

men. The vote they have already given on the resolution referred to is my vindication, and they, in affirming the general principles of the Confederation resolutions, will vote for that which may deprive them of their seats.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. AIKINS—The hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands cries "Hear, hear!" But, after the life members of the House have affirmed by their votes that they do not desire that the elective principle should obtain, I do not think they can find fault with me, an elective member, for affirming that it should prevail. And it does appear to me, hon. gentlemen, that this House, if constituted as foreshadowed by these resolutions, would be one of the most independent and irresponsible bodies that could possibly be created, the Crown possessing no power whatever over it. There is no power of dissolution; the Crown has no power to add to the number; and whatever difficulties might possibly occur under the elective system, when the opportunity is afforded to the people of correcting those difficulties, it will be found that these difficulties will be largely increased under the proposed system. It has been stated by some hon. members that a dead-lock might occur. That was the impression which prevailed when the elective principle was introduced; but few have thought proper to use such an argument during the present debate, because it has not been proved by the result. But if it were possible for a dead-lock to occur under the elective system, it is far more probable under the system proposed in the resolutions. If a feeling had been manifested by this Chamber since the elective principle was introduced—if we had attempted in any one respect to usurp the exclusive privileges of the Legislative Assembly—it might then with truth be affirmed that the introduction of the elective principle in this Chamber was a dangerous one. But such has not been the case. I think that the elective principle has worked well, and that so far as the danger of a conflict is concerned, it is as far removed under the present system as under the nominative system. Holding these views, I have thought it proper to place my amendment before the House, and I trust that the question will be discussed fairly on its merits. I beg now to move, seconded by Hon. Mr. BUREAU,—

To resolve, in amendment to the resolutions of the Hon. Sir E. P. TACHE,—That the Legislative

Councillors representing Upper and Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature, shall be elected as at present, to represent the forty-eight electoral divisions mentioned in schedule A of chapter first of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and each such Councillor shall reside or possess the qualification in the division he is elected to represent.

The ground may be taken by many hon. gentlemen who are strongly in favor of this scheme, that there is much more symmetry in the scheme presented by the resolutions, and which this motion, if carried, would mar. But really there is very little harmony in them. Under them the appointed councillors will, in Lower Canada, be required to reside in certain divisions or to hold their property there. In Upper Canada the same property qualification applies, but as to residence there is no restriction; whilst in one of the Maritime Provinces (Prince Edward) qualification is based on personal property only. Hence there is in reality very little symmetry about the scheme. (Hear hear.)

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU raised the point of order that the amendment had in substance been already disposed of by the vote on the amendment of Hon. Mr. SANBORN.

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—The question of order raised by the hon. gentleman is whether the amendment now proposed is not substantially the same as the one voted on by the House and brought forward by the Hon. Mr. SANBORN, and if it is, whether it is in order? Before giving my decision, I wish that the mover of the amendment should himself explain the difference between his motion and that already decided by the House, if he thinks proper to do so.

HON. MR. AIKINS—I contend that it is not the same, in effect, as the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Wellington. It is true that the elective principle is affirmed in both; but then the motion of the Hon. Mr. SANBORN went further and applied the elective principle to the Maritime Provinces, and was favorable to the retention of the life members, and it also extended the life principle to the Maritime Provinces, and contemplated the addition of ten life members to this Chamber from those provinces. My motion simply affirms the elective principle so far as Canada is concerned, and between the two I think there is a material difference.

HON. MR. ROSS—There is no doubt that the motion of the honorable member for