

the present Commissioner of Crown Lands. He has only been in office a few months, and I have not read his report. But I refer to the past, and I say that the whole of that domain has been squandered away in useless expenses. There is another matter which I have opposed—the Militia Bill of 1862. I admit that I opposed that measure. That was a measure which was going to entail upon the country an enormous expenditure, which would have exhausted our resources at a time when that expenditure was not required. Why, honorable gentlemen, was not the *Trent* diffidently settled at the time? Had not the American Government complied with the demands of Great Britain, and what threatened us to authorize that expenditure? There is one expenditure which I opposed, which might perhaps be questioned. I opposed the Supply Bill in 1858, and I had then voting with me, my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands. (Hear, and laughter.) Whether that vote can be defended in a constitutional point of view, I cannot say; but every vote I have given in this House, or the other branch of the Legislature, has been given in accordance with what I conceived to be the interests of my native country. (Hear.) My honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, alluded the other day to the conservative feature of the Senate in the United States, in allowing the same representation to small states as to the larger states. But this does not at all affect the general arrangement, because the large majority are large states. But while my honorable friend approves of this portion, he should have expressed an opinion on the whole system. In the United States, no change of constitution can be effected without the consent of two-thirds of both branches of the Legislature, and that must afterwards be sanctioned by three-fourths of the state governments. This is a conservative feature also. Then, what are the constitutions of the state governments. I have here a clause taken from the constitution of one of the states (Connecticut), which provides that:—

Whenever a majority of the House of Representatives shall deem it necessary to alter or amend this constitution, they may propose such alterations and amendments, which proposed amendments shall be continued to the next general assembly, and be published with the laws which may have been passed at the same session, and if two-thirds of each house, at the next session of said assembly, shall approve the amend-

ments proposed, by yeas and nays, said amendments shall, by the secretary, be transmitted to the town clerk in each town in this State, whose duty it shall be to present the same to the inhabitants thereof, for their consideration, at a town meeting legally warned and held for that purpose; and if it shall appear in a manner provided by law, that a majority of the electors present at such meetings shall have approved such amendments, the same shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of this constitution.

That is the way one of the oldest states guards the rights and liberties of its people. Then here is another extract from the constitution of the state of Mississippi, one of the new states, showing how the people there are protected against hasty innovation:—

Whenever two-thirds of the general assembly shall deem it necessary to amend or change this constitution, they shall recommend to the electors, at the next election for members of the general assembly, to vote for or against a convention; and if it shall appear that a majority of the citizens of the state, voting for representatives, have voted for a convention, the general assembly shall, at their next session, call a convention, to consist of as many members as there may be in the general assembly, to be chosen by the qualified electors in the manner, and at the times and places of choosing members of the general assembly; which convention shall meet within three months after the said election, for the purpose of revising, amending, or changing the constitution.

Now, in addition to this, what have we seen? Have we not seen changes in the constitution latterly in respect to slavery, and have they acted upon this till they have been ratified by the state governments? Now, compare this mode of procedure with that adopted in regard to the scheme—and very properly called a scheme—of Confederation submitted to this House. How were these delegates called into existence? Are they not self-appointed? (Hear.) Did not the members of the Executive Council of Canada constitute themselves delegates? (Cries of “no, no,” and “yes.”) And the members of the Executive Councils of the Lower Provinces, did they not also constitute themselves delegates? They prepared a scheme which they have laid before Parliament, and what is that scheme? It was embodied in resolutions sent to members of the Legislature before the meeting of the House, marked “private,” both on the outside and inside. Did any honorable member feel himself at liberty to go before his constituents, and explain it to them? Did any honorable member feel himself at liberty to