

posed in any British Colonial Legislature, without the sanction of the people, during all future time. (Cheers.)

Mr. T. R. FERGUSON said—I have listened very attentively to the discussion on this question, and it is certainly most singular, as well as amusing, to hear the different views that have been expressed upon it by the advocates of the amendment. The hon. member for Peel, I am certain, felt that his resolution was the most consistent and reasonable one that could have been well introduced on the subject. The hon. member for North Ontario, who seconded the motion, also, no doubt, thought it a very sensible one. I listened carefully to the arguments of both, and I find that they supported the motion from very different points of view. The hon. member for Peel made a strong speech in favor of the scheme of Confederation which has been adopted by this House, and he said he introduced his motion for the purpose of having the people vote upon it, and with the expectation that they would carry it by a very large majority. The hon. member for North Ontario took a very different view of the effect of the resolution, stating that he seconded it because he believed it would result in defeating the Confederation scheme.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON—I think the hon. member is quite mistaken. All I said was that I wished the people to have an opportunity of expressing themselves, so that we might ascertain whether or not they would prefer it to a legislative union.

Mr. T. R. FERGUSON—I beg my hon. friend's pardon; but that was not the object and aim the hon. gentleman had in view in seconding the motion. If his object was not to have the scheme rejected, then I cannot understand his language at all. I seldom agree with the views of the Hon. President of the Council; but on this occasion, I think he pointed out the inconsistencies of the hon. member for Peel in an excellent manner. But there are a few more left untouched, to some of which I will briefly allude. The hon. member for Peel declared that his motion was designed to secure the approval of the people, and that it would result in their approval of the formation of a new nationality. The seconder of the motion supported it because it was designed to secure the condemnation of the scheme, and prevent us from obtaining that new nationality. The hon. member for Peel stated that he was in favor of

having a dissolution of Parliament, so that a constitutional expression could be had through a general election. Now, for my own part, I doubt whether, if there were a dissolution of this House to-morrow, we would get a full, true and fair expression of opinion from the people at all. I believe that side-issues would creep in in every case—that the Conservative party would hang together in most instances, and the Reform party do the same, and that numerous local questions would interfere with the results sought to be obtained. My hon. friend from North Ontario declares himself in favor of having a direct vote of the people. Were it not that that is declared an unconstitutional method, I should say it was the only true course to be adopted, because it is the only way of properly testing public opinion on any one measure. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, the hon. member for Peel is one of the cleverest men in the province, but I must say that my experience with regard to his movements in Parliament is that he does not exhibit himself in anything like so clever or successful a manner as he does when pleading at the bar. I have never seen him taking a prominent position in this House, and playing his part in that position in a successful manner. If he had moved his amendment before the resolutions were adopted, I would have been able to have given him credit for sincerity, if not for ability, in advocating it; but after the resolutions have been passed, he brings up an amendment to another motion that is evidently hostile to the resolutions. Well now, let us take a look at the assertions of the hon. member for Cornwall, and I think we will be able to see the inconsistency still more clearly. The position he takes is, that if these resolutions are referred to the people, and are by them voted down, every honorable member who voted for them in this House must immediately resign his seat. Now, sir, what would be the result of that principle as affecting the hon. member who moved and the hon. member who seconded the amendment now in your hands? Why, sir, instead of having them both on the floor of this House to carry out the views of the people, one of them certainly must leave, if the views of the honorable member for Cornwall are carried out. I think every honorable gentleman must see clearly that whatever way you view the positions taken by the mover and seconder of this amendment, their course bears a contradiction on