

years before. The progress of the country requires that from time to time men should enter this House as representatives of the opinions of the day.

HON. MR. ARMSTRONG moved that the House do now adjourn.—Contents, 21 ; Non-Contents, 29.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I shall now endeavor to answer an objection made by the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) to the motion of the honorable member for Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE). He would make it appear that the motion is inconsistent with the position taken by the honorable member who seconded the motion, because he declared himself as favorable to Confederation. For my part, I can see no inconsistency in the proceeding of the honorable member, who merely asks that time be allowed that the people may give their opinions on the question. He does not care in what manner it is allowed. If the Government do allow time for the purpose, it will rest with them to say whether the question shall be submitted to the people by means of a general election, or some other way. The amendment of the honorable member for Niagara does not suggest any particular way of submitting the question to the country. He only asks that it be so submitted, leaving to the Government to choose the most convenient method of doing it. And this is exactly the position which I have myself taken. I have told honorable members who seemed to believe me altogether opposed to Confederation, that it is not the case, that I only want time to ascertain whether the people are in favor of the scheme or not. Only if the project is submitted to the people, it is desirable that it be presented to them in all its details, and not in the skeleton shape in which it is now laid before us. I have no intention to weary the attention of the House, but I thought it right to express my views and say why I intend to vote in favor of the motion of the honorable member for Niagara. (Hear, hear.)

The amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. CURRIE was then put to the vote, and lost on the following division :—

CONTENTS.—The Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Chaffers, Currie, Dickson, A. J. Duchesnay, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Flint, Leonard, Malhiot, Olivier, Perry, Proulx, Read, Reesor, Seymour, Simpson, and Vidal.—19.

NON-CONTENTS.—The Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Bennett,

Blake, Boulton, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, De Beaujeu, Dumouchel, Foster, Gingras, Guévremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, McCrea, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Ross, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, and Wilson.—31.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. AIKINS, the debate was then adjourned.

—o—  
MONDAY, February 20, 1865.

HON. MR. AIKINS said — Hon. gentlemen, when I last had the honor of addressing the House, it will be remembered by those hon. gentlemen who were present that I spoke very strongly in relation to the changes contemplated by these resolutions in reference to this Chamber. Since then, although I have listened very attentively to the speeches of honorable gentlemen, I have heard no good reason to convince me that the elective principle as regards this honorable House should be abolished. It has been asserted by those who are strong advocates of Confederation, that if any amendment is passed affecting the general principles of the resolutions, it will be considered a defeat ; that the scheme will have to be considered again, and that negotiations with the Maritime Provinces will have to be resumed in order to meet the altered view of the case. Had the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) been carried, this might have been the case ; but as the motion which I am about to move applies only to the Canadas, that would not be so. It will be remembered that that amendment affirmed not only the elective principle for all the provinces, but that the life members who are now sitting in this House should continue to hold their seats. It went further and declared that a number to correspond with the life members should be admitted to the Chamber from the Maritime Provinces. In referring to the vote which was taken on this amendment, I find that in the 41 votes cast against it, 11 of the life members of the House voted against, while only three voted for it ; thus they, by a large majority vote, negatived the principles therein affirmed. I refer to this particularly, for this reason, that the ground may be taken by the life members in this Chamber that my amendment is specially directed against, and if carried, would be applicable to these hon. gentle-