

together. And now, when the proposition is brought before this House to place the matter before the people, we are told that there are certain precedents against such a course, such as the union of Scotland and the union of Ireland, which I am sure must be particularly strong in the view of my friend the Honorable Minister of Agriculture. We are told that we must accept this scheme at once without a moment's delay, or it would slip through our fingers. I feel, sir, that this is a point which ought to be made—that the ground on which this motion is opposed, that the people having elected their representatives, they have a right to look to them. And if this country was annexed to the United States, if this Parliament is supreme, if it is able to upset one Constitution, why not another? The doctrine is a new one. It may be fortified by strong precedents, but it is not fortified by constitutional practice in this country—it is not fortified by the opinion of the people of this country, which is, that the representative is not elected to frame its Constitution. It is said by the honorable member for South Oxford that a number of elections have taken place, and that the people are in favor of the scheme. But what elections have taken place? There have been a few for the Upper House; but even the hon. member for South Ontario, a gentleman who comes in for a Ministerial constituency represented formerly by the present Vice-Chancellor of Upper Canada, even that honorable gentleman is defeated and another gentleman is elected in his place. That honorable gentleman is the first fruits of the elections, and he comes here and tells us that he pledged himself to his constituents that this subject should be appealed to the people—and more than that, he tells us that they were afraid he would support the Government on the details. It is an unhappy day for this country when it is found necessary to quote precedents from the most unpopular period in European history in support of the course that is being pursued. (Hear, hear.)

MR. JOSEPH DUFRESNE—I did not intend to say anything upon this matter, and I should abstain from doing so, were it not for a statement made by the honorable member for Lotbinière. He stated that parties in Canada upon this question were about equally divided. I deny that. I know too well sentiment in Lower Canada. I say that the bulk of the people in Lower Canada look upon an election as an oath—they want to use it only as a matter of necessity—they look upon it as

an immorality. I know that there are certain parties in Lower Canada in favor of an election, but the bulk of the people are opposed to it. There are also a few honorable gentlemen in this House who may be in favor of it, but in my opinion they are wrong. I can class those who are in favor of an election in Lower Canada—these are the *Rouges*. Under the present circumstances, they say:—"We are only about fifteen or sixteen; what difference will it make if we lose five or six of our number; and who knows that the States will not come here in our country with a few thousand greenbacks and help us?" (Laughter.) I only say this as a supposition. Then the second is the class who sell liquor in the day, and those who sell without a license—who are almost looked upon as public robbers. The third class are the drunkards—those who go on a spree for several days and pay nothing for it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Everyone knows that the accounts are sent in and are paid. Of course these words are not applicable to any one in this House; but those are the only ones who are in favor of an election. The bulk of the people are opposed to it; they consider it as an immorality; and if any one doubts that, I wish they would go out into my part of the country and inquire for themselves. (Hear, hear.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE—The language used by the hon. member for North Ontario, on one or two points, requires some notice. He boldly asserted that he did not believe that there was any serious agitation in Upper Canada for constitutional changes. He boldly asserted that an arrangement could have been made, and that till it was made the people could get on. Now, here is the language he used some years ago. In his speech on the Address in 1862, the following occurs:—

I mean to say that the refusal of righteous demands will lead to unpleasant and unprofitable quarrels. The time has come when 300,000 Upper Canadians will be heard on the floor of the House, and if this is not allowed, the results that will follow will be awful.

That is the language of the gentleman who has charged us with making "highfaluting" speeches. I did address the meeting held in Toronto, and a more unanimous meeting, perhaps, never was held in Toronto. I confined myself entirely to the matter under discussion, and made no appeals of any kind. I leave that to the honorable member for North Ontario himself. Then he states again—in