

Mr. BROWN) is here represented as having earned his popularity by attacking the institutions of Lower Canada, and the honorable member for Montreal East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) as having earned his by defending these same institutions, and the insinuation is that he has now abandoned the defence of these institutions and handed them over to the tender mercies of the Honorable President of the Council. Let me ask the honorable member for Lotbinière, if being in company with the honorable member for South Oxford be evidence of hostility to the institutions of Lower Canada, how he explains his own position, and that of his party, when they cast in their lot with the honorable member for South Oxford, while earning his popularity by, as he says, attacking the institutions of Lower Canada, and abandoned the Honorable Attorney General East when doing battle in defence of those institutions? (Hear, hear.) I think the question is one not easily answered. The honorable gentleman must either have been politically dishonest before, or politically dishonest now, and he can take either horn of the dilemma he pleases.

MR. JOLY—I never supported the Honorable Attorney General East, and if I have been forced upon the same side as the honorable member for South Oxford, it was because we were united together in opposition to that honorable gentleman. That was the only bond of union that connected us together. On the question of representation by population we were always divided. What I meant in the observation I made, that has been alluded to by the honorable member, is this, that the Honorable President of the Council had gained the position he occupies now by attacking Lower Canada, and the Honorable Attorney General East his, by assuming to defend it; and when at length they found that the game would no longer answer, when the Honorable President of the Council saw himself excluded forever from a seat in the Ministry if he continued to play it, they banded together, and we now see the result. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. H. MACKENZIE—At all events, Mr. SPEAKER, the hon. member makes it clear that he has changed sides. For when the Hon. Attorney General East was defending the institutions of Lower Canada, he opposed him, and now he opposes him because he says he has adopted the contrary policy.

MR. JOLY—I opposed him for other reasons—not for that reason.

MR. H. MACKENZIE—At all events the

hon. member has contributed his mite to the influence the hon. member for South Oxford had in this House, by attacking, as he declares, the institutions of Lower Canada. I have already said that all parties are not satisfied with this scheme; and while on this point, I wish to allude for a moment to the constitution of the Legislative Council. It is the only reference I shall make on this branch of the subject. When addressing my constituents, I took exception to this portion of the resolutions. I did so, not because I cared very much whether we had in this country a Legislative Council nominated by the Crown or elected by the people, but, the nominative system having been superseded by the elective, I preferred to have it as it was. It was in these terms that I spoke to the people. After having addressed one or two meetings, I saw the despatch of the Colonial Secretary, and I noticed that this matter of the constitution of the Council was pointed out as one which required revision; and I took it for granted that communications would be opened between the several Colonial Governments such as would possibly lead to a change. Doubtless there are sufficient reasons why this has not been done. But, although I would have liked it to have been so, and although it would have concurred more closely with the views of Upper Canada, I do not think it of sufficient importance to warrant me in rejecting the scheme on that account. (Hear, hear.) If it involves the rejection of the whole scheme, I do not feel myself warranted in pressing for an amendment on the point. (Hear.) In framing a constitution of this kind, everybody must be aware that an agreement could never have been arrived at except on the principle of compromise and concession. It is perfectly useless—it is worse than useless—to suppose that any of the several sections of a wide-spread territory could come together with a view to the formation of a union among themselves, unless each one of these sections was prepared to sacrifice and give up something. What right, I would ask, had we to expect that all the other colonies would agree to the views of Upper Canada, or to the views of Canada as a whole? What right had we to expect that the Province of Nova Scotia would agree with us in our views with reference to every particular matter? What right had we in Upper Canada to expect that in framing this scheme we would be able to expunge the separate school clauses from the School Act? If that could