

the French Canadians in bye gone years, and that he opposed representation based upon population. I praise him for having done so; but when the Act of Union was proposed and adopted, I am of opinion it was proposed with a view of annihilating the French race in Quebec as a party. In a speech made by Mr. Hume on 3rd June, 1839, in the English House of Commons, when the Act of Union was discussed, he said:

"I have no objection to the resolution, but I do object to any principle of representation not founded upon the basis of population, and which was proposed with the view of giving the British population a preponderating influence. I cannot but regret to see a people so amiable as the French Canadians treated with so little justice or consideration."

So if I found the clauses of the Act of Union arbitrary with respect of the representation granted to the inhabitants of Lower Canada, I not only expressed my opinion but also that of Mr. Hume. There is another opinion similar to that expressed by Mr. Hume, and it is that of Mr. O'Connell, who, in the course of his speech in the English House of Commons, used the following language:—

"The avowed intention of the Act is nothing less than the annihilation of the French Canadians as a party, who have already been treated shamefully by the British Government. I enter my most solemn protest. There can be no real union of the Canadas unless the French Canadians are put upon a footing of exact equality with the other inhabitants. If we do not make the proposed union in that way, there are examples to show that the passing of a mere Act of Union is no corrective to long-existing evils."

If I understood rightly the right hon. leader of the Government, he said there was no difference between a Conservative and a Tory; that he was satisfied with the policy that was followed in 1841 and 1845, and that he approved it. In 1848, Sir George Cartier, Lafontaine and Baldwin were fighting the right hon. leader of the present House on account of his Tory proclivities, and because the policy pursued by the party of which he was one of the leading men was not friendly to Lower Canada. I am more inclined to think that Sir George E. Cartier, Lafontaine and Baldwin were right rather than the leader of the present Government. If I say so it is not because I think that the right hon. leader has not a brilliant past; but I believed that he had changed his principles after 1848 when he made an alliance with Sir George E. Cartier. Sir George E. Cartier and the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec never called themselves Tories. The position taken by the member for North Simcoe during the last two electoral campaigns, the crusade which the *Mail* undertook against the French race and its institutions, call for some explanations; and if I raise this question here, it is in order to ascertain if the leader of the present Conservative party approves of the position and principles which are advocated by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and by the *Mail* and its editors. I want to know if the present Conservatives of Ontario are going to adopt the same Tory policy which was followed in 1837, 1841, and 1848, and if that same Tory policy, inimical to minorities, is going to be followed to-day. It is time, I think, that we should know. If there is no difference between a Conservative and a Tory, is there any difference between the policy of the Premier and that of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)? He said that George Brown had tried to make Lower Canada English. He was right in saying so, but is not his declaration with respect to George Brown a condemnation of the attitude taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when he said in his speech at Barrie that the French Canadians were a danger to the confederacy as long as they remained French? This speech means that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) wishes to continue what George Brown wanted to do—that is, to make Lower Canada English, to make her renounce her institutions. What I want to know is if the principles of the present Conservatives of Ontario are the same as those

which guided the Tories of 1837. In the discussion on the Act of Union, the Earl of Gosford, who had been Governor of Canada in 1837, expressed the following opinion with respect to the Canadian Tory party:—

"I am aware, my Lords, of the existence of great alarm in Canada, which, indeed, does not surprise me, arising as it must do, so far as the French Canadians are concerned, from the apprehensions of a violent ultra-Tory British party, whose object is to monopolise as much as possible all the power and patronage of the colony, and to assume the ascendancy over all who do not participate in their arbitrary views. The whole conduct of this party, and the violence of the language made use of by many of those who belong to it, are quite enough to exasperate the French population and produce amongst them the alarm I have alluded to."

The Earl of Gosford says that the language used by the then Tory party was sufficient to create alarm among the French Canadians, and I think to-day that the attitude taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and by the *Mail* is sufficient to create alarm amongst us. We must know what are the principles of those men and whether the members of the present Cabinet condemn their attitude and the policy which they are following.

Mr. MILLS. Before the motion is put, I wish to say a word in reply to the observations made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He seemed to think that I did him an injustice in presuming that he was acquainted with the contents of the measure proposed by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I said you purposely charged me with misstating the law.

Mr. MILLS. I will read the precise words of the hon. gentleman, and he will see that he not only misstated the law, but that he also gave an erroneous reason for what he did at the time the law was proposed. After stating that the hon. member for West Durham was the author of this particular provision, the hon. gentleman says:

"But that is not the worst feature. Why, they were to be tried summarily—not by a court and jury. The great right of trial by jury was ignored by the hon. gentleman, and the trial was to take place before two magistrates who had power to send the accused to prison. That was the way we acted in circumstances of that kind."

The hon. gentleman then goes on:

"I voted against that measure, and I believe those associated on the Opposition side of the House with me almost unanimously voted against it. We did not so vote on the ground that we had not the power to pass legislation of that kind, but we denied that there was any occasion for so stringent amendment to the law."

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. He says this was part of the measure proposed by the hon. member for West Durham, and that he was so shocked at the time the measure was proposed that he opposed it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, so far from having opposed the measure on that ground, opposed it, notwithstanding the existence of any such ground. There is no such ground in the law; that could not have been the reason for his opposition, and the hon. gentleman, relying on his imagination in the one case, has relied on it in the other. What am I to suppose with regard to the position of the hon. gentleman? His explanation, I think, quite justifies me in the observations which I made. The hon. gentleman said I was not acquainted with the actual provisions of the law which my hon. friend proposed in 1877. He was misled in looking at the Revised Statutes. I accept his statement, for I do not think he would seek to mislead the House in the matter, but it shows that he should be more particular about ascertaining the facts before making so positive an assertion as the one he made a few evenings ago. I now wish to call the attention of the First Minister to what he did say in 1865, and I think he will find that I