

did not misstate the views which he at that time entertained. He said :

"I have again and again stated in the House that, if practicable, I thought a legislative union would be preferable. I have always contended that if we could agree to have one Government and one Parliament, legislating for the whole of these peoples, it would be the best, the cheapest, the most vigorous and the strongest system of government we could adopt."

So the hon. gentleman is of opinion that legislative union would be preferable to a federal union, that it is better that the community should be governed by a single Parliament controlled by a single Executive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this point up, because I have heard it stated before that, to use the language of the hon. gentleman, I hated and was opposed to a Federal Government and favored legislative union. I think the words were that I hated it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so. The hon. gentleman read the first part of what I said, but he did not read the whole of it. I have the report of my remarks before me, and I will read from it :

"The third and only means of solution for our difficulties was the junction of the Provinces either in a federal or a legislative union. Now as regards the comparative advantages of a legislative and a federal union, I never hesitated to state my own opinions. I have again and again stated in the House that, if practicable, I thought a legislative union would be preferable. I have always contended that if we could agree to have one Government and one Parliament, legislating for the whole of these people it would be the best, the cheapest, the most vigorous, and the strongest system of government we could adopt.

The hon. gentleman read that part.

"But on looking at the subject in the conference, and discussing the matter as we did, most unreservedly, and with a desire to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, we found that such a system was impracticable. In the first place—

And I would call the attention of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) to the reason why I gave up my opinion in favor of a legislative union and took up and adopted federal union heartily and unreservedly.

"In the first place it would not meet the assent of the people of Lower Canada, because they felt that in their peculiar position—being in a minority, with a different language, nationality and religion from the majority—in case of a junction with the other Provinces, their institutions and their laws might be assailed, and their ancestral associations, on which they prided themselves, attacked and prejudiced; it was found that any proposition which involved the absorption of the individuality of Lower Canada—if I may use the expression—would not be received with favor by her people. We found, too, that though their people speak the same language and enjoy the same system of law as the people of Upper Canada, a system founded on the common law of England, there was as great a disinclination on the part of the various Maritime Provinces to lose their individuality, as separate political organisations, as we observed in the case of Lower Canada herself. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, we were forced to the conclusion that we must either abandon the idea of union altogether, or devise a system of union in which the separate provincial organisations would be in some degree preserved. So that those who were, like myself, in favor of a legislative union, were obliged to modify their views and accept the project of a federal union as the only scheme practicable, even for the Maritime Provinces. Because, although the law of those Provinces is founded on the common-law of England, yet every one of them has a large amount of law of its own—colonial law framed by itself, and affecting every relation of life, such as the laws of property, municipal and assessment laws; laws relating to the liberty of the subject, and to all the great interests contemplated in legislation; we found, in short, that the statutory law of the different Provinces was so varied and diversified that it was almost impossible to weld them into a legislative union at once. Why, Sir, if you only consider the innumerable subjects of legislation peculiar to new countries, and that every one of those five colonies had particular laws of its own, to which its people have been accustomed and are attached, you will see the difficulty of effecting and working a legislative union, and bringing about an assimilation of the local as well as general laws of the whole of the Provinces. (Hear, hear.) We in Upper Canada understand from the nature and operation of our peculiar municipal laws, of which we know the value, the difficulty of framing a general system of legislation on local matters which would meet the wishes and fulfil the requirements of the several Provinces. Even the laws considered the least important, respecting private rights in timber, roads, fencing, and innumerable other matters, small in themselves, but in the aggregate of great interest to the agricultural class, who form the great body

Mr. MILLS.

of the people, are regarded as of great value by the portion of the community affected by them. And when we consider that every one of the colonies has a body of law of this kind, and that it will take years before those laws can be assimilated, it was felt that at first, at all events, any united legislation would be almost impossible. I am happy to state—and indeed it appears on the face of the resolutions themselves—that as regards the Lower Provinces, a great desire was evinced for the final assimilation of our laws."

So that the hon. gentleman ought to have read the whole of what I have read, instead of quoting the first part and not the latter part, in which I stated that I had unreservedly abandoned my opinion because it was impossible, if we were going to have any union at all, to have a legislative union, and we could only have a federal union.

Mr. CASEY. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the father of Confederation—the right hon. gentleman who has been exhibited throughout the Dominion from one end to the other as the originator and proposer of Confederation, out of whose brain sprung the whole scheme, to whom principally, if not alone, is owing the existence and success of Confederation, and to-night he quotes his own words, and says he is sorry that the member for Bothwell did not read them before.

Mr. HAGGART. I rise to a point of order. The remarks of the hon. gentleman have not the slightest reference to the debate in hand.

Mr. CASEY. I contend that my remarks have as much to do with it as the hon. gentleman's reply, and I say the question of whether the hon. gentleman was originally in favor of legislative or a federative union is as much in order when discussed by me as when discussed by himself. I have just been trying to show that he was in the conference, as he stated himself, in favor of legislative union, and was obliged to modify his views.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has failed to convince me that what he was arguing was really on the question. He might argue that some others have been out of order, but it seems to me that it was the general wish of the House to hear the explanations which have been given, so that I did not choose to interfere. But the moment the House complains that the discussion is away from the question I must interfere.

Mr. BURNS. As it appears it would not be in order for the hon. member for Montreal Centre to change the wording of the resolution, I beg now, at his request, to move as an amendment, what would be his resolution if changed in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Essex.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is not the slightest objection to accepting the resolution if it can be done without the necessity of the hon. gentleman moving the amendment. I understand that that cannot be done, and there is no objection to this being substituted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that the mover cannot amend his own motion, but, as I find it was often done at the suggestion of Mr. Speaker Brand, the original motion may be withdrawn, and then, with the unanimous consent of the House, it can be presented in a new form.

Mr. BLAKE. Let the hon. member for Montreal Centre withdraw the resolution and then present it in the new form. Then he will have his own motion in his own hands.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. CURRAN moved :

That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted a humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland; and

That in the year 1886, by Resolution of the House of Commons, the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope again expressed that such a measure of Home Rule would be passed by the Imperial Parliament; and