

April 29, 1872

merchants in the country, he went down to his grave honoured and respected by all. He was another of the gentlemen upon whose memory this disgraceful and uncalled for imputation is now cast by the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). The Hon. T. D. Archibald was one of the foremost men in the country. A gentleman who dignified the seat which he filled, who still had held not only a seat in the Legislative Council, but who had been honored by the confidence of a large majority of the people of the country, and had occupied the position of an executive councillor. Mr. Weir had also passed away. He was, as the hon. gentleman knew, one of the most enterprising merchants that Nova Scotia ever had, and had represented several constituencies in the Province. And yet this gentleman who had received the confidence of county after county, and who had been held in high estimation by all classes must also have his memory vilified as far as it was in the power of the hon. member for Halifax to do so. Mr. Miller was another. He was a Roman Catholic gentleman, second to no man of his creed and class in Nova Scotia in point of talent. He possessed the confidence of the country, and the imputation that he purchased his seat in the Senate by the support that he gave to Confederation was as unfounded a statement as ever passed the mouth of man. He (Mr. Miller), representing one of the constituencies of Nova Scotia, came forward in the interests of his country, and avowed in a manly manner that he was himself convinced that the great measure which it is now known involved the prosperity of the whole Dominion was worthy of his support, and he gave that support without the slightest inducement of any kind.

Of all these gentlemen called to the Senate there was not one of them but who had enjoyed the confidence of constituencies in Nova Scotia, except Sir Edward Kenny, Mr. Dickey, and Mr. Archibald. He would not pursue the subject any further, but would merely say that the insinuations of the hon. member were entirely undeserved, and unworthy of him and the occasion.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had stated to the House that in Canada where it had been tried, he would ask the House if it had no significance that the men, not of one party, but of all parties, who met together at the Quebec Conference, and who had sat down and given full consideration to the best system for the government of the Country—men who had tried the elective system—should have resolved to go back to the nominative system. The hon. gentleman said that the people would have condemned that choice, but he gave no evidence. He knew that the men who framed this scheme were sustained by popular sentiment in the country at the elections which followed. The press of the country was silent on this point, and with such evidence as this we had a right to believe, until there was something more than a mere philosophical expression of sentiment to the contrary, that the system adopted was a wise one and in accordance with the wishes of the people. The hon. gentleman had expressed fears that the Senate would become too independent, and that as the Government could not increase their number they would get beyond control, and that the Government would not be able to get a majority in the Senate. He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) thought that this result would be more likely to follow the adoption of the elective system when there

would be two bodies chosen by the people, with co-ordinate powers, drawing their power from the people directly, and claiming the same privilege in reference to the initiation of money votes. He concurred with the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), that after the discussion which had taken place the wisest course would be to withdraw the resolution, and not bring it forward again until there was some indication that the public sentiment of the country desired it. The people would shortly have an opportunity of saying whether this important function of the Crown had been entrusted to safe hands or not.

Hon. Mr. McDougall (Lanark North) asked what evidence had been adduced to show that a change of constitution was desired by the people. He thought that ought to be the first consideration. He thought the constitution had been a success, and was not aware that any part of the country desired a change. When the Quebec convention had been held he had advocated an elective principle in the Upper House, but the decision of the large majority of the delegates was against that view, and in favour of the nominative principle and the great advocate of that principle on that occasion was the political leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie). He was not disposed to make a change until the constitution had had a fair trial and until it was shown that the Senate was an obstruction, every man who wished well to his country would uphold the constitution. The Federal principle should be restrained and kept within proper bounds, and the Dominion House should represent the whole country, standing together, passing laws for the benefit of the whole country. He thought these theoretical questions should not be raised while there were so many practical matters to be dealt with.

Mr. MILLS was quite as sincere in his convictions and his desire for the public good as anyone. He believed that though the Quebec convention decided in favor of the nominative principle, the people at large held a different opinion. It had been said that no change should be made until the necessity arose, as was the case in England. Canada and England, however, were in very different cases, the constitution of Canada had not grown gradually and naturally as that of England had, and he thought it was not wise to wait for some calamity before making a change. Was there any propriety in giving a Province a number of representatives in the Senate to protect the interest of that Province and yet place the appointment of those representatives in the hands of the Government, which might be in antagonism with that Province?

Hon. gentlemen opposite had upheld the high standing of the Senate and yet in the beginning they had been compelled to come to the House of Commons for a Speaker. Why should the Speaker of the Senate be appointed by the Crown, while the Commons appointed their own Speaker? In the framing of the constitution, that of England had been copied instead of being adapted to the different circumstances of Canada. He referred to the Speech of the member for Lanark North (Hon. Mr. McDougall) at Hamilton which had been stated to be in favor of annexation. He believed that if ever there were a change it would be in the direction of a closer change with the Mother Country, and that a state of independence