

in conformity, we are told, with the desire of the Lower Provinces. But we must look a little further than this. If you canvass the views of the honorable gentlemen who represented this province at the great Confederation meeting, you will find that most of them were inclined beforehand to concur in the views of the representatives of the eastern provinces, for they have always entertained views in opposition to the elective principle as applied to this House. They acted quite consistently, but it does not follow that they are right in making this change. We know that in former times, when our Legislative Council was nominated by the Crown, difficulties did arise. In old times, bills passed by the Assembly were thrown out almost by the hundred.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—That was before responsible government was adopted.

HON. MR. REESOR—I was about to add that it was before the introduction of responsible government, and that responsible government is a cure for many evils, but not to such an extent as it should be. But under the system of appointment there is another evil—the government of the day is particular in appointing those who are political friends of their own, and have aided them either at elections or in ways which may not be very creditable. (Laughter.) My honorable friend (Hon. Mr. CRAWFORD) may laugh, but if he reflects he will remember that he has himself known men in high positions whose career was not creditable in all particulars. However patriotic and anxious to discharge their duties rightly they might be, their views were sometimes warped by circumstances. Looking across the ocean, my honorable friend will remember that during the Administration of WILLIAM PITT, who wielded almost the sole control of Parliament in England for seventeen years, he appointed, during this period, 140 members to the House of Lords, subservient to his own wishes and intent on carrying out his views. I will just read to this House a short extract relating to him, written by a man capable of judging. In *MAY'S Constitutional History* we read:—

When Mr. PITT had been eight years in power he had created between sixty and seventy Peers, the greater part of whom owed their elevation to the parliamentary support they had themselves given to the Ministry, or to their influence in returning members to the House of Commons.

Now, when motives of this kind can be attributed to Mr. PITT, we need not say that similar motives may prevail here.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Does the honorable gentleman suppose that the members of this House will owe their nomination to the political services they can render in this House?

HON. MR. REESOR—Not solely, but rather to their political services at elections and otherwise, before their nomination. The honorable gentleman will remember a certain little domestic arrangement he made on the other side of the House, while in opposition, in which he had many warm friends. Does he expect to forget those?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I hope not. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—Well, there it is. The honorable gentleman acknowledges his determination to reward his political supporters. Is this the way to obtain an independent branch of the Legislature, one that will operate as a wholesome check on hasty legislation? Those who receive favors from a political party are not likely to turn their backs upon that party. I think we are not likely, under any circumstances, to have a more independent House under the proposed system than we now have, or one which will better advance the interests of the country. If you wish to raise the elective franchise, for elections to the Upper House—if you would confine their election to voters on real estate of \$400 assessed value, and tenants holding a leasehold of \$100 annual value, and thus place these elections out of the reach of a mere money influence that may sometimes operate upon the masses—if you think this body is not sufficiently conservative—let them be elected by a more conservative portion of the community—that portion which has the greatest stake in the community—but do not strike out the elective principle altogether. The late Duke of NEWCASTLE, than whom few British statesmen have had more to do in establishing new and liberal constitutions in the various colonies in the Empire, and whose opinions are very valuable on this point, wrote as follows to the Governor of Prince Edward Island, on the 4th of February, 1862:—

Nor do I think it any way objectionable, but the contrary, that the Council (as in Canada, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania) be incapable of being dissolved by the Governor. An Upper Chamber is valuable as an element of stability, and the principal value of an elective Upper Chamber I conceive to be this,—that while in virtue of its elective character, it may claim equally with the Assembly to speak the voice of the community, it may yet be so composed as to reflect their settled wishes and principles rather