

lutions here, the arrangement would not go into effect, and we would be placing the country in a state of turmoil and confusion in discussing measures which would be altogether unnecessary. We ought, it seems to me, first to carry out this arrangement as far as it is possible to carry it, and if we can secure the assent to it of the two larger provinces below, there will be a reasonable certainty of the scheme being effected. And then, and not till then will the proper time arrive for the discussion of the proposed constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada. I am perfectly amazed at the proposition of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON BLAIR), because he is friendly to these resolutions, and gave us the expression of his views thereon in an admirable manner at the opening of the debate. And how the hon. gentleman should desire to have the scheme for the local legislatures *quoad* this project is beyond my comprehension.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—I think it is only reasonable that, as hon. gentlemen argue, they should see before voting for or against Federation what are the proposed constitutions for the local legislatures. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend should add this to the reflection—that at all events hon. members will have a full opportunity of pronouncing upon it.

HON. MR. VIDAL said—Honorable gentlemen, you may probably regard it as presumptuous in one so inexperienced as I am in parliamentary debate, to enter the lists against the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, and to venture to dispute the validity of the arguments adduced by him in his eloquent speech against the amendment now under consideration; yet, great as is the existing disparity in point of ability and influence, I do not shrink from the contest, for I believe that I have truth and justice on my side, and have confidence that in its own inherent power, the truth will ultimately prevail. I have listened with delight to the hon. gentleman's address, and cordially concur with his views on many points, but there are some in which I differ, in none more so than that which regards all who support the amendment of the hon. member from the Niagara Division (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) as insincere, nay, even as wanting in loyalty to the Crown and to the country.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—What I said was this, that I was slow to believe in the

sincerity of those who advocated a measure and sheltered themselves behind details.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It was more pointedly put than that. It was said that the terms of the motion were such as clearly showed that it was made simply for the object of defeating the measure.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And I repeat that it is so. But that is very different from what you charged me with saying.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman made the remark that we were not altering the Constitution, but that the question before us was one simply for an address to the Crown. Now, strictly speaking, and taking the words of the motion in their mere literal sense, this statement is correct; but I ask hon. gentlemen if it is fair or candid to endeavor to lead the House to believe that this motion, which is undoubtedly for an address, is not in effect for a change in the Constitution? Are we not plainly told that no Imperial legislation will take place on this subject, unless such an Address as this receives the assent of the Canadian Legislature? I hold, therefore, that the motion before us, though it be for an Address to Her Majesty, is in effect a measure, which has for its object a change of the Constitution. Such being the case, the subject is one which demands our most careful consideration, and for which we ought to be allowed all the time requisite to the fullest and freest discussion. The changes which have been referred to, and with which it has been sought to compare this change, cannot with propriety be regarded as similar. I contend, in the language of the honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR) who has just preceded me, that this is in fact a revolution: the word is not too strong. So far from its being as has been stated, a simple change, like the mere introducing or reintroducing the use of the French language into the Legislature, or even the more important step of altering the constitution of this House, it is an entire alteration of our political condition and relations, and affects most deeply the whole country in all its varied interests. Whatever may be the correctness or incorrectness of the opinion of my hon. friend as to hon. members covering their hostility to the scheme of Confederation by objecting only to its details, it will not apply to me; I shall take no shelter under details. My course in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Niagara is based on broad and constitutional grounds. I differ from that hon. gentleman in regard to some of