

people is to be treated, hon. gentlemen will soon find out that they are on the wrong track; and when Parliament is again summoned, they will be met by a voice from the people that will show them that they have adopted a course that will consign names that have heretofore been honorable, to political oblivion, on account of this outrage upon the rights and liberties of a free people, and it will be an oblivion that will be richly merited. (Loud cheers.)

MR. SCATCHERD said:—The resolutions under debate, involving as they do an entire change in the Constitution of this country, I regard as of greater importance than any question that has been debated before this House since the union. So sweeping a change seldom takes place except after war or insurrection. (Hear, hear.) But we have had neither war nor insurrection—(hear)—we have enjoyed a very long season of peace and quietness, and at no time has there been an agitation among the people for such a change as that now proposed. I believe this scheme to have been undertaken mainly because the leaders of the two political parties saw that they had no hope left of continuing in office on the one hand, or getting into office on the other, while they fought against each other. I have heard it asserted in this House and out of this House, that so grave had become the position of public affairs, that all government had become impossible, and that the gravity of the occasion required that men of all parties should unite to find a solution of existing difficulties. I hope this was not a mere pretence, put forward by men in office to continue in office, and by men out of office to get into office. It is a fact well known, that so long as either party could govern without the assistance of the other, no advance was made toward a union between the leaders. The changing of two or three votes in this House would have indefinitely postponed the scheme now under consideration. That there was no necessity occasioned by a dead-lock in carrying on the Government must be apparent, when we consider that political parties, by a little forbearance, would have avoided the dead-lock. Surely, if parties could unite as they did in June last, they could have united to prevent the difficulty complained of, and have put off the evil day perhaps forever, without entering upon a scheme to subvert the Constitution. If a dead-lock existed, it ought

to be attributed rather to the contention of parties than to any defect in our form of government. (Hear, hear.) The union between the Canadas took place in 1840; for some time afterwards each section was represented in the united Legislature by forty-two members. Upper Canada at the time of the union had a population of 486,000, and Lower Canada 661,000. After the union took place, from 1844 to 1848, the majority of the Government was a very narrow one. The Government was kept in power by two or three votes; yet during these years there was not a suggestion in favor of a change of Constitution for the purpose of increasing the majority. (Hear, hear.) The same number of members continued to represent each section of the province until 1854, when the number from each section was increased to sixty-five, and has continued so to the present time. From the year 1854 until the present time, there has existed among the people of Upper Canada a strong agitation in favor of representation according to population. That principle was agitated by the Reform party at every election. It was the principal political topic, and members were required to pledge themselves to maintain it under all circumstances upon the floor of this House. And not only was the Reform party committed to that principle, but many Conservatives were forced to declare themselves in favor of it. In 1858 some of the members of the Government sent an official letter to England, in which the difficulties of the country were graphically referred to, and the agitation was characterized as being fraught with great danger to the peaceful and harmonious working of our constitutional system, and consequently detrimental to the progress of the province. This document was laid before Parliament in February, 1859, and in November of the same year the Toronto Convention met, where the Reform party was represented by about 570 prominent gentlemen from all parts of Upper Canada. At that meeting the grievances of which Upper Canada complained were discussed in an able manner by gentlemen fully acquainted with them, and capable of setting them forth. Although the project of a Federal union of the provinces had been brought before Parliament and the country in February, and the Convention met in November, and ample time was given for its agitation, we find that the Convention did