

is a great mistake. It is just because I appreciate its advantages, and wish to see them secured without any chance of danger resulting from the scheme having been too hastily adopted, that I speak as I do. (Hear, hear.) It is said the people were not appealed to when the unions between England and Scotland; and Great Britain and Ireland, were brought about. That is quite true, but it is equally true that these unions were brought about by the Parliaments of those countries—the representatives of the people. The measures were arranged with them, and the people were represented as to those unions by their Parliaments.

HON. MR. ROSS—That is just what is the case here too.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I beg the honorable gentleman's pardon. If he can find anything in this scheme which has emanated from the Parliament, it is new to me. Are we not told that, if even one amendment is passed by Parliament, it will destroy the scheme?

HON. MR. ROSS—The course taken here is exactly that which was adopted in England. Negotiations first, then the submission to Parliament of their result.

HON. MR. FERGUSON BLAIR—The unions between England and Ireland, and England and Scotland, were not negotiations merely; they were treaties; they were called treaties—

HON. MR. ROSS—They were negotiated first, and submitted to Parliament afterwards.

HON. MR. VIDAL—As it is not my intention to occupy the time of hon. gentlemen on any other occasion during the debate, I shall venture to touch on another point, not directly connected with the amendment before us, on which I said a few words when I last addressed the House on this subject. We have heard much about the proposed new constitution of the Legislative Council. We have been told it was political necessity that first forced the elective system on minds that were by no means enamoured of it, and this, I think, has been fully established. Now, it would ill become me, as an elected member, to dwell on any merits or excellencies the elective system may have possessed as applied to this branch of the Legislature—it is a subject we can none of us touch upon with the same freedom which we might if we were not ourselves elected—but I may call the attention of the House to this, that none of the evils that were dreaded, as likely

to flow from the elective system, have yet shown themselves, and I do not think it at all reasonable, much less necessary, that they should be anticipated in time to come. My own views were in perfect accord with those of hon. gentlemen who protested against the system when it was first introduced. I did not then consider it an improvement, and my views have not changed since; I have, consequently, no personal predilections for an Elective Council, but far prefer a Chamber nominated by the Crown. But I am not here to carry out only my personal views or predilections, but to guard the rights and privileges of my constituents; and I would remind hon. members that it is one thing to concede a privilege, but a very different thing to take it away. (Hear.) A privilege may be conceded unasked, but it is a dangerous thing to take it away unasked or unassented to. (Hear, hear.) I cannot find either that the Canadian Government made any endeavor to maintain the elective principle; I cannot see that the nomination system was forced on them by the wishes of the Lower Provinces. It may have been the desire of some of the Maritime Provinces to maintain their nomination system, but the change in ours was one which obviously met the wishes of the members of this Government, and no effort appears to have been made by them to preserve to the people of this country the privilege they now enjoy of electing members of this House. (Hear.) I think, also, that there are objectionable features in certain provisions of the scheme for which the Canadian Government are responsible. I speak not as an opponent, but as one of their truest and best friends—one who is desirous to keep them from doing a wrong. It is not as an opponent to them or to Confederation that I support the amendment of the hon. member from Niagara.

HON. MR. ROSS—I think that amendment is a vote of want of confidence.

HON. MR. VIDAL—So it has been said; but the assertion is not warranted by the facts of the case; it is merely an arbitrary declaration. I cannot consent to be put in such a position as I should occupy if I thought it were not. It is true, my hon. friends in the Government may say, "You will not do for us if you vote that way;" but I cannot sacrifice my views and vote contrary to my convictions, in order to be counted as a friend.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend