yet we will vote wrongly with you!" He had more confidence in the people of the country than to vote upon the supposition that they would be led into any mistaken view; he had more confidence in the constituencies than to suppose that the course which he should take on any particular subject would be considered from any such basis; and to say that an Administration, which was prepared to act as the present did, was governing the country, was to say something which was contradicted by their acts to-night. But what were the arguments that had been used? If the interests of this country required that this proceeding should be taken, and their vote implied that they did think so, was it their duty to influence the opinions of others who had to vote on the passage of this Address by the speeches they had delivered that night? Was it their duty to minimize the weight of their vote by their voices, their arguments, their individual views; to detach their supporters from the course which they themselves, from the noble and patriotic motives they had avowed, were going to support. But let them understand that while it would go forth to the people that they had voted in favour of the address, it would be known that they had done and said everything that they could consistently with avoiding a Government defeat to magnify the minority, and even to create a majority against the passage of the resolution, and they had said that the responsibility would be cast upon the hon. members on this side, but he should have something to say about that presently. The country would understand what he had done. In opening the question he had referred to the importance of this address passing by as large a majority as possible in that House, but this so far from being recognized by those who said they should support it, had been so lightly valued, that on the contrary they had done their best to accomplish the defeat of that purpose. He wondered whether those were the grounds upon which, in times past, the Hon. Provincial Secretary had supported the principle of Representation by Population—was it that he was afraid to meet the people at the polls upon "a false sectional issue"—upon this cry of "agitate, agitate, agitate?" How were they to account for the past political conduct of the hon. gentleman? When they found that, as a member of the Administration of the day, he was going to vote against what he thought would be to the interest of the country, because he was afraid that the people might differ from him, and that, therefore, the people might eject him from office. (Hear, hear.) But, he says it is very important that there should be a good Government at the present time, that it is a necessity to the country, and that the present Government is the only good Government; and, therefore, it is necessary that they should continue in office. (Cheers and groans.) Therefore, though they had such an opinion of this motion, they would vote for it; but while doing so they would speak against it—they would damage the cause as much as possible—they will say everything they can to induce others to vote against them, although they are going to vote in favour of them themselves—that they have not sufficient moral courage, and are not sufficiently alive to the responsibilities which persons who fill their seats should feel, to put their votes and voices together to vote according to the dictates of their conscience, but they voted one way while they spoke another. He would try to answer some of the arguments which had been made use of by his supporters on this occasion; he would try to show the Government who were going to support him on this occasion why they