

advisers. Well, then, I assert that the case the honorable gentleman has cited to show that my honorable friend on the other side was wrong, is no case at all. It is not applicable in any respect to present circumstances, because, I repeat it again, we had not responsible government at that time.

HON. MR. BUREAU—We have not responsible government yet, then.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—How does the honorable gentleman make that out?

HON. MR. BUREAU—The honorable gentleman has stated that since the death of Lord BAGOT we have not had responsible government.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The honorable gentleman cannot surely have understood me. I think I said that under Lord METCALF there was responsible government in name but not in deed. And if the honorable gentleman will study our parliamentary history a little closer, he will admit that such was the case. The consequence was, as I have already stated, the resignation of Hon. Messrs. LAFONTAINE and BALDWIN. Still the Lower Canadian party was unbroken. It is true the new advisers of Lord METCALF coquetted much with that majority to obtain adhesion; but it was in vain. They remained firm to the last, until the general election of 1848 brought back the parties to Parliament in much about their natural strength. I have already stated that I have destroyed my notes, and I am ready to await the verdict of this honorable House. (Applause.)

HON. MR. VIDAL said—Honorable gentlemen, as I consider it my duty to vote for the motion now before the House, I think it desirable to clear myself from the imputation of inconsistency in having supported the amendments which have been proposed, and which the House has rejected. I may state that my views as to the desirableness of submitting the question to the people are unchanged; the plan has been voted down, but no argument has been adduced to demonstrate that it was wrong in principle, or likely to destroy the scheme. I have previously expressed my general approval of the Confederation, and that my desire was to secure its permanency by having its foundation broad and deep in the expressed approval of the people. Submission of the proposal to them has been refused, and the only question now for me to decide is whether I should accept the scheme as it is, or vote for its rejection altogether. Under these circumstances, I have no difficulty in

deciding that I must support the motion for its adoption. (Hear, hear.)

The question was then put on the main motion, which was carried on the following division:—

CONTENTS.—Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Allan, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Bennett, Fergusson Blair, Blake, Boulton, Bossé, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, De Beaujeu, Dickson, A. J. Duchesnay, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Foster, Gingras, Guévremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, Leonard, Leslie, McCrea, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Price, Read, Renaud, Ross, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, Vidal, and Wilson—45.

NON-CONTENTS.—Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Bureau, Chaffers, Currie, Flint, Letellier de St. Just, Malhiot, Moore, Olivier, Proulx, Reesor, Seymour, and Simpson.—15.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON BLAIR, that a select committee be appointed to draft an Address founded on the said resolution, and that the committee be composed of Honorable Messrs. CAMPBELL, FERGUSSON BLAIR, ROSS, CHRISTIE, Sir N. F. BELLEAU, and the MOVER.—Carried.

The House adjourned during pleasure; and on resuming,

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ reported the Address, and moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON BLAIR, that it be agreed to.—Carried.

It was then ordered that the Address be engrossed, signed by the SPEAKER, and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by the whole House. It was also ordered that such members of the Executive Council as are members of this House, do wait on His Excellency the Governor General, to know what time His Excellency will please to appoint to be attended with the said Address.

The House then adjourned.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

MONDAY, *February 20, 1865.*

MR. JOLY said—MR. SPEAKER, when it is proposed to change the Constitution of the country, it becomes our duty to study with the greatest care, and from every distinct point of view, the new Constitution which it is proposed to substitute for the existing one; and in doing so we ought not to disdain the experience of past ages