

the resolution, who called upon the House to support it, says he does not believe a word of it. (Laughter.) The very first sentence that he uttered was that he did not believe in the resolution; for he said that he was in favor of submitting yes or no to the people, but not in the mode proposed by the resolution, the only mode known to our Constitution.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I do not wish my language to be misrepresented by my hon. friend. What I stated was that I did not consider that to be the only way of ascertaining the views of the people, and did not think it wrong to take a vote, yea or nay, upon the question.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Well, my hon. friend from Peel submitted that the appeal should be made in one way, the constitutional way, and that was the way my hon. friend from North Ontario did not like. How could my hon. friend suppose that a vote like that could be taken in a country whose Constitution is modelled on the Constitution of England? By what contrivance known to our Constitution could we take such a vote? There is none such. There is no means, no system, by which we could make an appeal of that kind, and in order to do it we should have to subvert the principles of the British Constitution. The hon. gentleman knows there is no means of doing it. We might, indeed, pass a law declaring that the people shall vote yes or no on this question; but such a law would in itself be a change in our Constitution, and I would like to see any man representing Her Majesty in this country give his sanction to a measure of that kind, which would be a subversion of the first principles of British constitutional government. Sir, we in this House are representatives of the people, and not mere delegates; and to pass such a law would be robbing ourselves of the character of representatives, and be a proceeding which even the honorable member for Chateauguay himself denounces in language, although he supports it in countenance when pressed by others. That hon. gentleman is too familiar with the principles of British constitutional government to support such a proceeding himself, but still he encourages others to do it, and to say that which he would not advance himself. (Hear, hear.) Sir, a reference to the people—a direct reference to the people—of a question of this kind may be the means by which

a despot, an absolute monarch, may get that popular confirmation and approval which he desires for the laws necessary to the support and continuation of his usurpation. It may be the means by which a despot, at the point of the bayonet, may ask the people to vote yea or nay on the measure he proposes; but in every free country where there is a Constitution at all, the vote must be taken by the constituted authorities, the representatives of the people, and not become a mere form and cover to tyranny, but a measure which accords with the calm and deliberate judgments of the people, as expressed through their representatives. (Hear, hear.) I was rather alarmed when I first read the notice given by my hon. friend from Peel, and feared that he was going to take the course advised by the hon. member for North Ontario, because the language of his notice was undefined upon the subject. I, however, had every confidence in the constitutional principles—the conservative principles—of the hon. gentleman; but as the language of the notice was not clear, I was exceedingly relieved when he read the motion to the House in its present complete shape. I admit that it was quite open to any member of this Parliament to move either that the House be dissolved or not dissolved. I admit that the hon. member had a constitutional right to move that the House be dissolved, with a view of referring this question to the people, and therefore it was that I felt relieved when I found that this was the course he proposed, and regret, on the other hand, that the hon. member for North Ontario has so far fallen away from his old conservative principles as to take the other ground. Now, what is the opinion entertained upon this subject in England? I was exceedingly pleased to read lately the report of a speech delivered to his constituents, at Huddersfield, by Mr. LEATHAM, a member of the Imperial Parliament. He is, I believe, a brother-in-law of Mr. JOHN BRIGHT, and belongs to the advanced Liberal school of English politicians, known as the Manchester school; and although educated in the political doctrines of that school, he yet had the courage to get up before the people of Huddersfield, as Radical a constituency as any in all England, and spoke in strong language against the Permissive Bill, a temperance measure which resembles that passed through this Legislature by the hon. member for Brome, because he held that it was uncon-