

reject it. It was true that soon after the resolutions had been agreed upon, copies had been sent to the members of both Houses confidentially, but the people must be kept in the dark. If the members had acted up to the implied requirement of secrecy, and not divulged the provisions of the scheme, the people were to this day ignorant of its character, and it could not be said that it was ever constitutionally submitted to the country. Then we were told that, as elective members and as patriots, it was our duty to accept the measure as it was, even though portions of it might not be satisfactory, rather than lose it altogether. It had been generally represented by the local newspapers in Upper Canada—fed to do so—that it was commonly approved; but while the simple idea of union might find favor, as he believed it did, it was not less true that the country was waiting for the details, of which they would judge when they had been discussed in Parliament. When this had been done, and the bearing of the manifold particulars was thoroughly understood it was expected, at least among the English of Lower Canada, that it would not be passed until after having been submitted to the people. If it were passed through without such an appeal, he had no hesitation in saying that the Government would assume a very serious responsibility, and if, in after times, the union should prove disastrous, it would bring upon them imprecations instead of blessings. And he was under the impression that the Government, whenever they had given their views on the subject, had never said it would not be so presented, but no doubt their utterances were very much like those of the Delphic oracle, susceptible of being understood in two opposite ways. But what could such an indisposition to speak clearly indicate, if not a purpose to press the matter on to a result, even though the people might not want it. Under this measure the elective members would have a right to vote themselves, two out of three at least, as members for life. Now it had been found necessary to enact a law to ensure the independence of Parliament, and for the purpose of removing all temptation to swerve from the right, they were precluded from occupying even the small offices of postmasters in the remotest parts of the country, or acting as security for such officers. For every day that a member occupied a seat in either House unlawfully, he was subject to the extreme penalty of £500, and if this strictness had been found necessary, was not the spirit of the law violated when this House was invited to pass a measure by which

the members of the Legislative Council of the Confederation would be appointed for life, and selected from the members of the present Legislative Council—even allowing that all the Crown nominated members were to be first chosen, as the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands had left us to infer from his remarks.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said he had stated nothing of the kind, and the honorable member had no foundation whatever for his assertion. He (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) had used no such language, but had expressly stated that due consideration would be given to members of both sides of politics, and to life and elective members equally.

HON. MR. SANBORN said he had reason to suppose that what he had stated was a fair inference from what the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands said.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The honorable member could not have been in the House when the statement was made, or how could he draw that conclusion?

HON. MR. SANBORN said he was ready to accept the explanation, as it would not affect his argument. And supposing all the members nominated by the Crown were appointed, he would say it was but just; nay, it would be unjust to deprive them of seats which had been given them for life. The Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands would thus see that he (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) had attributed only such opinions to him as he himself conscientiously held to be right. Assuming then that the Crown members would retain their seats, there was a direct temptation presented to at least two out of three of the elective members. This, he thought, exhibited the project in a very damaging light. Such a measure was calculated to bias the judgment, and ought not to be presented to any legislative body. He held that elective members had received a sacred trust to exercise; that they were sent here by their constituencies to represent them, and to do that only. Under these circumstances he would ask, whether they could conceive they had the power to vote away the rights of their electors? That was not in their *mandat*, and if they did, they would be doing what they had no authority to do; they would be doing what they could not do without going beyond the authority confided to them. Coming to the principle of elective legislative councils itself, he might say it had already been adopted in four British colonies besides Canada. Canada, though the largest of these, was not the first to adopt it,