

he very face of it. And what would be the result of a general election? Those two honorable gentlemen, holding such dissimilar views with regard to the motion upon which they have agreed, would go to the country pulling different wires. The honorable member for Peel will use his best endeavors to influence public opinion in such a manner that it will ratify the resolutions in favor of a Federal union, while the hon. gentleman who seconded the motion will go to the people with the very reverse idea. So you will find these two hon. gentlemen, who have joined so cordially to bring this motion before the House, will disagree on every point the moment after it would be carried, and cause the utmost confusion among the people. I cannot understand the matter at all. I do not see how they can defend their consistencies, either before this House or before the country. There was not a single word said by the Hon. President of the Council or the Hon. Attorney General West, with reference to the inconsistency of those two hon. gentlemen, to which every one in this House will not cordially assent. We voted by a large majority, the other night, in favor of those resolutions. I was in favor, when I came here, of having the question referred to the people; and I only wish that such could be yet done; but when I came to understand the emergencies by which we were surrounded, and saw that we were threatened with the loss of the Reciprocity treaty and the bonded system, in addition to the continuation of the passport system, and were also threatened with the putting of American gunboats on the lakes, and without access to the seaboard except upon and by sufferance of the United States Government, I came to the conclusion that it was important for us to take such steps as would procure, in the shortest manner possible, the assistance of English money, English soldiers and English gunboats for our defence, and that, therefore, there was the most urgent necessity for sending some members of the Government home to England, to bring those resolutions before the Imperial Parliament during the present session, and making such arrangements for our defence as it seems we must make. These were the reasons why I voted for a set of resolutions which, I am free to confess, I would not otherwise have supported. Having voted for them on Friday night, along with a large majority of the members of this House, with the full expectation that everything was to be hurried

through, and the session brought immediately to a close, so that the leading members of the Government could go on an important mission to the Mother Country, I understood the hon. member for Peel to have voted with the same understanding. And what are we told now? Why, that there is no necessity for haste in the matter at all; that there ought to be a new election, occupying two months at least, before a return could be made. But is it seriously proposed that during all this time we are to remain in a defenceless state, and without any prospect of having any for another year? Why, the honorable gentleman must see that the proposal bears such a contradiction on the very face of it, that he ought to withdraw it. These resolutions have been passed by this House, or they have not been passed at all. If they have been adopted by the Parliament of Canada in a constitutional way, then in voting for this motion we would be only stultifying ourselves, mocking our constituents, and insulting Her Majesty, for we would be putting ourselves in the most false and inconsistent position in which the representatives of any people ever placed themselves, on this continent. (Hear, hear.) I know the honorable member for Peel laid down the doctrine before he voted for the resolutions, that they ought to go to the people before their final consummation, and to that doctrine every one must assent; but when he voted for the resolutions, as we all did, on the ground that there was a necessity for their immediate adoption, I say it is clearly contradictory for him to bring up this motion after the resolution has been carried by so large a majority. I am sorry that he has thought fit to bring forward this motion at this stage of the proceedings, and I must say—and am sorry to have to say it too—that I think he has accomplished very little good for his party or for his constituents, since he has been in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I voted for the resolutions because I saw there was a necessity for doing so, and after having thus voted on Friday night, I am not going to nullify that vote on Monday night, by supporting the amendment which the honorable member has proposed, more to gratify his own notions, I fear, than to do the country good. It has been said—and very correctly said, I think—that if a new House should be elected, the members of that House would have to discuss the matter over again, and take another vote upon it. The honorable member for Corn