

already remarked upon that very point, and if it were changed, would it not be to retain the elective principle? If the Imperial Parliament may do so, may we not ask them to do it? May we not record our views? And would they, upon a measure of such vast moment and pregnant with such results, proceed to adopt a principle unless they knew its operation to be beneficial? Turning to his proposed amendment, the honorable member said that if it were adopted, the principle of federal representation in the resolutions would be retained; the same members would be retained (in Canada at least); and to render the proportion of the Lower Provinces relatively equal, he would allow them to name ten life members. Were we to be told that such a form would be incongruous, and be deterred from considering the proposition? Then we should be reflecting upon ourselves. He and other honorable members sat under a mandate from the people, while other honorable members sat under a patent from the Crown. It would be a reflection both on our past and present condition. There were the same reasons now for adopting such a form as there were when the elective principle was adopted. It was a domestic matter, and should be left to domestic arrangement. Each province had its own peculiar interests, and should be left to the exercise of its judgment in the management of them. If subsequently a change were desired, it could be granted. He maintained that his views were correct and logical, and he was at a loss to see the incongruity with which they were charged. He could not discover any sufficient cause for the proposed change, and as the people had not asked for it, and as Canada formed a large majority of the whole, it ought not to have been granted without reference to their opinions. Representation according to population was now looked upon as a cardinal principle, but it certainly was not observed in dealing with this important question. We were told the vote was taken by provinces, not by numbers, still the Lower Provinces had the majority of representatives, though they represented but a minority of the people. Then it was said our delegates were leading men and men of talent, which he was quite prepared to allow, yet they did not compose all the talent or statesmanship of Canada. In this way the one-third of the populations interested had given the law to the other two-thirds. We were told again that the Constitution emanating from the Conference was desirable because it was modelled on the British Constitution.

The British Constitution was unmatched in the world, and was not susceptible of imitation. It had grown by the accretions of ages, by the independence of the people, and by their undying love of justice and fair play. (Hear, hear.) It had been produced by the strictest inductive method, and stood unrivalled as a monument of the greatest human wisdom. Except in remote future times, it could not be imitated—(hear)—and he did not urge this difference as a demerit, for it was in the nature of things that it should exist. It had reference to different kinds of people—to people of different genius, and to people of new countries and altered circumstances; but though an able theoretical composition, it might fail to produce the anticipated results. It was not a copy of that horror of our Constitution-makers—the Constitution of the United States—but he would show that the delegates had borrowed more largely from that Constitution than from any other, though to be sure, in some aspects, it differed very much from it, as in the provision which gives to members of the Upper House their seats for life. The resolutions provided that an equal representation should be given to the three sections of the Confederation as having separate interests, while in the Lower House the representation was to be according to population. Both these provisions were copied from the American Constitution. The life membership was supposed to be in conformity with the British Constitution, but the limitation of the number of members was a violation of it. The limitation of the power of the federal, and the power of the local governments, was the old story of federal and state rights—in fact, the bone of contention which had led to the present unhappy war; an apple of discord which our posterity might gather in fruits of the most bitter character. There was another branch of the subject he would fail in his duty if he did not touch upon, and that was the situation in which the English of Lower Canada would be placed. The Honorable Premier had remarked at some length upon the disposition to toleration and the indulgent spirit evinced by his people in past times, and he (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) was not prepared to detract from this. He would freely and fully concede the point. He had always lived in the midst of a mixed population, and his division was more French than English, and it would ill become him to cast reflections on their liberality and desire for fair play or justice to others. But this was the time, when treating of important arrange-