

privileges which are dearest to them, and that without consulting them. It would be madness—it would be more, it would be a crime. On these grounds I shall oppose this scheme with all the power at my command, and insist that under any circumstances it shall be submitted to the people before its final adoption. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—MR. SPEAKER, I received intelligence this evening that the Hon. member for Hochelaga was about to reply to my speech of the 2nd of March, and that is why I came here. Otherwise, as I have not yet quite recovered, I should have remained at home; but I frankly acknowledge that if I had foreseen that I should have had to listen to such a speech as that which we have just heard, I should not have put myself out of the way for so little. Any one hearing him speak must have said: "Either he is not a very powerful reasoner, or this hon. member has but a poor idea of the intelligence of this House and but little respect for his colleagues." But for my two pamphlets and for the speech of the Hon. Solicitor General, which he read and commented upon as he knows how to do, he would very speedily have found himself aground; but by deriving assistance in the way I have mentioned, he contrived to find the means of speaking for three hours. (Hear, hear.) Is it necessary for me to repeat that I have never denied the opinions which I held in former days? Nor will I deny them to-night. I acknowledge freely that my opinions on certain matters have changed. Of what advantage, then, can it be to him to spend his time in repeating what I admit myself? If I proved to him that he had changed several times himself, I did not do so to lay blame upon him, but to reproach him with denying his past career, in order that he might be more at his ease in that which he is at present following. (Hear, hear.) But, for that matter, what does it signify to the country that he or I held one opinion yesterday and that we hold another to-day? What the country requires to know is whether the scheme of Confederation which is submitted to us by the Government is good or bad. (Hear, hear.) The man who declares that he has never changed his opinion on any subject whatever is, to my thinking, a simpleton. The public requirements change with circumstances, and necessarily bring with them other ideas. (Hear, hear.) We do not eat when we are

no longer hungry, nor drink when our thirst is satisfied. Did the hon. member, for instance, put in practice, when in power, the doctrine which he enunciated respecting the double majority, when he was seated on the Opposition benches? When the House was engaged in debating a resolution, the object of which was to affirm the principle of the double majority, the present Hon. President of the Council having got up to say that he would never have governed Upper Canada by means of a Lower Canada majority, the hon. member for Hochelaga rose in his turn to declare that he also would never consent to govern in opposition to the will of Lower Canada. And yet, in 1858, did he not enter a Cabinet which was refused by nearly all the members from Lower Canada?

HON. MR. DORION—I said that at the time of the formation of the BROWN-DORION Ministry. I told the Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) that I would not undertake to carry through the Legislature the four great measures which were then in question, without the consent of the majority of the representatives from Lower Canada.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Ah, yes! An excellent reason can always be found for retaining power when we have it, in spite of our own declarations. In 1862, did he not form part of a Government situated in the same position? And from 1863 to 1864 did he not govern Lower Canada with a rod of iron, supported only by a weak Lower Canadian minority?

HON. MR. DORION—The only measure passed in 1863, that relating to Separate Schools in Upper Canada, was carried by a majority in both provinces.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—That is not so, as the Upper Canadian majority voted against that bill, which owed its safety to Lower Canadians only. But it is the principle which is in question here, and the hon. member cannot divert the attention of the House from that fact. If the double majority was good in one case, it must be so in all cases, in legislation as in administration, but more especially in administration, which cannot and ought not to be based on anything except public opinion. Now, the hon. member for Hochelaga certainly governed his country despite the majority of its representatives. (Hear, hear.) He has spoken to us of the petitions presented to this House against the scheme of Confeder-