

much of this law as may appear rational and good. I refer to the territorial divisions and the propriety of causing them to be represented by persons who have vested interests therein; and indeed how could any one represent with equal devotion and advantage a division, as the man who had sared rights therein, whether by personal residence or the ownership of the property upon which his qualification rests, and who clings to it because it has descended to him from his ancestor, or because he has acquired it by the sweat of his brow, his vigils and his toils? I hope it will not be said that I intend by my remarks upon this law to disparage the residents in the towns, for the division which I have the honor to represent embraces part of the most populous city in Canada, and I only accepted the charge after the refusal of two of its most eminent citizens—eminent equally by their large fortunes and their social position. But probably those gentlemen had learned by their own experience or by that of others, that public life did not present sufficient charms to cause it to be eagerly coveted. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Before recording my vote on the amendment before the House, I feel it my duty to say a few words in reference to that amendment. I cannot say that I altogether concur in the manner in which it is drawn, but at the same time I feel called upon, as an elected member, to support it. I feel that it would ill become me—that I would be hardly discharging my duty to my constituents—if I were to sit silently by and give my vote to change the Constitution under which I was elected. (Hear, hear.) I feel that there is something extraordinary in the fourteenth of these resolutions before the House, and I would like to hear the Government give a full explanation as to the manner in which that resolution was arrived at in the Conference. Bear in mind, honorable gentlemen, that the eleventh resolution declares that “the members of the Legislative Council shall be appointed by the Crown under the great seal of the General Government, and shall hold office during life.” Thus the House will see that by this resolution the Crown has the right for all future time to select the legislative councillors in Upper Canada from any part of the country which the Crown sees fit; but in Lower Canada there is this difference that, according to the sixteenth resolution, “each of the legislative councillors representing Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature, shall be appointed to represent

one of the twenty-four electoral divisions mentioned in schedule A, of chapter 1st of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and such councillor shall reside or possess his qualification in the division he is appointed to represent.” Then the fourteenth resolution declares that “the first selection of the members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the legislative councils of the various provinces, so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve.” Now, honorable gentlemen, I have always understood—my reading of books on constitutional law has given me to understand—that the greatest of England’s statesmen who have spoken on the question of the Royal prerogative, have always broadly laid it down as a rule that the prerogative should never and could never be limited. How is it then that these thirty-three individuals, talented, able and gifted, as no doubt they were, who met in the room behind me and sat with closed doors, saw fit to hamper and cripple the operation of that good rule? (Hear, hear.) Should the prerogative of the Crown in the selection of members of this House be limited? It may be true that, residing in many of the divisions in Lower Canada represented in this House, there may be good men, competent men, well qualified men; but it is equally true that there may be just as good, able and talented men, outside of them as in it. Why, then, should the doors of this House be closed against these men? Why is it, I would like to know, that the prerogative of the Crown is to be restricted so as to prevent the choice of these men?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I can give explanations to the honorable gentleman. He must be aware that Lower Canada is in a different position from Upper Canada, and that there are two nationalities in it occupying certain portions of the country. Well, these divisions have been made so as to secure to both nationalities their respective rights, and these, in our opinion, are good reasons for the provision that has been made.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I do not think my honorable and gallant friend sees the point of my remarks. I would ask why in the first selection the choice of the Crown is restricted to the members of this Chamber, when probably others out of it could be found whose presence here would be of more advantage to the public?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I do not know what advantage would be derived if the Crown