

body." That is just it—they shield themselves behind a Legislative Council composed of their own creatures brought back to life, and then while lauding to the skies the colonial liberality of England, they pull the strings and make their puppets play the part of oppressors. It is precisely the same political organization that is proposed in the scheme of Confederation. In a Legislative Council composed of life-members, we shall have men prepared invariably to refuse the people the measures they require, if such measures in any way affect the privileges of the aristocratic classes. However eager may be the efforts of the members of the elective body, it will be constitutionally impossible for us to obtain such measures. Moreover, these councillors, of whom the majority will be hostile to us, will do everything in their power to gratify the Imperial Government, by whom they are to be appointed—a Government which has ever liberally subsidised its creatures. Such, Mr. SPEAKER, are the dangers in our path if we return to the old system of life-appointments proposed by the Government in the Confederation scheme. (Hear, hear.) But the first instructions given by Lord BATHURST to Governor SHERRBROOKE were not sufficiently explicit, apparently; for shortly afterwards he transmitted the following—"I strongly recommend you to see that the Legislative Assembly does not dispose of public moneys without the consent of the Legislative Council,"—thus unscrupulously violating the very essence of the Constitution, evidently under the impulse of rabid national feelings. It is a principle of the Constitution of England that the popular House, which represents the opinions of the people, has alone the right of voting supplies for the administration of the government, and that moneys levied for that purpose from the people can be expended only with the consent of that House and not otherwise. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, what do we find in this instance? We find the Imperial Government expressly instructing Her Majesty's representative in Canada not to allow the supplies to be voted without the consent of the Legislative Council, appointed for life by the Crown, and whose constant efforts were directed to resisting the just demands of the French-Canadians. This question of the supplies, the chief cause of all the difficulties by which we have been beset, both previous to and since that period, was not to be thus disposed of. We then had men who were not to be baffled by

difficulties or rebuffs. And thus it is that we find those noble champions of our rights and liberties coming forward, year after year, with the same demands; never disheartened by defeat, and struggling on until at last their legitimate claims were acceded to. In January, 1819, the Houses were opened, and the first question which brought on an animated debate was, once more, the question of the finances. A discussion arose as to whether the Lower House, after having obtained the annual vote of supply, could moreover obtain a detailed civil list and vote on each item separately. The majority desired this in order to assure themselves of the integrity of the public officials, and to hold in check the members of the Executive Council, over whom they had no control. Others opposed it strongly, as a new principle and violating the rights of the Crown. A committee, appointed to examine into the question, reported in favor of a reduction of the expenditure—which they declared to be far too great in proportion to the revenue—and the abolition of pensions, which tended to grave abuses. Adopting a middle course between the two extremes, some wished to vote the supplies under certain heads, giving a gross sum for each department. But the supporters of a detailed vote carried the day. The bill was passed, sent up to the Council, and, as was anticipated, rejected by that body in the following terms:—

That the mode adopted for the granting of the civil list was unconstitutional, unprecedented, and involved a direct violation of the rights and prerogatives of the Crown; that if the bill became law, it would not only give the Commons the privilege of voting supplies, but also of prescribing to the Crown the number and character of its servants, by regulating and rewarding their services as they thought proper, which would render them independent of their electors, and might lead to their rejecting the authority of the Crown, which their oath of allegiance bound them to sustain.

Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, the Council nominated for life rejected that eminently just measure—the voting, item by item, of the supplies by the Lower House; that is to say, the distribution of the moneys levied from the people—and even went the length of declaring the measure unconstitutional. Is it possible at this time to understand how servility could be carried to such an excess? At that period the population of Upper Canada had increased to a proportionately considerable extent, and the British population of Lower