

hese Scheme, and they are determined to secure the best terms they can for New Brunswick. Though the thirty-three delegates agreed to the Quebec Scheme, it was but a compromise, for it is not to be supposed that any one member was perfectly satisfied with all its parts. No Scheme could be made where there are different interests without a compromise. My hon. friend says there was a vast amount of haste used in preparing this Scheme, and there was no parallel case of a constitution being prepared in so short a time. I differ with him. You may search the history of the Colonial Empire, and you will not find a constitution, the formation of which has taken more time than this. The constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada were likely drawn by some second hand lawyer. The constitution of United Canada was drawn by the British Government, and all the knowledge they had of what was required was from Lord Durham, and one element was not introduced into that constitution until Lord Durham complained of its omission. United Canada is now a flourishing country, but before the Union there was a dullness and lassitude in the country which contrasted unfavorably with the United States, where all was life and action. It is in Canada now that you see the great elements of advancement. Is it not this Union that has made Montreal the populous city she is? They have built Railroads and Canals, and their population has increased very rapidly. This has been the result of their Union, and it will probably be the result of this. How long did my hon. friend want the constitution to be kept in the political crucible before it could be formed? It was formed by thirty-three gentlemen, and most of them were men of good education and sound constitutional knowledge, and had been occupied in public business during the greater part of their lives. The realisation of this Union is one of the day-dreams of my life, and I consider it will prove a great advantage to the country. We have the example of the United States. There were some thirteen States who saw that it would be for their mutual benefit to unite, and they have since risen in wealth and prosperity until they have attained their present position. The model of our Constitution has been the British Parliament. The head of our Government is to be the Queen's representative. We only apply the principle of the American Constitution as far as they work out some of the principles we have adopted as incident to our position. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) says he cannot agree with the principle of representation by population. I understood him to assent to that principle last winter, and only wanted certain

checks. We never can be united without representation by population, because Upper Canada will not consent to any other basis. Lower Canada will not consent to a Legislative Union. I will ask my hon. friend if he prefers a Legislative to a Federal Union?

Mr. SMITH—I will answer that at some future time, for it requires a lengthy reply.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—I take it my hon. friend would prefer a Legislative Union with representation by population, to a Federative Union, because he says that the principle of representation by population is inapplicable to a Federative Union, but then he says he is willing to go into a Federative Union provided he could get the necessary checks. I think the Constitution provides checks in the Upper Branch. This Branch is entirely distinct from the American Senate. The Senate together with the people can make treaties, and they require no further action from the Legislative body, but a treaty made by the Government of Great Britain is a powerless instrument unless enacted by the Parliament. He says in the United States Senate each State has an equal representation, and objects to the Scheme because it does not make this provision. He is in favour of uniting the Maritime Provinces with a view of uniting the whole. After they are united he will have exactly what he wants, for then each Province will have twenty-four members in the Upper House and four more from Newfoundland. In the United States all power is in the people, and they confer a certain portion of that power upon the Government of the different States, another portion to the Federal Government, and another portion they keep themselves. There is no analogy between their Government and ours; they require a Court of Appeal as necessary to their condition. Our Parliament is all powerful, all the power that is not conferred upon the Local Legislature is given to the General Government. The tendency of this arrangement is to a Legislative Union. It will arise out of this in the future, and be the final result. There is a provision made for assimilating all the Laws in every part of the Confederacy except Lower Canada. The provisions made for selecting Judges from any part of the Confederacy is I think a good arrangement, and will be an advantage to the public interest. I was concerned in a case where there was only one Judge in the Province that could try it on account of having an interest in it.

Mr. SKINNER—I will ask my hon. friend if he has any objections at all to the Quebec Scheme, and if he has I wish him to state what they are.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—My idea is if we can get any improvements I will go for them. I said before that I did not believe that there was one gentleman out of the thirty-three but what objected to some of its provisions, and it is but a compromise, each one giving up certain objections in order that all might agree. You cannot devise a Scheme that all will agree to each provision in it. We may acquire some advantage for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in this controversy, for we know that a few thousand pounds would be an advantage to us, but it would be very little advantage spread over the whole Confederacy. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Young) says the great question with this country is regarding the eighty cents a head, to aid us in supporting our local improvements. In Canada they do not get a single dollar from the Government towards local improvements. They have municipal corporations to attend to those matters, and through their agency they make their public improvements. In the United States every improvement is made by direct taxation, and they receive no money from the public treasury. In the conference we took the position that our people had been accustomed to receive from the public treasury certain sums of money to enable them from time to time to carry on their schools, roads, and local improvements. The enquiry was then made of what would meet our resources in future, and the conclusion arrived at was, that eighty cents per head, with our casual and territorial revenue, our undeveloped minerals and unproductive forests, would make all the improvements we required, to as great an extent as in the past. There was a remark made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner) about giving the delegates some instructions. I think they will be pretty well instructed, after hearing the discussion in this House. If you send delegates with instructions, and the delegates from the other Provinces receive pacific instructions, and they all stand by their instructions, they can never come to an agreement; there must be a mutual concession and compromise amongst them all.

Mr. SKINNER—I did not say I would give the delegates pacific instructions. I said we should discuss and mature this matter, and have a plan, and instruct the delegates, but allow them a margin to go upon to better enable them to get what they want.

Hon. Mr. FISHER—I thought from the tenor of his speech that he wished to give the delegates positive instructions. I do not think he is acting consistent;