

men here, however, have said that they were in favor of direct taxation for the support of the local governments, because it would lead those who have to pay the taxes to look more closely into what was going on, and the manner in which their money was expended. (Hear, hear.) There seems also to have been a feeling in the Lower Provinces in favor of a legislative union, and the Hon. Mr. GREY seems to be combatting that idea. He says that with a legislative union, municipal institutions, and direct taxation in every province, would be the only means of getting along. He expressed himself as opposed to that and in favor of a Federal union, which he thought would afford them all the advantage that could be attained, commercially, by union, and would allow each province to retain control over its own local affairs. The local legislatures, he said, were to be deprived of no power over their own affairs that they formerly possessed. But in Canada it was represented that the local legislatures were to be only the shadow of the General Legislature—that they were to have merely a shadow of power, as all their proceedings were to be controlled by the Federal Government. That is the position taken by the advocates of the measure on this floor. So it seems that those gentlemen who have represented to us that they acted in great harmony, and came to a common decision when they were in conference, take a widely different view of the questions supposed to have been agreed upon, and give very different accounts of what were the views of parties to the conference on the various subjects. (Hear, hear.) In the Lower Provinces they were strongly opposed to direct taxation, while here it was presented as one of the advantages to accrue from the Federation. (Cries of No, no.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I say yes. That view of the case has been taken. If the amount allowed for the expenses of local legislation—the 80 cents per head—was found insufficient, the local parliaments must resort to direct taxation to make up the deficiency, while in the Lower Provinces, it seems, nothing of that kind was to follow. Now, all the gentlemen who have spoken on the Government side of the House have declared that this scheme was a great scheme; but they have declined to allow us to understand what sort of a local legislature we are to have. They will not tell us how our Executive is to be formed. They will not tell us whether we are to have legislative councils in Upper and Lower Canada, and whether or not they will be

elected councils. They will not tell us what number of members will constitute the Executive Council of the Confederation, nor what influence each individual province will have in that government. They will not bring down the scheme for the local legislatures. They tell us that it is better to withhold those details—that we are dealing with Federation alone, and have no business discussing local governments. What is the object of all this vagueness? Is it politic or statesmanlike to tell us that we, the representatives of a free people, are not to know anything about these things, but vote with our eyes shut? I hold that we ought to have the whole scheme before us, but they say we shall know nothing about it. And yet they continue to say it is a great scheme. Well, if it is a great scheme, and they continue to deal with it and with this House in this way, are not they, the architects and fabricators of this great scheme, fairly entitled to be called great schemers? (Laughter.) Are they not treating us as a lot of school-boys? As an evidence of the excellence and popularity of their scheme, they point to the circumstance that they have formed a strong government upon the question, with a majority of seventy in this House, while two governments preceding them could each only muster a majority of two. And because they are so strong they feel themselves at liberty to deny to the people's representatives the right to have information on a most important matter of this kind—information they would not have dared to withhold if they were weak. (Hear, hear.) When a motion is placed on the notice paper of this House for several days, requiring a statement of the portion of the debt which Lower Canada and Upper Canada respectively will have to pay, they tell us that they cannot submit to the House any information of that kind. Is it possible that the hon. gentlemen composing the Government have not determined that question at this stage of the proceeding, and that they have not yet made up their minds respecting it? If they have not, it shows that they have been trifling with their position, and have not been discharging the duties devolving upon them. It has also been represented that this matter has been so fully before the country for a great length of time, that it is not necessary to submit it to a vote. I would ask in what way has it been before the country? Why, it was declared, in the first instance, by the