

never asked to vote on the question at the polls. Parliament passed the Act and decided the question by opening their doors and every office in the kingdom save one to the aspiration of every honest Catholic subject. I deny most emphatically that these changes were referred to the people, and that they were not made in opposition to the feelings of the majority of the electors. A reference was also made to the Stamp Act passed to tax the American colonies, and while on that subject I wish to show the distinction between that Act and the Stamp Act recently brought into operation. The Attorney General and others attempted to show an analogy, and tried to make it appear that the existing Stamp Act was passed and enforced by a foreign Parliament. Such, however, is not the case. The first was passed by the Parliament of Great Britain to make the colonies pay a share of the expenses of the war which had just terminated between England and France,—a war in which the colonies had spent some of their best blood, and a share of their treasure. But the whole comparison is done away when we reflect that the existing Act was passed by a Parliament in which we have a voice. Gentlemen may say that it is a small voice and not worth having,—no matter how small it changes the constitutional rule relating to the whole matter. The objection was to “taxation without representation,” but we have a representation.

From more than one member here, and over and over again in this discussion, we have heard that the scheme of Union was objectionable, because one of the delegates, while passing through Quebec, attached his name to it on Sunday morning,—it has never been pretended that more than one did it. The deed, of course, was to be regretted, but I can tell gentlemen that there has been more heavy sins than that committed round these benches within the past few days, and it would be well for us all if, when the time approached, for us to leave the world if we had no greater sin to answer for. I can appreciate a due regard for the Sabbath and the propriety of observing it with decorum, but I cannot appreciate this double rectoring, this straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. Some of the gentlemen who made this objection committed a worse sin within half an hour afterwards by reviling their neighbors.

(The usual hour for adjournment having arrived, the debate was adjourned and the House adjourned.)

THURSDAY, Feb. 20.

The House met at 11 o'clock

The adjourned debate was resumed

Mr. BLANCHARD continued.—I would not, Mr. Speaker, have claimed so much time were it not for the peculiar circumstances in which I am placed. But of the number of gentlemen who spoke at the other side, a good many occupied more than an hour and a half, and to all who spoke I am called upon to reply. I will take care, however, that my remarks this morning shall be brought within a small compass, for I find that I have gone over nearly all that I desired to say. There were one or two points which I omitted yes-

terday in speaking of the finances, and these I will take up first. I shewed the House that the financial statement published yesterday morning, in answer to the calculations of Mr. Johnston, contained two or three gross errors by not taking into consideration the free goods that will be imported.

But there was another error which I ought to mention, and which was one that such a gentleman as Mr. Jones should not have made. Referring to one item that he mentions, we find him stating that at the present rate of duty cotton warp will not be largely imported. Does not every one know that at this moment cotton warp is only half the price that it was last year? It has come down from 1s 3d to 8d sterling per pound; and yet that gentleman, in charging the duty derivable at fifteen per cent, has not taken notice of the price. The same importation of cotton warp that was made last year would cost just half what it did then, and therefore the duty, as compared with last year, will stand at 7½ per cent. Yet that gentleman, actuated, no doubt, by a desire to make the matter look as bad as possible, has calculated the duty as being payable on the same quantity and at the same price. There is also a very large reduction in the price of all cotton goods, and yet Mr. Jones takes no notice of this.

The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Chamber), who dwelt upon the tariff, must have been aware of these facts. I have no doubt he does not like that the whole country should know them, and would prefer that his customers should not know that cotton and cotton warp has fallen nearly 100 per cent. It was said in course of the debate that it was never intended or expected that the delegates would have taken any action in England that would bind this country—that they were merely to have gone home for consultation, and to have returned with a scheme for ratification by this Parliament. That statement has gone from lip to lip, but I hold in my hand a public declaration made by the leader of the Government at the time when the resolution passed. In 1836, in reply to Mr. Annand, Dr. Tupper made this explanation, which is to be found on page 224 of the debates—

“Hon. Provincial Secretary, in reply to a remark from Mr. Annand, said that the passage of the resolution would enable a scheme of Union to be given effect to by the Imperial Parliament, but that one of the conditions would be that the existing Legislatures would not be interfered with, and would continue to sit for the term of their election.”

I ask whether, in the face of this declaration, it can be said that the country was deceived, and that the delegates were not given complete authority? The only reservation was that the existing Legislature should not be dissolved until the period of their existence had expired. In the face of this declaration given to the country, how can the complaint of deception be made? The resolution itself was as plain as it could be written; but to prevent the possibility of a misunderstanding, the leader of the Government, in distinct and unqualified terms, declared that the