

the debate of 1862 on representation by population—"No man with Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins will submit to the present state of affairs." (Hear, hear.) And yet he accuses us now of taking hasty action in this matter. When the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration was formed, he devoted himself to denouncing the Hon. Provincial Secretary, who was then Commissioner of Crown Lands. He used all his power in abusing that gentleman, and he prophesied what the result would be when that gentleman appeared again before the people of Upper Canada. I gave my opinion plainly at the time, and I do not believe that any person used such strong language as the honorable gentleman himself. The question had come to be one that must be settled in one way or the other. It was quite clear to me for one, and to the people of Upper Canada, that the Federation project was the only thing we could have to remedy the state of affairs in which they were placed. (Hear, hear.) But I had forgotten one point in regard to the Coalition arrangements being made to carry on the public affairs. When the liberal members held a meeting to consider the propositions made by their Government, the honorable member for Cornwall attended and took an active part in the business of the meeting, and heartily approved of the project. He declined, it is true, to vote yea or nay on the first resolution, approving the policy proposed, but that was merely because the resolution was so worded as to expressly approve of Mr. BROWN's share in the perfecting of the arrangements made. This is proved by the terms of the second resolution, which was moved by the honorable member for Cornwall himself. (Hear, hear.) The motion was in the following terms—"That the proposition for at least three members of the Opposition entering the Government be accepted." Mr. MACKENZIE of Lambton, moved in amendment—"That the proposition for three members of the Opposition entering the Cabinet be rejected, and that the proposition for the settlement of our sectional difficulties receive an outside support." The amendment only received eleven votes; the eloquence of the honorable member for Cornwall carried the meeting against my resolution. That honorable gentleman also moved the third resolution, as follows—"That it is all-important that Mr. BROWN should be one of the party to enter the Cabinet." Only three gentlemen—viz., Hon. Mr. BROWN and Messrs. BURWELL and SCATCHERD—voted against this. Now,

if the honorable member was sincere then, how are we to account for his course now? (Hear, hear.) Was he deceiving us then, or is he speaking against himself now? (Hear, hear.) Considering the part that honorable gentleman had in organizing the Government, it did seem very extraordinary that he should have repeatedly reproached honorable gentlemen opposite with having formed a coalition.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear, hear.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Was it possible that he urged the formation of the Government with a view to destroy the liberals who had entered it? I believed then that the best course to pursue was to give the Conservative Government a thorough outside support. I have always had a strong objection to party coalitions. I felt then, as I do now, that they may lead to later results not foreseen at the time, and all that I wished was that the Liberal party should give their support to the Administration for the purpose for which it was formed, that support to cease when the object should be accomplished. The honorable member for Cornwall thought differently, and I do not think it becomes that hon. gentleman to get up now and denounce those hon. gentlemen for the course they have taken. He is not able to say that he did not vote. He voted as here recorded, and with the desire that I have always had to have everything of this kind recorded to prevent future misunderstanding, I took the trouble to have a certified copy of the proceedings, from which I have just quoted. When any honorable member took that course in the caucus, I think he was clearly bound to adhere to the same course. (Hear, hear.)

DR. PARKER—MR. SPEAKER, I had some intention of voting for the resolution in your hands, sir, until I heard the speech of the mover, the hon. member for Peel; but that gentleman has quite convinced me that I ought not to do so. (Hear and laughter.) He proved most conclusively that the proposed Confederation was in itself a most satisfactory and desirable measure, and that the internal state of these provinces, as well as the threatening aspect of foreign affairs, were conclusive reasons for its immediate adoption. Defences, he told us, were immediately required, and that they could only be made effective by first uniting the provinces. Accepting this argument and others advanced by that hon. member, the conclusion is that the necessity for Confederation is imperative and immediate. But, sir, how does this