

is not a point that can be taken against it which has not been thoroughly sifted before the country. We are, therefore, in a different position, and there is this hanging over us besides—as stated by the hon. member for Peel—we cannot go back, we must go forward—we must have some decision on this question—we cannot let things rest as they are. It is of no use for the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) to tell us that matters can go on as they have been doing for many years past. That was not the opinion of the hon. gentleman when he came here in 1862. (Hear, hear.) He came as a supporter of the Conservative Government then in existence, and yet the first vote he gave was in condemnation of his own friends, because they did not bring in a Ministerial measure to settle this question. If he looks at his own speech on that occasion, denouncing the Hon. Attorney General West and his colleagues, because they would not give representation by population, and because the feeling was so strong that not a moment should be lost in dealing with the question—he would find there an answer to his arguments now, when he tells us this thing may be shoved aside, and matters go on as before. (Hear, hear.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I did not state at the time referred to that there was any danger of revolution, or anything of that kind. I urged the question as a measure of justice for Upper Canada against my hon. friends who were not in favor of it.

HON. MR. BROWN—He urged it upon his friends on that occasion to turn them out, because they would not move; and now he urges it in the very opposite direction—namely, to turn them out because they do move. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—If the hon. gentleman would allow me to make a remark, I would say it appears to me the fallacy he has fallen into is in assuming that this measure is identical with the measure of representation by population, for which he has been agitating the country for some year past. It is not the same question. The question of Federation or Confederation has not been before the country. It was not before the country at the last general election. He knows full well that the party, of which he is a distinguished member, has pronounced over and over again, and through his own mouth, against this scheme of Confederation.

He knows that the Reform Convention of 1859 did so.

HON. MR. BROWN—No, it did not.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I say it did.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Get the resolutions, and prove it if you can.

HON. MR. HOLTON—What were the facts? The Government of that day had proposed a Confederation of all the provinces as their remedy for the Canadian difficulty. The Liberal party did not accept that. If they had done so, the probability is that you would have had Confederation long ago, with the consent of the Lower Provinces. But the Reform Convention declared it was no remedy. It is true they put in a saving clause, that at some future day, in some remote contingency, after the settlement of the Canadian difficulty, but not as a means of settling it, the Federation of all the provinces might be taken up. But I merely rose to point out to my hon. friend the fallacy into which he has fallen—and it is a very close one—in assuming that this measure is identical with the measure for which he agitated the country so long, and which the hon. member for North Ontario advocated on the occasion to which he refers.

HON. MR. BROWN—I think the hon. gentleman has risen for a very poor purpose. And in place of accepting his explanation as correct, I dissent from it *toto cœlo*. The position of the matter is quite the opposite of what he states. He says this is a different thing altogether. I totally deny that it is. I say this is simply what we asked for, only in another form. The measure we asked for was representation by population. We got that. (Hear, hear.) And the hon. gentleman is the last man to object to this, which is the very basis on which he agreed to go into the BROWN-DORION Administration—representation by population being the basis, accompanied by such checks and guarantees as might be shown to be necessary. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman has stated that I have spoken against Confederation of the provinces. He will turn to no speech of mine since I entered Parliament in which, when I made any allusion to the matter, I did not take care expressly to state that I regarded a union of all the provinces as the grand future destiny of these provinces. But to those who offered us Confederation of the provinces as a present remedy for all the evils we suffered, I said I would not accept that. But I took care to say nothing directly against it, what-