

pure and simple, we say you can't get it—it is not advisable that you should have it, because it is a step in the wrong direction. It is going back. We adopt the principle of Federation, as a step in the right direction, which will, in the meantime, relieve us from the pressing difficulties under which the country labors, and which also looks to the future—to a Federation of all the British North American Provinces first, and beyond that to the admission of other territories into the great North American Confederacy.

Having thus shown the views which were entertained at that time, I feel, honorable gentlemen, that we are perfectly consistent in supporting the main features of this scheme. (Hear, hear.) I think it will be in the recollection of honorable gentlemen, that while this meeting in Toronto took place on the 9th of November, 1859, there was also another meeting in the city of Montreal, on the 25th of October preceding, the proceedings at which to a great extent influenced the decision of that convention. The meeting at Montreal, composed of Lower Canadian Opposition members of Parliament, gave forth to the world a very important and able document—a document which on its face was partly advisory to the members of the Reform party of Upper Canada, who were about to meet in Toronto. It was signed by the following gentlemen: the Hon. Messrs. A. A. DORION, L. T. DRUMMOND, L. A. DESSAULES, and THOMAS D'ARCY MCGEE. If the House will bear with me, I will quote from it as briefly as possible, because it is impossible for me to present, in any language of my own, arguments so cogent, and so satisfactory, in support of the scheme now before the House. (Hear, hear.) After setting forth the necessity of immediate action and deprecating dissolution of the union pure and simple, these gentlemen—who formed a committee of the Liberal party of Lower Canada to prepare this manifesto—say:—

Neither can we comprehend how the re-adjustment of representation could effectually prevent the recurrence of the conflicts and collisions arising out of the distinct character of our two-fold population. In each section there would still be minority and majority parties; and unless the principle of a double majority could be enacted as a fundamental law, we should be exposed to an endless round of the same complaints that we now hear, of one section ruling the other contrary to its well-known public opinion, and to see reproduced in our politics the same passions, the same intrigues, the same corruption and insincerity. The enactment of the double majority is not advocated in any quarter.

I am sorry that my hon. friend from the Grandville Division is not in his place, for I think the remedy he proposes is so ably shown in this document to be insufficient to meet the exigencies of the case, that even he would be convinced of the inadequacy of the views he has just now announced. The language I have quoted is just what we say now, that representation by population *per se* would not afford sufficient means of extrication from our difficulties, and would not give us the hope which the new constitutional system, of which it forms a main feature, does afford, that we will be rid of the evils which have distracted the country. (Hear, hear.) Upper Canada, were that principle engrafted into our legislative union, would undoubtedly have greater power and weight, but as the manifesto justly says:—

We should be exposed to an endless round of the same complaints that we now hear, of one section ruling the other, contrary to its well known public opinion.

We should still have Upper Canada *versus* Lower Canada; because local difficulties, arising out of real or supposed interference with the customs, laws, religious institutions, or sectional questions of any kind, would provoke and perpetuate the same bitter and hostile feelings which have so long annoyed and vexed the people of both sections of the province. (Hear, hear.) The Federative system is the only cure for this great evil. (Hear, hear.) The manifesto of the committee proceeds to say:—

Your committee are impressed with the conviction that whether we consider the present needs or the probable future condition of the country—the true, the statesmanlike solution is to be sought in the substitution of a purely Federative for the present so-called Legislative union. The former, it is believed, would enable us to escape all the evils, and so retain all the advantages appertaining to the existing union, while by restricting the functions of the Federal Government to the few easily-defined subjects of common or national concern, and leaving supreme jurisdiction in all other matters to the several provinces, the people of each sub-division would possess every guarantee for the integrity of their respective institutions which an absolute dissolution of the union would confer.

It is impossible to state in stronger or more appropriate terms than these the advantages set forth in the leading features of this scheme—they are in exact accordance with the principles here so luminously and powerfully stated. One would suppose that