

of the country, to involve them in a much larger expenditure, to change the constitution of the Upper House completely, to bring in an additional number of representatives from Upper Canada, and to add a new element of forty-seven members altogether to the Lower House. I say I am persuaded the people did not understand that this was to be done without their having an opportunity of speaking upon it, and of saying whether they approved of it or not. (Hear, hear.) And I scarcely can believe that we will be able to find, at this late day of the world's history, in a free country such as Canada, among a people who understand what are their rights and liberties, a government prepared to act in so unconstitutional a manner—a government ready to tyrannize and to assume the part of an oligarchy. (Hear, hear.) But this Government is prepared to act thus. They tell their followers that they are at their peril to accept the scheme just as it is, that they are not at liberty to change a single word of it, and if they do so they will defeat the whole project. That, however, is not the way in which hon. gentlemen in the Lower Provinces deal with this question. Hon. Mr. TILLEY, in Nova Scotia, only two or three days ago, made the declaration that if the people's representatives choose to alter the resolutions, they were at liberty to do so. (Hear, hear.) And yet we in Canada are gravely told that we are not to be allowed to exercise any judgment or to pronounce any opinion upon it. (Hear, hear.) I regard the scheme itself as having been got up hastily, for it bears upon its face the evidence of haste and of compromise. Indeed, it is a complete piece of patchwork, and as we are all aware, it is a piece of patchwork in which we are not to be at liberty to change the patches in any respect so as to make it look better to the eye or more endearing to those who will have to wear it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) On the subject of the Legislative Council, it does strike me that the language is not such as to convey the idea that hon. members of this House have said it ought to convey. The 14th section reads thus:—

The first selection of the members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the legislative councils of the various provinces.

You will observe the language—"From the legislative councils of the various provinces." That is, from the legislative councils

now in existence. "So far," the clause goes on to say, "as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve; such members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective local governments." Honorable gentlemen say that means, upon the nomination, so far as Canada is concerned, of the present Government. I presume that in the nature of things, the hon. gentlemen who are at present administering our affairs anticipate that they will be the controllers of our destiny, for some time at all events, in the Federal Government. So that they are going themselves to nominate to themselves. Is that the object of the clause? In point of fact, would it be such in its operation, because before these nominations can take place, I assume that the Executive Government must be in existence, and that when the Federal Government comes into existence, the present Government will cease *co-instanti*. I take it that so soon as the Imperial Act passed, there would be an end to the present arrangements, and that the local legislatures and the General Legislature would be brought into existence at the same moment. The present Government of United Canada would cease to exist. And how then would the nominations to the Legislative Council take place, from this Government to the Executive Government of the Confederation? (Hear, hear.) In one way, these resolutions may be considered as only an outline of the Constitution. But they seem to have descended to very small details. For instance, they say that a member who is absent from the Council for two sessions shall vacate his seat. This is a very small piece of detail, and I regard it also as a very unjust piece of detail, because the cause of a member's absence may be sickness, and it may be the case that a member would be sick during the period of two sittings of Parliament and well immediately afterwards.

AN HON. MEMBER—In that case he might be excused.

Another HON. MEMBER—Or he could be re-appointed.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—There is no provision for any such thing; and I hold that when they went into detail such as this, the details ought to be full enough to prove what is meant. But if it is not detail—if it is mere skeleton—why did they introduce this at all? Why not simply say that the