

agree with the terms of his resolution, if we should adopt it, and this House be dissolved, and members sent to the country for election before the new House could adopt the measure? The House of Commons would be dissolved, and the Imperial Parliament could not legislate on it for a year or more—(hear, hear)—so that by the course proposed, the country would still remain, for a year or two longer, exposed to the dangers and difficulties so eloquently described by the hon. member for Peel. (Hear.) If that hon. member had voted against the previous question, and thereby asserted the right to amend or refer the Address before adoption, he could now very properly ask and claim our support to this resolution. But he not only voted for the previous question, but for the Address, and deliberately chose the present time to make this motion. Under these circumstances, he at least has no claim upon the support of the House. (Hear.) Having made a solemn contract with this House on the main question, he now turns round and seeks to upset the arrangement of his own making. His course is best explained by a simple illustration. Suppose four or five gentlemen had entered into an unanimous agreement, when one turns round and says, "I was and am in favor of all that has been done; but unless you now attach this condition, I draw back and retire from the arrangement." (Hear.) That was conduct which could not be approved either in public or private affairs. The position of the seconder of the resolution—the hon. member for North Ontario—is entirely different, because he, like myself, asserted by his vote on the previous question, the desire to have the resolutions amended. The honorable member for Peel told us, even to-day, that this he considered the proper time to place his motion before the House. The resolution itself is highly proper, and one for which I would have voted, had it been made before the adoption of the Address. (Hear.) Now it is entirely out of place. The hon. member for North Ontario remarked just now, in the course of his speech, that this Constitution, if adopted, will soon have to be amended, and therefore, he said, we ought not to accept it. I entirely dissent from that opinion. Why, sir, the British Constitution is but a series of amendments made from time to time—a growth by successive amendments. The objection of my hon. friend is one of the main reasons why I am willing to

accept this scheme. I believe it will admit of amendment as time goes on, so that it may be made to meet the changing wants and requirements of the people. My hon. friend from North Ontario referred to the seductive influence of the breath of the Hon. President of the Council, when breathed into the ears of members, and its magical effects in relaxing the knees, and then, sir, he looked, by way, I presume, of application, at the hon. member for West Elgin. (Loud laughter.) Now I have always regarded the hon. member for West Elgin as one of the most reliable members of this House. (Laughter.) Well, if my honorable friend looked more particularly in this direction, I have nothing to add to the reasons already given in explanation of my vote. The question before me was—"Should we adopt or reject the resolutions?"—and agreeing with the hon. member for Peel that something should be done immediately, I voted for them. I think it would be most outrageous if, after they have been sanctioned by a vote of this House, we were to nullify them by any subsequent proceedings. If the resolutions were to be referred to the people at all, it should have been before they received the sanction of this House. Are we to turn round to-day and reverse what we did on Saturday last? I repeat, sir, that I think the resolutions should have gone to the country—and if my opinion had prevailed, they would have been referred—but not now, after their deliberate sanction by this House; to do so would stultify the Legislature. Our duty is now, in my opinion, to carry them into effect in good faith, and not stand shilly-shallying—blowing hot and cold with the same breath. I, sir, stand by what I have done, and by what this House has done, and shall vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Peel—(hear)—who, I think, occupies a most inconsistent position. (Hear, hear.) There is another point, sir, to which I desire to allude. The hon. member for Peel stated that he voted for the Address as a private individual—as he would have voted on the question if out of this House. Now, sir, no member can shield himself under such a subterfuge. No member can separate his private from his legislative character in this House. If the explanation of the honorable member for Peel be the general doctrine and practice of Parliament, I should like to have it understood, because there are occasions when it would be very convenient to