

*Hon. J. M. Leary.*

# THE CANADIAN MIRROR

## OF PARLIAMENT.

EDITED BY H. FOWLER, Esq. }

Kingston, August 1, 1841.

{ PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE  
{ OF "THE NEWS," Grass & Johnson, sts.

### HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, July 28.

#### NATURALIZATION BILL—CONTINUED.

Mr. SIMPSON said he had but one thing to object to, which was, that instead of five years residence as the bill provides the period should be seven. If it required seven years to learn a simple trade, he thought there should at least as long a probation be required before a foreigner should be endowed with the highest attributes of a British Subject.

Mr. MERRITT said it was amusing to hear the apprehensions which are expressed by hon. members concerning Americans.—There were, he was happy to say, in that house some living witnesses of the conduct of those very people, who had been so mercilessly traduced, on occasion of the late war with the United States in 1812. And who were the originators of the late rebellion? Were they Americans? No, they were the English, Irish, and Scotch! (Hear, hear.) When hon. gentlemen talk of Americans disseminating their republican principles in this country; he really thought it was very like a tacit admission that their institutions were better than our own: else where could be the danger to be apprehended from their attempts. He (Mr. Merritt) would be ashamed to make such an admission; particularly as we have now responsible government. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the bill would pass: and more than that, he would have been better pleased if the government had sent down a measure which would have embraced foreigners from all parts of the earth! He thought it was high time that they should abandon the Chinese policy hitherto pursued and adopt a more liberal and extended policy. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he believed that the gallant and learned Knight had on a former occasion been in favor of a measure of this description which was introduced in the House of Assembly of Upper Canada by the learned and gallant Colonel from Essex. He (Mr. Cartwright) was in a minority upon that question, but subsequent events had justified the vote he then gave.

Colonel PRINCE said he only regretted that this bill does not go to the same extent as the one to which the hon. and learned member had just alluded. But he (Col. Prince) was one of those who was willing to get half a loaf if he could not get a whole one. He was astonished to find the gallant Knight from Hamilton so strenuously opposing this bill. He was quite at a loss to imagine by what consideration he was actuated, whether it was because the bill emanates from the government, (hear, hear,) or whether the events of the last four years have changed his opinions—those events which have conferred upon the gallant Knight a great deal of renown at very little inconvenience to himself. (Hear, hear.) If it could be ascertained, the gallant Knight would discover that the majority of the individuals for whom this bill is intended are those who stood by us in the time of our difficulty, not those who annoyed the government of this country during the four years of rebellion. He would acquit the Americans, as a nation, of having been instrumental in putting the government

of this country to the expense it had been three or four times, and had as often been put to. The revolution of '76 to which hon. rejected by the Legislative Council. The gentlemen seemed to attach so much importance as exhibiting the ingratitude of the measure was that it is republican, and that American nation, he (Col. Prince) contended it was a disgrace to come to the polls and was an honor to that nation; he declared they were perfectly justified. (Hear, hear.) The individuals for whom this bill is intended are those who have sought our protection, have lived under and obeyed our laws, and the very least we can do is to hold out the right hand of fellowship to them. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. HALE said he thought there was some consideration due to the remark of the gallant Knight from Hamilton, that the bill comprehends also those who remain within the Province by compulsion—men suffering punishment for crimes. He thought this should not be overlooked.

Mr. HINCKS said he could not allow to pass unnoticed the observation that the Americans who come into this Province are the dregs of society. He (Mr. Hincks) would affirm that there was not a more sober, well conducted class of people in the Province, and they were inclined also to be the most peaceable and loyal subjects, so long as they were treated with consideration. But if had unfortunately been the policy of the government, or rather of the dominant faction in this Province, to oppress them, and deny them the privilege of obtaining the redress of their grievances, after having settled amongst us, and after having cleared our forests and converted our wilderness into productive fields. As to their being wedded to republican principles, he [Mr. Hincks] would affirm without fear of successful contradiction that those who are so wedded to republican institutions would never come into this Province to become inhabitants thereof.

Sir ALLAN McNAB said he would reply to one observation of the learned gentleman from Essex, who said that he considered the Americans were perfectly justified in their revolution. He (Sir Allan) believed if this were admitted, that upon the same reasoning we should all be rebels in this province. (Hear, hear.) The learned gentleman might be assured that he [Sir Allan] had no particular desire to oppose the government or to support it. [Hear, hear.] So long as he considered the government to be right he would of course support them; no longer. [Hear, hear.] He [Sir Allan] was not to be driven from his position by ridicule or by the terror of being thought an opposer of the government.

The motion was negatived and the bill passed.

FRIDAY, July 30.

#### THE BALLOT BILL.

The house went into committee upon this bill—Mr. JOHNSTON in the chair.

Mr. SMALL said, in rising to propose the adoption of the first enacting clause of this bill, he would not detain the committee with any lengthened remarks upon it. The principle of voting by ballot had been discussed in almost every session of the Upper Canada Legislature for the last ten or fifteen years, and the Bill had passed the House of Assembly

argument generally used in opposition to the measure was that it is republican, and that American nation, he (Col. Prince) contended it was a disgrace to come to the polls and give a secret vote. This latter circumstance, however, of its being a secret vote was the very thing which in his estimation recommended it, because in that very secrecy lay the security. It is calculated to render security to the poor voter, to the tradesman, the mechanic, from the oppression of those who are able to exercise a strong control over him. He [Mr. Small] had witnessed the ill effects of the open system of voting as practiced in this province. The present system was one which he believed was loudly called for by a majority of the people of Upper Canada. He had no desire, however, to press forward the measure at present until we see what sort of election law we shall get. [Hear, hear.] But he wished it to be particularly understood that he did not abandon the principle, and he would now take the sense of the committee on the principle of the bill by moving for the adoption of the first enacting clause.

Col. PRINCE said if this measure had been introduced by any other than a countryman of his own, he would have felt less astonishment. But that an Englishman in an English province should have the temerity to bring forward a measure so completely hostile to British institutions, was a matter not only of astonishment but of regret. The speech of the hon and learned gentleman has been brief, because he finds that he has learned upon a broken reed. But brief as the speech of the hon gentleman has been, mine shall be still more brief. I admit that in the old country the vote by ballot may in some cases be useful, but I am not prepared to say that it is that system of voting at elections which I would vote for; but I am prepared

to say that if there is a country in the world where the lower class who possess votes are under the all powerful influence of the wealthy, it is in England. But does this observation apply to this country? Certainly not. Are we so dependent, so ignoble, as to be controlled in the exercise of our franchise? I trust we are not. Does not this broad, expansive, this beautiful, this fertile country, afford to every human being who is able to raise the hatchet upon his shoulders a sufficient independence? [No.] I say that every man who possesses health and strength may, if he choose, be as independent as the lord of the land. [Hear, hear.] Yes, the backwoodsman of Canada is far more independent than the office holder who relies upon the fleeting fancies of the popular will for his continuance in office. I will never acknowledge that the Canadian freeholder has any necessity for resorting to this underhand mode of giving his vote: no, he may go boldly to the hustings, and defy any human being to injure him if he gives an honest vote. You may talk of Executive influence, but I say if any one allows such influence to be exercised over him he is ignoble. [Hear, hear.] I am aware that in a country where a man is dependent upon a rich, powerful, and sometimes tyrannical landlord, in manufacturing districts, they are sometimes constrained to vote according to