

given to the elective principle, and the House remains now a visible memento of the carrying out of the very position which I take on the present occasion. (Hear, hear.) The ground taken then, and to which the Hon. Premier (Hon. Sir ETIENNE P. TACHÉ) gave the sanction of his name and reputation, was a recognition of the principle embodied in the amendment now before this honorable House. (Hear, hear.) If we gained anything by introducing the elective principle, we propose to keep that advantage, by retaining it just in the same form, and bearing the same relation to the proposed Legislative Council as it is retained in and bears relation to this House.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—But, under the present union, there is no federative necessity for relative equality of numbers in the Legislative Council, as there will be under the proposed union.

HON. MR. SANBORN—I admit no necessities of the kind. These necessities are entirely artificial. In that respect, I think hon. gentlemen are entirely in error in the position they take. And, though I concede to my hon. friend from Erie Division (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) every credit for great candor and soundness of judgment, still I must say that, when he enters into the province of law, he is travelling a little, as we say in the profession, out of the record—and that any one who is familiar with the doctrine of trusts could not fail to see the falseness of his reasoning in that particular. As regards a trust, of course, the person who has a mandate given to him, must act according to his discretion under the circumstances. But then he must do so within the trust that is given him, and not beyond the trust.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—Of course.

HON. MR. SANBORN—My hon. friend cites the act empowering the Legislature of Canada to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, and on this act he bases his whole argument. If I convince him that that act does not cover his argument, will he then concede the point? That act, to which my hon. friend refers, was passed for a specific purpose, to enable Parliament to re-construct this House. It had answered its purpose when the constitution of this House was changed, but it cannot properly be invoked as giving authority with reference to bringing in other provinces to form a new Confederacy.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—But my hon. friend will observe, that we are not legislat-

ing now—that we are merely passing an Address.

HON. MR. SANBORN—We must feel that, according to the rules of law, we are asked here to go beyond the duties which our electors sent us into this House to discharge. I contend that neither any act on our own Statute Book, nor any Imperial Act, authorizes us to assume that they elected us to come here to demolish the whole fabric of our Constitution; and to seek to form another and entirely different political system, embracing a number of other provinces, so that our identity is entirely swamped and lost. I must say that, if my hon. friend feels bound at all by the trust committed to him by those who sent him here as a representative of the people, I conceive he is necessarily bound to this, that he must sustain the elective principle with regard to the constitution of the proposed Legislative Council. It is impossible, I think, to arrive at any other conclusion. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend made use of one expression, with apparently some degree of reluctance—the term “buncombe.” I think that was suggestive, and very suggestive. For, if those who are favoring this principle favor it for what my hon. friend characterizes as “buncombe,” then they are seeking popularity with the people—they are seeking what the people want—(hear, hear)—and that argument certainly does not avail my hon. friend in his present position; for he maintains that the people fully understand this thing, and want it. If this be the case—if the whole Province of Canada is bent upon having this scheme—then those who are trying to resist it are standing alone, and are either acting patriotically, or are beside themselves. They cannot certainly be acting from any desire to obtain popularity, because, according to my hon. friend, they are just doing what the people do not want them to do. (Hear, hear.) I know that the position of my hon. friend is somewhat embarrassing. He resides in a section of the province, where he feels there is a difficulty that needs to be removed in some way or other; and he is now endeavoring to show that the best means of removing that difficulty is to embrace a great many other difficulties of a huge character, and of which we cannot fully comprehend the consequences. When an hon. gentleman is prepared to take that ground, I think it would be better for him to take it in silence, than to attempt to sustain it by reason. As regards Lower Canada,