

Canada insisted that there should be representation according to population, and I remember, when that was granted, we found that Upper Canada was entitled to 82 representatives, as compared with 65 for Lower Canada, and Lower Canada equally insisted that, according to the bargain made in 1840, at the time of the union of the Canadas, the representation was to be equal, no matter what change of population should occur. Practically a deadlock had been reached—but it was not with respect to the separate school question. Do not malign the country. We were not fighting and tearing each other's eyes out on sectarian issues; but we, in the upper province, were insisting, with practical unanimity, that we should have representation according to population, while the people in Quebec were insisting that no change should be made in the Act of Union by which the two Canadas were brought together. So government fell, and government was reconstructed, and government again fell, and it was impossible to carry on the affairs of the country. Public affairs had come to a deadlock, not on account of the school question at all, but on account of the difficulties occurring in carrying on public affairs from the large majority in the province of Ontario holding one view, and the large majority in the other province determinedly holding the other view.

Well, Sir, we will pass on. We come now to the next stage. A great mistake has been made by the Finance Minister; he has mixed up dates and places, and it is well that we should keep them apart. We have the resolutions of Quebec, adopted in the fall or winter of 1864. We have the endorsement of those resolutions by the Canadian Parliament in February, 1865. The resolutions, so far as we are concerned with them as affecting the question of schools, are just as I have read them, they simply saved the rights of the Catholic and Protestant minorities in the Canadas at the time of the union, whenever the union should come into force.

The next step with respect to confederation took place, when? Parliament again met in August, 1866. Difficulties had arisen in the maritime provinces. No difficulty had occurred here. We had agreed to confederation on the terms of the Quebec resolutions, that is to say, the province of Lower Canada and the province of Upper Canada, and there was not one word of guarantee of the right of appeal which we find now in the Confederation Act. In the Parliament of 1866, which met mainly for the purpose of defining the constitution of the local Houses, an attempt was made, at the instance of the Protestants of the province of Quebec, to improve the school system in that province, to give the Protestants what they had been long demanding, and what they had not been able to obtain, notwithstanding that the united parliament represented the pro-

vince of Ontario, as well as the province of Quebec; and, in fulfilment of the promises which were made, not, however, as part of the confederation scheme at all, a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Three Rivers, who was then Solicitor General in the Government, to carry out the promises which had been made during the confederation debate in favour of the Protestant minority of that province. What became of that Bill? Why, Sir, it was withdrawn. After some discussion, it was withdrawn, and some of the statements with respect to the terms of its withdrawal I should like to have an opportunity to read to the House. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring in this statement to show how utterly fallacious was the argument made by the Finance Minister. Remember, the gravamen of this argument, the point of the whole discussion, was, that those clauses were insisted upon, those limitations on the powers as regards education were insisted on in the interest and on behalf of the Protestant minority, and that we here, a majority of Protestants, because it is the Roman Catholic minority which appeals to us, are refusing to give effect to the very conditions on which our forefathers insisted at the time of confederation. Now, Sir, the Bill was withdrawn, and what statements were made? Sir John Macdonald, in announcing the withdrawal of the Government Lower Canada Education Act, said:

The minority in each section would have to throw themselves on the justice and generosity of the majority.

Mr. Cauchon, a leading gentleman at that time, having very great influence in the province of Quebec, said:

At the time of the adoption of the confederation scheme it was understood that the separate school law of Upper Canada was not to be interfered with, and that the Lower Canada law was to be changed in some particulars, but the Protestants of Lower Canada now demand privileges that they should not have asked.

Mr. Dunkin, a Protestant from the Eastern Townships, said:

As the case now stood the Protestants of Lower Canada would have to take their chance, and that chance has firmly believed would be a good one.

The Hon. Mr. Brown:

Congratulated the Lower Canadians that they were to be relieved from the obnoxious school law which the Government designed to impose upon them. * * * * * He contended that the rights of the minority would always be better protected when left to the justice of the majority.

Hon. T. D. McGee said:

We were sending the minorities east and west adrift with a feeling of insecurity as to their future which this House could have removed by frankly dealing with the case. Since that cannot be done the best that could be would be to leave