

our policy a direct vote of censure the hour before we start. (Hear, hear.) He wants us to go home strong—with an Address to the Sovereign in one hand, and a defeat by the people's representatives in the other. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. gentleman thinks he is sustaining the Administration by his present motion, I can only say that I for one do not thank him for his support. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman may carry his resolution if he can, but I tell him that in that case no mission will go to England with any such insulting message from this Government as now constituted. (Hear, hear.) The House may perfectly comprehend that if any Address is to be carried to the Queen by the present Government, it must be the Address we have submitted to Parliament. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) says that we are attempting to dictate to the House—that we are endeavoring to take away from them the rightful powers of the members of this Legislature. We do nothing of the kind. The members of the Legislature may act as they deem right; they may reject our Address, or amend it, or couple it with anything they please—all we say is, that we cannot be the bearers of a message shaped in the way the hon. member for Peel proposes. But if this House says there shall be an appeal to the people, it will get an appeal to the people at once—to-morrow—(hear, hear)—and that without the mockery of going home to the Imperial Government with an Address asking in one breath that the bill may be passed into law, and in the next that it may not be passed into law. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Peel has said that the legislatures of the other provinces have gone, or are going, to the people—and why not we? The hon. gentleman ought to know that the other legislatures were in a different position from that which we occupied. As regards the New Brunswick Legislature, its term expired, I think, in May—they had not been for four years before their constituents—they were going soon at any rate, and they came to the conclusion that it was well to go at once. And so also it was in Newfoundland—the period when a dissolution must take place was rapidly approaching, and they took the same course. The honorable gentleman says that if the Legislature of Nova Scotia do not approve of the resolutions, the Government will advise a dissolution. So probably would we under such circumstances. If this Legislature had not approved of the scheme, we would undoubtedly, with His Excellency's assent, have

appealed to the country against the decision of this House. And otherwise what necessity is there for a direct appeal to the people? Here we have been discussing the question for years—

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Oh! oh!

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable gentleman may cry "Oh! oh!" but I tell him that the people throughout the country generally understand this question just as well as the members of the Legislature. Those who are most difficult to be made to understand are those who don't want to understand. Even the honorable member for Cornwall once understood this question, and if he does not now it is because he has forgotten it. (Laughter.) If there were any doubt about public feeling, there might be propriety in going to the people. But is there any doubt about it? I am not opposing the honorable gentleman's resolution on constitutional grounds. I am not denying the rights of the people; if I had any doubt whatever about what would be the verdict of the people, I should be the first to say that we ought to go to the people. But it is simply because I am satisfied there would be a sweeping verdict of the people in favor of the measure, that I think it unnecessary to take it to the country. What would be the verdict of the people may be judged from what has been the vote of their representatives here, who are responsible to them. Never has there been such a verdict in this Parliament on any matter of grave importance as we have had in favor of this measure—in the Upper House a majority of three to one, and in the Lower House also a majority as nearly as possible of three to one. And of the six honorable members who were absent from the vote—the SPEAKER, and the five honorable members who were absent—five would have gone for it and only one against it—the House being divided, 94 for to 36 against. And as regards those 36, more than one-half of them have risen in this House and declared themselves in favor of the general principle, and only opposed to some of the details. I say there never has been such a unanimous verdict from any Parliament in favor of any great constitutional change. And since the policy of the Government has been announced, no fewer than 50 out of our 130 constituencies have been appealed to by elections, for the one House or the other—and in the whole of these, only four candidates offered themselves in opposition to this policy, and but two got elected—and I think one of those two did actually vote