

the union, 650,000 inhabitants, 200,000 more than the population of Upper Canada, although its government cost only \$573,348; and in the same proportion, provided the new Local Legislature is equally economical as the old, this sum will be increased to \$1,230,000—some \$400,000 over and above the local subsidy, which excess will, of course, have to be raised by direct taxation. These figures, taken from the Public Accounts, are easily accessible by the honorable member from the Gore Division, and are, of course, entirely reliable.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The figures I presented to the House are also reliable, and I challenge the honorable gentleman to dispute them.

HON. MR. ARMAND—I have listened attentively to the honorable members who have spoken to the question before the House, some of whom have manifested fear in regard to the changes proposed to be introduced in the Constitution, and I am far from blaming them, but it is to be observed that none of them have proposed a remedy for the difficulties of the situation. Two or three said that the measure had taken the Legislature and the country by surprise, but it seems to me that those honorable members have forgotten that the question of Confederation was discussed both in Parliament and in the country in 1859, and that since then the Legislature and the press have occupied themselves with it often enough. Did not the Legislative Assembly last year name a committee to inquire into the difficulties which seemed to be hurrying us on to anarchy, and did not that committee report that the remedy for those evils was Confederation? Those honorable members also seem to forget that since the Government disclosed its policy through the magnificent speech of the Minister of Finance to his constituents at Sherbrooke—a speech circulated in all parts of the country by the press of the various political parties—24 elections have taken place, 13 for this honorable House and 11 for the other. Of the 13 for this House three candidates only declared themselves opposed to Confederation, and of those three, but one was elected. Of the 11 for the Assembly, one only objected to it, and it is said that he will now vote for the measure. Relative to that provision in the resolutions of the Conference, having regard to the elective principle in the Legislative Council, I have already stated my opinion, and I would tell the honorable member for the Wellington Division that it seems

to me that the delegates, who are all eminent men, could not have come to such a conclusion except after mature deliberation. I can well understand that before England permitted us to adopt its Constitution—gave us responsible government, allowed us the control of our own affairs; and when its governor was not advised by ministers responsible to the people, but were surrounded by advisers who were more like clerks, who to preserve their salaries were often obliged to submit to the arbitrary will of their master—I can easily conceive, I repeat, that it was expedient to seek a remedy for the wrongs under which we then labored. But to-day, when the parent state requires that its governors shall choose advisers responsible to the people, the elective system is no longer needful in relation to finance or to the tranquillity and safety of the people. As to finance, I will certainly not say that officers of the Government take advantage of their position to speculate in setting up ephemeral candidates—most assuredly not; but I will say that many citizens, little careful of their true interest and of the future of their country, convert election days into days of speculation, by giving rise to corruption, violence and perjury; and I shall be ready, whenever required, to prove as clearly as that two and two make four, that in several divisions the election resembled civil warfare more than proper election contests. I know that many persons, I will not say urged by an inordinate liberalism, degenerating into demagoguery—for I do not believe we have in our young country any of those fierce demagogues—but I will say, that there are persons who wish that all the offices under the State should be submitted to universal suffrage, because they know that in such circumstances they could impose upon the sympathy and the judgment of the people. But I would say to such persons—gentlemen, do not suppose yourselves wiser statesmen than those of the Mother Country, who have established their Constitution after centuries of efforts and contests, and who work it after the experience of centuries. I would further tell them “do not suppose yourselves better able to appreciate the British Constitution than Monsieur MONTALEMBERT, one of the great *literati* of the day, the historian and eminent statesman; or than M. BERRYER, the prince of the French bar, both of whom proclaimed but recently that that Constitution was one of the most beautiful and free that could possibly be desired.” I congratulate the Government upon desiring to preserve so