

Well, Mr. SPEAKER, is there not injustice in this provision? We have been told that we shall have the management of our public lands. I admit that this would be of great benefit to us, if we were in a position to assure those who might settle in our midst that they would have a voice in the councils of the nation. But no, Mr. SPEAKER; immigration to this country will always be impossible under the Confederation perparing for us, and it will be diverted towards the territories of Upper Canada, where the settlers can be represented in the Provincial Legislature, where the climate is more favorable and the soil more fertile. But from another point of view, can we consider advantageous to Lower Canada the possession and administration of its public domain under the circumstances in which we shall be placed by Confederation? Assuredly not, and for this reason: each province is to assume its public lands, with the debts due upon the lands. On the public lands situated in Upper Canada, and which she is to assume, there is a debt of six millions of dollars due to the province, whilst on those in Lower Canada there is only a debt of one million; consequently Upper Canada will obtain from Lower Canada a claim for five million of dollars in excess of that which she yields to Lower Canada. Here we have one of the few great advantages which have been pointed out to us since the beginning of the discussion; and I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, whether it is advantageous to Lower Canada? On the contrary, while highly advantageous to Upper Canada, it is grossly unjust to Lower Canada. Is it not evident that the Confederation is entirely for the benefit of Upper Canada? And is not a sufficient proof of it to be found in the fact that we find in this House but two or three members from that section of the province who are opposed to the scheme? If all the members from Upper Canada, to what party soever they may belong, unite to-day to support the scheme of the Government, it is because they perfectly understand that everything has been conceded to them, and that they have obtained all that they wished for—all the concessions that they sought for, and for which they labored and struggled so energetically and so long. (Hear, hear) That is perfectly well understood. But if influences hostile to Lower Canada, which worked against us during the preparation in England of the law respecting the change in the constitution

of the Legislative Council, had not caused the removal from the Union Act of the clause requiring the assent of two-thirds of the members of the Legislature to effect a change in the basis of our representation—if those influences had not worked to remove that safeguard of our interests, Upper Canada would never have been so persistent in striving to obtain representation based on population. She would have seen the impossibility of obtaining it, and the inutility of asking for it, and would, in consequence, have abandoned it. But from the moment when that clause was removed from the Union Act, it was competent to the Legislature to enact a change in the Constitution by a mere majority; and it may consequently be said that through that influence which worked against us, Upper Canada now obtains representation based on population. (Hear, hear) The members from Upper Canada will observe that I do not maintain that the principle of representation based upon population is in itself an unjust principle; but I maintain that as they refused us the application of it when the population of Lower Canada was in a majority, it is unjust of them to demand it now because they are in a majority, and I cannot see by what right they wish to obtain it now. I say that if the application of that principle was unjust twenty years ago, it is also unjust to-day; and that if it is just to-day, it was equally just twenty years ago. (Hear, hear.) A member considered it very extraordinary that the *Rouge* party—let us call it by that name, since it is the one by which the Liberal party is designated in this country, and we have no reason to take exception to it—since the *Rouge* party in Canada have washed away from that name all the stains with which the *Rouge* party in France had covered it, and that here the banner of that party is spotless—(hear, hear)—a member, I say, considered it extraordinary, and ridiculed the idea that the *Rouge* party should have constituted themselves the protectors and defenders of the religion, the nationality and the institutions of Lower Canada, during the discussion of the scheme of Confederation. But when we see at the head of the movement, hostile to that Confederation, a man like Mr. CHERRIER of Montreal, who will certainly very favorably bear comparison with all the members of the Conservative party of Lower Canada in respect of devotion, honor, national feeling and ability—when we see, I repeat, a man