

If the Senate has not the power to amend Money Bills it has no practical power to see fair play to the Provinces in finance or to protect an interest unfairly used financially. If it threw out a Money Bill under the practice in England, as of 1860, the Commons could the next Session tack a new Bill in the same words to the Supply Bill and say you can not amend, pass, or reject the whole Bill. To reject a supply Bill might in olden times have been feasible but to-day with the functions of Government so vast and complicated it is unthinkable. There would be no pay for the Army, Navy, Civil Service, Judges, Government, Railway men or money to pay any public charge. It would mean chaos. A Supply Bill should be passed as a matter of course by the Senate in almost any conceivable circumstances if it contains nothing but Supply. If other matters are inserted in the Bill or "tacked to it" these should be struck out and be made into a separate Bill or Bills.

Subjoined are a few references to the debates on the Quebec Resolutions in the Canadian Parliament, and also a few references to works on the Constitution of Colonial Governments for conveniences so that those interested may have access to those which are found in the Parliamentary Library.

In the Parliamentary Debates 3rd Session Provincial Parliament of Canada on the subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces at page 21, Mr. Campbell gave the reasons for the Conference determining as they had on the Constitution of the Upper House and says, "And the main reason was to give each of the Provinces adequate security for the protection of its local interests, a protection which it was feared might not be found in a House where the representation was based on numbers only as would be the case in the General Assembly. The number of representatives to the Legislative Council under the Federal Constitution would be limited and they would be appointed for life instead of elected by the people." "For the purpose of securing equality in that House the Confederation would be divided." He then explains why the Senate was not elective. Upper Canada was growing fast and an agitation might arise there for greater representation. "They (Ontario) might object to the fishing Bounties paid the Lower Provinces to the money expended there in fortifications or to something else and claim a representation in the Council more in accordance with their population to enforce their views; and in view of such contingencies the delegates from those Provinces conceived it would not be safe to trust their rights to an elective House." At page 22, col. 1 referring to the Constitution of the United States he says,—“In this way the smallest State like Rhode Island was as fully represented as the State of New York and if that was considered necessary in a country so compact together as the United States how much more would it not be proper in a Confederation some of the sections of which were separate from each other by long narrow strips of land or wide estuaries with small representation in the popular branch and looking chiefly to their equality in the Upper Chamber for security for local rights and interests and institutions.”

Sir John Macdonald says at page 29, Vol 1, "We were forced to devise a system of union in which the separate Provincial organizations would be in some degree preserved." At page 35 he says,—“We resolved then that the Constitution of the Upper House should be in accordance with the British system as nearly as circumstances would allow.” At page 36 he says, "The provision in the Constitution that the Legislative Council shall consist of a limited number of members—that each of the great sections shall appoint twenty-four and no more will prevent swamping. The fact of the Government being prevented from exceeding a certain number will preserve the independence of the Upper House, etc." At page 38, col. 1, speaking of the limitation of the number of Senators, Sir John said, "To the Upper House is to be confided the protection of sectional interests: therefore it is that the three great divisions are there equally repre-